

Running head: CULTURAL STYLES, RELATIONAL SCHEMAS AND PREJUDICE

Cultural Styles, Relational Schemas and Prejudice Against Outgroups

Jeffrey Sanchez-Burks

Richard E. Nisbett

Oscar Ybarra

University of Michigan

Final Version

Keywords: Culture, Relational Schemas, Prejudice, Intergroup Biases, Work Styles

Abstract

Two studies provide evidence that, in work situations, Latinos (Mexicans & Mexican-Americans) are guided by a concern with socioemotional aspects of workplace relations to a far greater degree than are Anglo-Americans. The focus on socioemotional considerations results in Latinos having a relatively greater preference for workgroups having a strong interpersonal orientation. Preferred relational style had a far greater impact on preferences for workgroups and judgements about their likely success than did the ethnic composition of the workgroups, for both Latinos and Anglo-Americans. Evidence that the two groups differ markedly in relational schemas comes from examination of suggestions about how group performance could be improved, judgements about whether a focus on socioemotional concerns necessarily entails a reduction in task focus, and recall for socioemotional aspects of workgroup interactions. Implications for the dynamics of intercultural contact are discussed.

(Characters 981; Words 136)

Relational Schemas, Cultural styles, and Prejudice Against Outgroups

Ethnocentrism, prejudice and misunderstandings often follow in the wake of intercultural contact. As work settings become increasingly culturally diverse, within and across national boundaries, the opportunity for these negative intergroup dynamics increases. Intercultural contact in the workplace has been associated with conflict, negative intergroup competition, turnover, and absenteeism (Garza & Santos, 1991; Pelled, 1996; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992). These negative outcomes are most commonly attributed in the psychological literature to factors such as in-group favoritism, competition for scarce resources, and a deep level of aversion for outgroups which may be the result of socialization or innate factors (for reviews of this literature see Hirschfeld, 1996; Sidanius, 1993; Stephan, 1985; Tajfel, 1982; Zanna & Olson, 1994).

Curiously, cultural differences in relational style have often been largely overlooked as a significant influence on intergroup prejudice. Cultural groups often bring into work situations very different assumptions about appropriate interaction patterns and these may influence intergroup dynamics (Forgas, 1985). For example, expressing one's appreciation of a colleague at work with a strong embrace is considered inappropriate and unprofessional within Northern European and American cultures, but is considered quite normal within Latin and Middle-Eastern cultures (Condon, 1985; Kras, 1995; Trompenaars, 1993). The cultural psychology and anthropology literatures are replete with such examples of cultural variation in attitudes about appropriate workplace behavior. The purpose of the present research is to propose a relational schema approach to a very broad-based and deep-seated set of differences in interpersonal orientation having to do with "task" versus "socioemotional" concerns. We explore the nature of such relationship schemas and examine the possibility that they can sometimes have a more powerful influence on intergroup prejudice than can differences in ethnicity per se.

Task and Socioemotional Relational Orientations Across Cultures

The distinction between task-related and socioemotional approaches to social relations appears throughout the psychological literature differentiating types of social goals (Bales, 1965; Benne & Sheats, 1948), conflicts (Coser, 1956; Jehn, 1997), leadership styles (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974; Sinha, 1980), and interpersonal relationships (Blau, 1964; 1979; Clark & Mills, 1993; Goffman, 1961; Weber, 1947). When people are guided by a task-focused orientation, their effort is directed toward accomplishing task-related goals, and attention is focused on monitoring the extent to which these goals are being accomplished. When people are guided by a socioemotional relational orientation, their effort and attention are directed toward the interpersonal climate of the situation, and they strive to maintain social harmony. Interestingly, the fault line between cultural differences in workplace relational styles also appears to run along these two dimensions. A culture's relational style in work contexts can be characterized by the role of these two orientations in group members' representation of appropriate work behavior.

An implicit assumption in the psychological literature is that, in any given situation, people relate to others according to either a task orientation or a socioemotional orientation--but not both simultaneously (e.g., Bales, P., & Williamson, 1979; Clark & Mills, 1979, 1993; Fiedler, Chemers, & Mahar, 1976; Zartman & Berman, 1982). Task-focused behaviors and socioemotional behaviors are rarely conceptualized in this literature as congruent or complementary approaches to reaching an objective. Within mainstream American samples, this assumption appears to have some empirical basis. For example, Bales and his colleagues note that very few people attend to both task and socioemotional goals in a given situation (Bales et al., 1979; Parson, Bales, & Schils, 1953). Research on role differentiation in workgroups suggests that individuals who take on a task role, a role in which they impose deadlines, critique the work

of others, and so on, are less likely to also be the people who simultaneously play a strong socioemotional role (Bales, 1958; Fiedler et al., 1976). It appears that behaviors corresponding to these orientations are incompatible—leaders, relationships, and work styles are either task-oriented or socioemotional-oriented, but rarely both. Insofar as the task and socioemotional dimensions are regarded as unipolar, it is assumed that the more one focuses on interpersonal relationships the less progress one will make toward completing a task. Conversely, the quality of interpersonal relationships is assumed to decline as more effort is spent focusing on completing a task. The implication is that task and socioemotional orientations are inherently in opposition to one another. We will take a closer look at the relationship between these orientations and examine how they are mentally represented across cultures.

There is evidence that the assumption of a negative relationship between task and socioemotional orientations may not be universal (Ambady, Koo, Lee, & Rosenthal, 1996; Bond, 1986; Diaz-Guerrero, 1967; Doi, 1962). Cultural research on work styles suggests that an assumed negative relationship between these two orientations may be specific to certain cultural groups. Indeed, parsing out the social world into task and socioemotional situations (e.g., work versus social events), may actually be a unique feature of Northern European culture, linked historically to the influence of ascetic Protestantism in the Calvinist tradition (Fischer, 1989; McGrath, 1993; McNeill, 1954; Weber, 1904/1930). According to Weber, the early ascetic Protestants' emphasis on an unsentimental impersonality in work conduct developed out of the idea that work was one's calling, and hence, "to use time in idle talk, in sociability...[while working] is evil because it detracts from the active performance of God's will in a calling" (Bendix, 1977, p. 62). As Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1993) put it: "No intimacy, affection, brotherhood, or rootedness is supposed to sully the world of work" (p. 133). This

historical link to ascetic Protestantism would help explain why the suppression of socioemotional considerations in work relations runs counter to the tendencies of many minority groups in our society and cultures abroad (Sanchez-Burks, 1999). For example, socioemotional aspects of work relations appear to be emphasized, not suppressed, in Latin cultures (Lindsley & Braithwaite, 1996; Triandis, Marin, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984), Japanese culture (Misumi, 1985), Indian culture (Kool & Saksena, 1988; Sinha, 1980), and Middle Eastern cultures (Ayman & Chemers, 1983).

The Latin American work relational style illustrates this contrast with the European-American style. Whereas the mainstream American assumption about work is that business is business and not a social activity (Kimmel, 1994), among most Latin American cultures there is a deep cultural tradition centered on the concept of simpatía (Triandis et al., 1984). This highly valued relational style resembles the search for social harmony characteristic of many East Asian cultures, but includes an emphasis on expressive displays of personal charm, graciousness, and hospitality more specific to Latin cultures (Diaz-Guerrero, 1967; Gabrielidis, Stephan, Ybarra, Pearson, & Villareal, 1997; Roll, Millen, & Martinez, 1980). A person who is simpatico(a) is one who pro-actively attempts to create a highly personable atmosphere as an end in itself, even in the workplace (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994; Condon, 1985; Triandis et al., 1984). A review of the literature on the contrast between Latin and European-American work styles reveals this difference in socioemotional emphasis in a variety of work contexts such as clinical settings (Roll et al., 1980), educational settings (Zea, Quezada, & Belgrave, 1994), international negotiations (Glenn, Witmeyer, & Stevenson, 1977; Shenkar & Ronen, 1987), and occupational settings (Lindsley & Braithwaite, 1996).

The present research takes a social cognition approach to these cultural styles, applying, in particular, the notion of relational schemas. We anticipated that such an approach would show that cultural differences in preference for certain relational styles over others are sufficiently deep that people necessarily evaluate and interpret social events in different ways. One important implication would be that what appears to be group-based prejudice may instead sometimes be preferences for schema-consistent relational styles.

Relational Schemas and Cultural Styles

Relational schemas (Baldwin, 1992; A. P. Fiske & Haslam, 1996), similar to event schemas (Cantor, Mischel, & Schwartz, 1982), social episodes (Forgas, 1985), and scripts (Abelson, 1981; Schank & Abelson, 1977), are cognitive structures that provide goals and expectations about what can be expected to occur in a given situation, what behaviors are or are not appropriate, and which elements of the situation are important to notice and store in memory (S. T. Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Wyer & Gordon, 1982). Although most of the existing literature in the script and relational schema tradition has focused on the effects of schemas on memory (e.g., Black, Galambos, & Read, 1984; Brewer & Nakamura, 1984), a few studies have demonstrated the effects of relational schemas on behavior, preferences, and social judgments.

For example, Wilson and Capitman (1982) found that male undergraduates primed with a dating relational schema behaved more favorably towards a female confederate (e.g., smiling and talking more, gazing more into her eyes, etc.) than those who had not been primed with this schema. Similarly, Hansen (1989) primed two types of male-female relational schemas and found that participants judged subsequently presented male-female interactions more favorably when they matched the primed relational schema. Hansen also found that participants recalled a greater amount of schema-relevant information than irrelevant information. These findings indicate that

relational schemas provide people with cognitive maps that are used to relate to others and to construct the meaning of the social context (Baldwin, 1992; Cantor et al., 1982; Fiske & Haslam, 1996). The studies also indicate that people prefer social interactions that are consistent with their accessible relational schemas over those that are schema-inconsistent, perhaps in part because schema-consistent interactions allow one to anticipate other's actions and to more easily coordinate behavior and communication strategies with them (Ibarra, 1992; Shaw, 1990).

One advantage of this schema approach to cultural differences in relational styles is that it suggests hypotheses regarding a number of cognitive processes related to intergroup phenomena that would be difficult to conceptualize outside a schema framework. For example, it suggests that groups that differ in how task and socioemotional orientations are structured cognitively should also differ in how they comprehend the consequences of emphasizing task versus socioemotional behaviors in a given situation. In addition, cultural and ethnic-group differences in the use of socioemotional and task relational schemas will be reflected in differences in encoding and recall of socioemotional-related and task-related information. Indeed, assessing people's comprehension, evaluations and memory of social interactions are among the most common techniques researchers use to demonstrate the existence and operation of specific relational schemas (for a review see Baldwin, 1992). The present research relied upon these techniques to make specific predictions about hypothesized schema differences between Anglo-Americans and Latins.¹

The first goal of the research was to show that people evaluate workgroups differently depending on whether they exhibit schema-congruent or schema-incongruent relational styles. A second goal was to determine the relative influence of relational schema congruence and ethnicity congruence on evaluations of workgroups and decisions to work with these groups. Relational

schema theory suggests that interpersonal preference for coworkers will be based to a substantial degree on the match between the actor's relational schemas and the target's behavior. An individual guided primarily by a task relational schema at work, for example, is likely to choose a co-worker who refrains from expressive displays of emotion over a co-worker who does not. However, when the actor and the target differ both in their ethnic-group membership and their relational style it can be difficult to discern whether the actor's preference is guided by relational schema processes or by other biases having to do with ethnicity *per se*.

This sort of ambiguity permeates a large number of studies documenting intergroup biases in work settings. For example, Tusi and Egan (1994) found that Anglo-American supervisors rated non-Anglo employees lower on the quality "acts professional" than Anglo employees. These supervisors could have been influenced primarily by factors related to ethnic-group membership, as would be explained by social identity or categorization processes (Brewer, 1979; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), but they could also have been affected by differences in relational schemas and their influence on people's preferences. In most experimental paradigms, as in daily life, ethnicity is confounded with relational style: people behave in ways consistent with the norms and practices of their respective cultures. The present research disentangles the relative influence of these factors. Our aim was to demonstrate that, at least under some circumstances, relational schema congruence could have a greater influence on evaluations of workgroups and decisions to work with them than would ethnic-group membership.

A third goal of the research was to demonstrate that these evaluations and preferences reflect schema differences, specifically that, in work settings, Anglo-Americans are guided primarily by a task relational schema, whereas Latins are guided by both task and socioemotional schemas. We intended to show that members of the two cultures (i) reason differently about the

factors that affect successful work relations and (ii) differ in their attention to socioemotional events in work settings.

Present Research

In a laboratory experiment (Study 1) and a field experiment (Study 2) we presented Latin and Anglo-American participants with workgroups differing in the balance between task focus and socioemotional focus. In Study 1, one set of participants was exposed to a workgroup in which the targets followed a strict task-focused script (the Task workgroup) while another group was exposed to a workgroup that combined a task focus with an expressive emphasis on establishing and maintaining interpersonal harmony (the Task + Interpersonal workgroup). In Study 2, all participants were exposed to both types of workgroups. The Task workgroup was modeled after ethnographic and psychological descriptions of the Anglo-American cultural relational style reviewed earlier and the Task + Interpersonal workgroup was modeled after similar descriptions of the Latin cultural relational style. In the design of both studies, ethnic identity of workgroups was crossed with the workgroups' relational style; groups consisted of Anglo-Americans or Latins, independent of relational style manifested.

We made the following predictions for Study 1 based on the hypothesis that Latins are guided by both task and socioemotional relational schemas whereas Anglo-Americans are guided primarily by a task relational schema.

1) Latins would evaluate the Task + Interpersonal workgroups more favorably than would Anglo-Americans and that Anglo-Americans would evaluate the Task workgroups more favorably than would Latins.

2) Evaluations would be driven by differences in relational style more than by ethnic differences per se. Thus, we predicted that both Latins and Anglo-Americans would have more

favorable evaluations of the workgroups that exhibited a schema-consistent relational style irrespective of whether the workgroup shared their ethnic-group membership.

3) In further support of the view that relational schema differences drive these evaluations and preferences, we intended to show cultural differences in the way people reason about events and in their memory for events. Specifically, we predicted that (a) Latins would provide more socioemotional-related suggestions for improving the workgroups than would Anglo-Americans; (b) Latins would be more likely than Anglo-Americans to say workgroups would have been more successful if socioemotional factors had been given more consideration; (c) Anglo-Americans, but not Latins, would tend to reason that socioemotional considerations and task considerations would have opposite effects on performance; (d) Latins would recall a greater proportion of socioemotional events than would Anglo-Americans.

There were no specific expectations for reasoning about, or memory for, task-related events. It is possible that Latins are less concerned about task issues, but to assume so would be to adopt the mainstream American view that greater concern with socioemotional issues automatically implies less concern for task issues. Nonetheless, we included questions about task issues that were comparable to those about socioemotional issues in order to explore the question.

Study 1

In Study 1, Mexican participants from central Mexico and Anglo-American participants from the Midwestern U.S. were presented with one of four videotapes of an alleged tutoring session. One version was strictly task-focused (Task workgroup); the other had a substantial socioemotional component (Task + Interpersonal workgroup). We crossed this manipulation with the target groups' ethnic membership: "Anglo-American" or "Mexican." Thus, the experiment consisted of a 2 (Culture: Mexican or Anglo-American) X 2 (Targets' Relational Style: Task or

Task + Interpersonal) X 2 (Targets' Ethnicity: Anglo-American or Mexican) between-subjects design. Participants provided their account of the interaction, evaluated the success of the workgroups, provided suggestions for improving the workgroups, and then evaluated the hypothetical influence of task and interpersonal factors.

Method

Participants

Participants were university students from the Mexico and United States. In both countries, students were recruited from an introductory psychology class or another social science class. In Mexico, 110 students (52 males, 58 females) from La Universidad de Guadalajara, the second largest university in Mexico, volunteered to participate. The American sample consisted of 108 University of Michigan undergraduates (57 males, 51 females) who identified themselves as either "White" or "Anglo-American." Participants from both samples were either college freshmen or sophomores. There were no significant gender effects for any of the analyses.

Stimulus Materials

The videotapes, each about 4 minutes in length, ostensibly contained clips from the first and last part of a half-hour tutoring session between two college students. Four video clips were created by crossing the relational style variable (Task versus Task + Interpersonal) with the targets' ethnicity variable (Anglo-American versus Mexican). The social interaction began with one person entering the room and saying hello to the other. In the Task version, the second person replied politely while remaining seated and then began discussing questions about readings from a class. In this version of the videotape, the entire discussion remained focused on the reading materials. At the end of the interaction, one person stood up, said goodbye to the other person and then walked out of the room. The discussion unfolded in a congenial yet task-focused

manner. The Task + Interpersonal version was similar to the Task version with a few specific exceptions. When the first person entered the room, the second person stood up and walked over to greet him. They smiled, shook hands, and took a few moments to inquire about each other's weekend activities before sitting down and beginning to discuss questions about the readings. Later in the discussion, one person explained how a particular character in the reading reminded him of a movie that he saw last week. The other person stated that he saw the movie as well. After a brief discussion about the movie's highlights and mutual laughter, the discussion returned to the readings. Finally, at the end of the session one person gathered his belongings, stood up and waited to walk out with the other person.

The ethnic identity of the actors was manipulated by two means: providing either English or Spanish names for the targets (Mike Smith and Robert Anderson versus Miguel Ochoa and Roberto Martinez) and by a cover story regarding the audio portion of the tapes. We told participants in the outgroup condition, (viewing Anglo-American targets in Mexico; viewing Mexican targets in the U.S.), that the audio portion was translated from English to Spanish (for Mexican participants) or the reverse (for American participants) and re-recorded so that participants could understand what was said. In the conditions where the targets supposedly shared the participants' ethnic identity, it was explained that "due to a technical error" the audio portion of the original video had been damaged and thus different people later over-dubbed the voices using written transcripts from the original interactions. Thus, in all conditions, participants heard their native language on the audio portion of the tapes and in each case the audio portion was dubbed over the original. In this way, two points were made clear to participants; (a) the targets in the video were either Anglo-Americans interacting in the U.S. or Mexicans interacting

in Mexico and (b) the audio portion of the video was translated when necessary so that they could understand what was being said.

Two bilingual research assistants conducted translations of the audio tracks from English into Spanish and separate bilinguals performed back-translations. At each step, native Spanish speakers from the Guadalajara region were obtained to ensure authenticity of accents and conceptual equivalence. To facilitate both the language cover story and the cultural identity manipulation (targets were of ambiguous ethnicity), small black boxes were later superimposed over the mouths of the actors. Thus, it was impossible to verify the actual language spoken by the original actors. Just prior to viewing the videotapes, subjects read the following introductory paragraph:

In this video you will see a portion of a half-hour tutoring session in which an older student Mike Smith (Miguel Ochoa), meets another student, Robert Anderson (Roberto Martinez), for a tutoring session in the student lounge at school. This is the first tutoring session between Mike (Miguel) and Robert (Roberto). Though they have met briefly before, this is their first time working together.

Procedure

Participants were told that the experimenters were “interested in the kinds of impressions people get of people and situations from different amounts of information.” In each country a native speaker and the first author served as the experimenters. Participants were run in groups of four to six. They read the brief introductory paragraph and then viewed the 4-minute videotape. Next, participants filled out a questionnaire packet that took about 30 minutes to complete. The questionnaire included measures of participant’s (i) memory of the interaction, (ii) global evaluations of the interaction, (iii) suggestions for improvement, and (iv) counterfactual

judgments regarding task and socioemotional factors. The questionnaire contained a final measure that asked participants to write down the apparent ethnicity of the people in the video.

Participants' responses confirmed that the manipulation of the ethnic membership of targets was successful. The ostensible Anglo-American targets were perceived as "Anglo", "White" or "European Americans" and the ostensible Mexican targets were perceived as "Mexican" or "Hispanic" by all of the participants. After completing the questionnaire, participants were fully debriefed.

Dependent Measures

Translations. Participants read the questionnaire containing the dependent measures in their native languages. The questionnaire was developed in English and then translated into Spanish by a research assistant from central Mexico and the first author. To ensure conceptual equivalence, two additional assistants and a professor at the University of Guadalajara back-translated the questionnaire into English. No major discrepancies were found between the two versions. The same procedure was followed in translating participant responses written in Spanish.

Memory. Participants were given half of a page to provide an open-ended "account of what happened in the video" and "to write down everything that came to mind." For coding purposes, we segmented responses into units corresponding to each clause, using Miller's (1984) method (also see Morris and Peng, 1994). Each unit was then coded as socioemotional-related or task-related, or neither. Coders were instructed that socioemotional-related items were those that focused on behaviors that either facilitated or inhibited harmonious interpersonal relationships (e.g., "they were very friendly to each other" or "they didn't show any interest in getting to know about the other person's life"). Task-related items focused on behaviors that facilitated or

inhibited accomplishing the task (e.g., “they reviewed homework” or “they got distracted a lot”). Intercoder reliability (Cohen’s Kappa) was .85. Seventy-two percent of the units fell into one of the two categories. To control for differences in the total amount of information participants provided, analyses were performed on the proportion of socioemotional-related items divided by total number of units and on the proportion of task-related items divided by total number of units.

Global evaluations. Participants filled out two 8-point Likert type scales regarding their “overall impression of how things went” [(a) -4 very negative to 4 very positive; (b) -4 complete failure to 4 complete success]. These two items were significantly correlated, $r(217) = .45$, $p < .001$ and were combined to create a global evaluation index for the analysis.

Suggestions for improvement. Participants were asked to provide two specific suggestions, one sentence each, in response to the probe: “what might have made things go better.” Next to each blank space were 5-point Likert scales which participants subsequently used to weight the importance of each suggestion (1-not very important, 5-very important). Responses were coded as either socioemotional-related (e.g. “more time spent paying attention to the other’s feelings”) or task-related (e.g., “more time spent on working”); 89% of responses fell into one of these two categories. The first author and a research assistant coded the suggestions using typed reproductions of the participants’ responses so as not to reveal the cultural identity of the respondents or the experimental condition. Intercoder reliability (Cohen’s Kappa) was .83. For each subject two indices (each ranging from 0-10) were created; the total weighted number of socioemotional-responses and the total weighted number of task-focused responses. Thus, if a participant provided two socioemotional suggestions, and rated the importance of the first suggestion as “5” and the second suggestion as “3, ” the person’s socioemotional score would be

“8” and their task score would be “0.” Analyses were performed for each of these types of suggestions.

Counterfactual judgments. Next, participants responded to six counterfactual judgments. Instructions were given to “indicate for each item how the tutoring session would have been different if only that item had been present.” Using a 7-point Likert scale (-3 for the worse, 0 no change, 3 for the better) participants rated the probable influence of two types of items, socioemotional-related (if they were old acquaintances; if neither person was interested in learning more about the other’s personal life; if they were complete strangers) and task-related (if they spent more time working; if completion of the task was very important to each of the students; if more time was spent focusing on the task). Items within each domain were combined to create a socioemotional-related index (Cronbach’s alpha = .71) and a task-related index (Cronbach’s alpha = .70) that reflected the extent to which participants felt that change in each domain would facilitate, inhibit or not change group functioning.

Results

Global evaluations

A Culture X Targets’ Relational Style X Targets’ Ethnicity ANOVA was performed on participants’ global evaluations of the tutoring sessions. There was a main effect of Targets’ Relational Style indicating that, overall, each culture rated the Task workgroups more favorably ($M = 1.97$) than the Task + Interpersonal workgroups ($M = .35$), $F(1, 210) = 49.87$, $p < .001$.² However, this main effect was qualified by the predicted Culture X Targets’ Relational Style interaction, $F(1, 210) = 3.67$, $p = .057$. This interaction, shown in Figure 1, indicates that Mexicans rated the Task workgroups less favorably than did the Anglo-Americans, $p = .055$, and tended to rate the Task + Interpersonal workgroups more favorably than the Anglo-Americans,

although the latter difference was not statistically significant, $p > .30$. There were no other significant main effects or interactions (all $ps > .10$).

Mexican evaluations were similar for the Task workgroups regardless of which ethnic-group they believed they were observing; the same was true for the Task + Interpersonal workgroups, both $ps > .15$. Similarly, Anglo-American evaluations were unaffected by presumed ethnicity of the target group, both $ps > .35$. Thus, evaluations of the videotaped social interactions were unaffected by whether participants thought they were viewing members of the in-group or outgroup.

Suggestions for improvement

Culture X Targets' Relational Style X Targets' Ethnicity ANOVAs were performed on weighted socioemotional-related suggestions for improving the interaction and on weighted task-related suggestions. Results for the socioemotional-related suggestions are presented first followed by results for the task-related suggestions.

Weighted socioemotional-related suggestions. As anticipated there was a main effect of Culture. As shown in Figure 2, Mexicans emphasized socioemotional-related suggestions ($M = 2.94$) more than did Anglo-Americans ($M = 1.29$), $F(1,210) = 24.95$, $p < .001$, and did so for both Task and the Task + Interpersonal workgroups, both $ps < .001$. There was also a main effect of Targets' Relational Style indicating that more socioemotional suggestions were provided for the Task workgroups ($M = 3.42$) than for the Task + Interpersonal workgroups ($M = .88$), $F(1,210) = 61.93$, $p < .001$.

There were no significant effects associated with Targets' Ethnicity. Mexican participants provided approximately the same number of socioemotional-related suggestions for Anglo-

American targets and Mexican targets in the Task workgroup and in the Task + Interpersonal workgroup, and the same was true for Anglo-American participants, all $ps > .25$.

Weighted task-related suggestions. There was a main effect of Culture indicating that Mexicans provided fewer task-related suggestions ($M = 3.27$) than did Anglo-Americans ($M = 4.32$), $F(1,210) = 7.12$, $p = .008$. There was also a main effect of Targets' Relational Style indicating that, as would be expected, participants provided fewer task-related suggestions for the Task workgroups ($M = 1.44$) than for the Task + Interpersonal workgroups ($M = 6.01$), $F(1,210) = 182.68$, $p < .001$. There was also a Culture x Targets' Relational Style interaction indicating that Mexicans provided fewer task-related suggestions than did Anglo-Americans for the Task + Interpersonal workgroups ($M = 5.13$ vs. $M = 6.88$) but approximately the same for the Task workgroup ($M = 1.42$ vs. $M = 1.47$), $F(1,210) = 6.52$, $p < .02$.

There were no significant effects associated with Targets' Ethnicity. Mexicans emphasized task-related suggestions to the same extent for Anglo-American targets and Mexican targets in the Task workgroup and in the Task + Interpersonal workgroup and the same was true for Anglo-American participants, all $ps > .40$.

Results were in line with expectations. When asked to analyze what might improve matters, Mexicans emphasized socioemotional considerations more than did Anglo-Americans, but, somewhat surprisingly, did so not only for the Task workgroup but also for the Task + Interpersonal workgroup. Anglo-Americans emphasized task considerations more than did Mexicans, especially for the Task + Interpersonal workgroup. Both Mexicans and Anglo-Americans made the same recommendations whether they believed the groups were composed of Anglo-Americans or of Mexicans.

Counterfactual judgments

Participants rated counterfactual statements regarding the influence of hypothetical socioemotional-related factors and hypothetical task-related factors. Separate Culture X Targets' Relational Style X Targets' Ethnicity ANOVAs were performed for each of these factors.

Socioemotional-related counterfactual judgments. As predicted, there was a main effect of Culture. Figure 3 shows that Mexicans were more inclined to believe that a greater emphasis on socioemotional behaviors would have led to greater workgroup success ($M = .64$) than were Anglo-Americans ($M = .03$), $F(1,210) = 14.13$, $p < .001$. There was also a main effect of Targets' Relational Style indicating that an increase in socioemotional behaviors would have benefited the Task workgroups ($M = .81$) more than the Task + Interpersonal workgroups ($M = -.11$), $F(1,210) = 33.61$, $p < .001$. There was also a significant Culture X Targets' Relational Style X Targets' Ethnicity interaction, $F(1,210) = 4.99$, $p < .05$. This interaction revealed that for the Task + Interpersonal workgroups, Mexicans tended to perceive some benefit to increasing socioemotional behaviors, whereas Anglo-Americans thought that this would make things worse, particularly for Mexican targets ($M = -.86$) compared to Anglo-American targets ($M = -.10$), $t(210) = 2.05$, $p < .05$.

Task-related counterfactual judgments. There was a main effect of Targets' Relational Style indicating that participants rated the Task + Interpersonal workgroups as more likely to benefit from an increase in task-related behaviors than the Task workgroups ($M = 1.80$ vs. $M = 1.09$), $F(1,210) = 21.66$, $p < .001$. There was also a Culture X Targets' Relational Style interaction indicating that Mexicans were less inclined than Anglo-Americans to believe that the Task + Interpersonal workgroup would benefit from more task focus ($M = 1.63$ vs. $M = 1.96$), but Mexicans were more inclined than Anglo-Americans to believe that the Task workgroups

would benefit more from an increase in task focus ($\underline{M} = 1.44$ vs. $\underline{M} = .77$), $F(1,210) = 10.14$, $p < .002$.

There was also a Targets' Relational Style X Targets' Ethnicity interaction indicating a tendency for participants to rate Mexican targets in the Task + Interpersonal workgroup as more likely to benefit from an increase in task focus than were Mexican targets in the Task workgroup ($\underline{M} = 2.0$ vs. $\underline{M} = .98$), whereas participants rated Anglo-American targets as equally likely to benefit from an increase in task focus in the Task + Interpersonal and Task workgroups ($\underline{M} = 1.6$ vs. $\underline{M} = 1.2$), $F(1,210) = 4.55$, $p < .05$.

Overall, these results indicate different understandings about the extent to which socioemotional and task behaviors can improve a work situation. Mexicans thought that increased socioemotional emphasis would improve matters more than did Anglo-Americans, even for the Task + Interpersonal workgroup, whereas Anglo-Americans thought that increased socioemotional emphasis would only make matters worse for this workgroup. There was no overall difference between Mexicans and Anglo-Americans in judgments about the likely effects of increasing task focus, but Anglo-Americans tended to think the Task + Interpersonal workgroup would benefit relatively more from increased task focus and Mexicans thought the Task workgroup would benefit more. The pattern of results indicates that participants' suggestions were guided by principles of appropriate relational styles more than by factors related to ethnic-group membership. In only two instances did targets' ethnic-group membership play a role: Anglo-Americans tended to believe that Mexican performance in the Task + Interpersonal workgroup would suffer more than that of Anglo-Americans if socioemotional emphasis were increased, and secondly, only Mexican targets were believed to benefit more from increased task

focus in the Task + Interpersonal workgroup compared to the Task workgroup. This latter tendency, however, was shared equally by Mexican and Anglo-American participants.

Relationship Between Task and Socioemotional Counterfactual Judgments

The empirical literature on attitudes regarding socioemotional and task concerns suggests that Anglo-Americans perceive these as competing strategies; focusing more on task concerns necessarily means focusing less on socioemotional concerns. Cultural research on this topic suggests that this may not be the case for Latins; effort can be simultaneously directed at task and socioemotional goals. Within our relational schema framework this implies that task and socioemotional schemas would be represented as unipolar and incompatible for Anglo-Americans but not for Mexicans. To test this hypothesis we performed a correlation analysis between the two counterfactual scales for each culture. For Mexicans there was no significant relationship between these two dimensions, $r(105) = .11, p > .10$. This suggests that, for Mexicans, putting forth more effort toward the socioemotional aspects of a work situation does not preclude one's ability to simultaneously focus on the task, and both can independently contribute toward greater likelihood of success. However, Anglo-American ratings of these two dimensions were significantly negatively correlated, $r(107) = -.55, p < .001$. Thus, for Anglo-Americans, if an increase in task focus was perceived as helpful to the workgroup interaction, as indicated by positive ratings, then it was deemed likely that an increase in socioemotional focus would be detrimental to the interaction, as indicated by negative ratings. As anticipated, the difference between the correlations for Mexicans and Anglo-Americans was significant, (Fisher's r to z transformation) $z(217) = 3.69, p < .001$.

Memory

Culture X Targets' Relational Style X Targets' Ethnicity ANOVAs were conducted on the proportion of socioemotional-related information recalled and on the proportion of task-related information recalled.

Socioemotional-related recall. As anticipated, Mexicans recalled a greater proportion of socioemotional-related information than did Anglo-Americans ($M = .16$ vs. $M = .10$), $F(1,210) = 5.86$, $p < .02$. There was also a main effect of Targets' Relational Style indicating greater socioemotional-related recall for the Task workgroup ($M = .17$) compared to the Task + Interpersonal workgroup ($M = .09$), $F(1,210) = 8.84$, $p < .01$, and a main effect of Targets' Ethnicity indicating greater socioemotional-related recall for Anglo-American targets ($M = .16$) compared to Mexican targets ($M = .10$), $F(1,210) = 6.78$, $p = .01$. These effects, however, were driven entirely by Mexican's socioemotional-related memory for Anglo-American targets in the Task workgroup ($M = .30$) as indicated in the three-way interaction, $F(1,210) = 7.21$, $p < .01$. Modal socioemotional responses for Mexican participants in this condition include: "they didn't seem happy to see each other", "the people didn't talk about anything personal/things not related to work," and "they were not very relaxed with each other." None of the other means contrasting Mexicans and Anglo-Americans were significantly different from one another (all $ps > .05$).

Task-related recall. There was a main effect of Targets' Relational Style indicating greater task-related recall for the Task + Interpersonal workgroup ($M = .65$) compared to the Task workgroup ($M = .53$), $F(1,210) = 15.12$, $p < .001$. There was also a three-way interaction indicating that, in the Task condition, Mexicans and Anglo-Americans tended to recall more task-related information for the ingroup compared to the outgroup, $F(1,210) = 5.34$, $p < .05$. This difference was significant for Mexicans, $p < .02$, but only marginally significant for Anglo-

Americans, $p = .08$. There was no main effect of Culture on recall of task-related information, $F(1,210) < 1$

Memory results are, in broad form, consistent with anticipations. Mexicans recalled more socioemotional information than Anglo-Americans. Mexicans and Anglo-Americans recalled equivalent amounts of task-related information. There were, however, two unanticipated additional results: the greater recall of socioemotional information by Mexicans was confined to Anglo-American targets, and both Mexicans and Anglo-Americans recalled more task-related information when the targets were members of their own group than when they were members of the other group.

The results of Study 1 indicate that Mexicans and Anglo-Americans are guided by different relational schemas when perceiving workgroup interactions. This is evidenced by the findings that (i) Mexicans rated the strictly task-focused workgroups as less successful than did Anglo-Americans; (ii) Mexicans more than Anglo-Americans rated socioemotional behaviors as beneficial to workgroup success; (iii) Mexicans perceived task and socioemotional behaviors as mutually beneficial to workgroup success, whereas Anglo-Americans perceived them as incompatible, and finally, (vi) Mexicans had greater memory for socioemotional events than did Anglo-Americans.

The importance of the workgroup's relational style stands in marked contrast to the relative unimportance of the workgroup's ethnic makeup. Neither Mexicans nor Anglo-Americans were influenced more than slightly by the presumed ethnicity of the group they were watching. Of 28 possible comparisons of participants' ratings of their own vs. the other group, only four were significant, and three of these were recall measures rather than the other, more evaluative judgments. Nonetheless, evidence of ethnic-based prejudice did emerge. There was a greater

tendency for Mexicans to note a lack of socioemotionality on the part of task-focused targets presumed to be Anglo-American compared to targets presumed to be Mexican. In addition, Mexicans and Anglo-Americans tended to recall more task-related information about ethnically similar workgroups than about ethnically dissimilar workgroups. Thus, it appears that though the targets' ethnicity mattered, it mattered much less than did the targets' relational style, and not at all for evaluations of success.

Study 2

A second study was conducted to replicate and extend our initial findings and also to address specific issues raised in Study 1. Study 2 consisted of a field experiment in which we set up a stronger test of the hypothesis that evaluations and preferences would be aligned with relational schema-consistent social interactions rather than with ethnic-group membership. The fact that the two groups in Study 1 had had little contact with each other in the course of their daily lives, and little first-hand knowledge of each other, might explain why ethnic-group memberships played such a small role in those results. In Study 2, we remedied this by obtaining samples from two ethnic-groups that have daily intergroup contact as well as an intergroup history marked by conflict and prejudice: Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans living in a U.S. southwestern border city. In addition, we added a behavioral commitment measure to test whether participants would actually join workgroups that displayed a relational style congruent versus incongruent with their schemas. This measure provided the opportunity to examine the relative contribution of relational styles and ethnic-group membership to prejudicial behavior outside the laboratory context. We integrated these extensions of Study 1 into a mixed between-within subjects experimental design that would clearly indicate if an individual's preferences were

influenced by a workgroup's relational style or by the workgroup's ethnic makeup. We also studied cognitive measures as in Study 1.

Under the pretense that the university administration was interested in improving student advisory committees, we asked students in a college with a mixed Anglo-American and Mexican-American student population to listen to two audio recordings of such committees and tell us which one they would like to join in the event that the dean selected them to participate. As in Study 1, there were four versions of the committees (targets' relational style: Task or Task + Interpersonal, crossed with targets' ethnicity: "Anglo" or "Latin"). However, in this study participants were presented with two groups: either an Anglo Task committee and a Latin Task + Interpersonal committee, or an Anglo Task + Interpersonal committee and a Latin Task committee. This resulted in a 2 (Culture: Mexican-American or Anglo-American) X 2 (Targets' Relational Style: Task or Task + Interpersonal) X 2 (Targets' Ethnicity: Anglo or Latin) mixed design with Targets' Relational Style and Targets' Ethnicity as partial within-subject factors. Note that because participants were presented with only two of the four committees (i.e., Targets' Relational Style was not fully crossed with Targets' Ethnicity) analyses of the main dependent measures were performed separately for participants presented with each combination of the committees. In addition to obtaining a behavioral commitment from participants, we assessed their success evaluations of the committees and their memory for information relevant to socioemotional aspects of the interaction or the task.

Our expectations, based on the hypothesized schema differences between Latins and Anglo-Americans, and based on the results of Study 1, were the following:

1) Mexican-Americans would prefer the Task + Interpersonal committee more than would Anglo-Americans, and would prefer the Task committee less.

2) Preferences would be aligned with the relational style of a committee to a greater extent than with the ethnic makeup of the committee. Thus, we predicted that Mexican-Americans would prefer the Task + Interpersonal committee and Anglo-Americans would prefer the Task committee even when this meant choosing to work with an ethnic outgroup rather than an ethnic ingroup.

3) Mexican-Americans would evaluate the Task + Interpersonal committee more favorably than would Anglo-Americans and the Task committee less favorably.

4) As for predictions about preferences, we anticipated that evaluation ratings would be influenced by the committee's relational style more than by the committee's ethnic makeup.

5) Mexican-Americans would recall more socioemotional-related events from the committees than would Anglo-Americans. As in Study 1, we made no a priori predictions regarding cultural differences in task-related recall.

Method

Participants

Sixty-nine male undergraduates (40 Mexican-American, 29 Anglo-American) attending the University of Texas, El Paso participated in the study. All of the Mexican-American participants were bilingual and had lived in the region their entire lives with the exception of some students who had moved from across the border at an early age (Juarez, Mexico to El Paso). All of the Anglo-American participants were born either in El Paso or nearby towns.

Stimulus materials

Audio cassette-tape recordings were made of ostensible student advisory committees that were meeting during the semester to discuss various student concerns and convey them to the administration. The four-minute recordings included samples allegedly taken from the beginning

and middle parts of the meetings. The scripts followed one of two relational styles: a strictly task-focused conversation (the Task committee) or a task-focused conversation with a strong additional emphasis on socioemotional elements of the situation, for example, it included side discussions that concerned relationships more than the task per se (the Task + Interpersonal committee). In the Task committee, the discussion dealt exclusively with items on the agenda. The discussion began with committee members saying hello to one another then proceeding directly to a discussion concerning the day's meeting agenda. At one point, a committee member proposed that they spend a little time getting to know each other more (e.g., talking about their background, interests, etc.). Another committee member immediately responded that they should just focus on the agenda items in the interest of time and efficiency. Later in the discussion, a proposal was made to discuss some topics that were not on the agenda. It was clear in the discussion that this proposal would be time-consuming and cause the meeting to stray from the agenda. This proposal was met with swift and direct criticism from one committee member (i.e., "I don't think that would be a good idea John. Let's just stick to what we have written down"). In the Task + Interpersonal committee, members spent considerably more time on personal introductions and general pleasantries at the beginning of the meeting before embarking on the agenda. When the same time-consuming proposal that appeared in the Task committee was made, a very indirect comment was made in response (i.e., "That sounds like a really good idea. Though, I don't know, do you think we have enough time?").

Crossed with this relational style manipulation, we varied the ethnic identity of the members of the two committees. One committee always consisted of Anglos (as conveyed by accents that reflected the vernacular of Anglo-Americans in the region and by the common English names of the targets) and the other consisted of Latins (as conveyed by a noticeable

Spanish accent and by the Spanish names of the targets). The order of the two committees presented to each participant was counterbalanced.

Procedure

The experimenter, who could be taken for either an Anglo-American or Mexican-American (according to post-experimental interviews during pilot testing), approached participants at various locations on campus and asked if they would be interested in helping the university improve student advisory committees. Participants were told that the 20-minute study involved listening to samples of two committees currently meeting and completing a brief questionnaire, and that they would receive \$5 in compensation for their time.

It was explained that each semester the dean randomly asks a number of students to sit on these committees and that one of the perks of participating in the study would be that they could indicate which of these two committees they would like to join, in the likely event that they would be called by the administration. After completing the questionnaire, participants were paid and thanked for their time.³ All but 2% of the students approached agreed to participate.

Dependent measures

Preference decisions. Participants indicated which of the two committees they would like to join (or indicated "no preference") in the event that the administration would call upon them later in the semester.

Memory. Participants were asked to write down the first four things that they could remember from the first committee and then four things from the second committee. Responses were coded by two research assistants, blind to condition, for socioemotional-related events (e.g., "conversation was friendly", "one person was rude to the other") and task-related events (e.g.,

"completed all of their goals", "didn't work much"). Intercoder reliability (Cohen's Kappa) was .89. Eighty-two percent of the responses fell into one of these categories.

Perceived future success. For each committee, participants used a 7-point scale (1-not successful at all, 4-somewhat successful, 7-extremely successful) to rate the likely future success of each committee.

Manipulation checks. Using 5-point scales, participants indicated the extent to which each committee was "focused on the task" and "focused on relationships between the people" (1-not at all, 5-very much).

Results

Manipulation Checks

Culture X Targets' Relational Style X Targets' Ethnicity mixed design ANOVAs were performed on ratings of the extent to which each committee was "focused on the task" and "focused on interpersonal relationships" and yielded the expected main effects of Targets' Relational Style. The Task committee was rated as more "focused on the task" than the Task + Interpersonal committee ($M = 3.71$ vs. $M = 2.62$), $F(1,65) = 36.61$, $p < .001$, and rated less "focused on interpersonal relationships" than the Task + Interpersonal committee ($M = 2.60$ vs. $M = 4.06$), $F(1,65) = 38.18$, $p < .001$. Target's Relational Style did not interact with Culture or with Targets' Ethnicity and there were no other main effects (all $ps > .20$). These results indicate that the manipulation of targets' relational style was successful. Finally, all but two participants (both Mexican-American) correctly identified the committees as being comprised of either all Anglo-Americans or Mexican-Americans. These two participants were dropped from the following analyses, though including them did not significantly alter the pattern of results.

Preference decision analysis

A Chi-square analysis was performed on the percentage of Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans who chose one or the other of the two committees (about an equal number for each culture indicated that they had no preference, 20.7% of Anglo-Americans and 17.5% of Mexican-Americans). We anticipated that Mexican-Americans would prefer the Task committee less and the Task + Interpersonal committee more than would Anglo-Americans. This was the case; 54.5% of Mexican-Americans chose to work with the Task committee compared to 87% of Anglo-Americans, and 45.5% of Mexican-Americans chose to work with the Task + Interpersonal committee compared to only 13% of Anglo-Americans, $\chi^2(1, N=56) = 6.53, p < .02$.

We predicted that both Anglo-American and Mexican-American preferences would be more influenced by the committee's relational style than by the committee's ethnic makeup. Indeed, as shown in Figure 4 (Panel A), Anglo-Americans preferred to join the Anglo Task committee (88.8 %) far more than the Latin Task + Interpersonal committee (11%), $\chi^2(1, N=9) = 5.44, p < .05$, and preferred to join the Latin Task committee (85.7%) far more than the Anglo Task + Interpersonal committee (14.2%), $\chi^2(1, N=14) = 7.14, p < .01$ (Panel B). Mexican-Americans were also uninfluenced by the committee's ethnic makeup. Mexican-Americans showed an approximately equal preference both for the Anglo Task committee (47%) versus the Latin Task + Interpersonal committee (53%), $\chi^2(1, N=17) < 1$, (Panel C) and for the Latin Task committee (62.5%) versus the Anglo Task + Interpersonal committee (37.5%), $\chi^2(1, N=16) = 1, p > .25$ (Panel D). These results demonstrate particularly clearly that when relational style and ethnic-group membership were pitted against each other, relational style was a far more influential factor than ethnicity in participants' preferences.

Predicted success

Culture X Committee ANOVAs with Committee as a repeated measure were performed on participants' ratings of the likely future success of the committees. The results for participants presented with Anglo Task and Latin Task + Interpersonal committees, presented in Figure 5 (Panel A), show a main effect of Culture indicating that Mexican-Americans provided higher success ratings ($M = 3.9$) than did Anglo-Americans ($M = 3.13$), $F(1,27) = 4.95$, $p < .05$ and a main effect of Committee indicating higher success ratings for the Anglo Task committee ($M = 4.10$) compared to the Latin Task + Interpersonal committee ($M = 3.13$), $F(1,27) = 5.62$, $p = .02$. The results for participants presented with Latin Task and Anglo Task + Interpersonal committees (Panel B) also show a main effect for Committee, $F(1,35) = 9.05$, $p < .01$, indicating that, overall, success ratings were higher for the Task committee ($M = 4.16$) compared to the Task + Interpersonal committee ($M = 3.11$). These effects are comparable to those of Study 1.

Anglo-Americans tended to perceive that the Task committee would be more successful than the Task + Interpersonal committee whether the Task committee was composed of Anglo-Americans (Panel A) or Latins (Panel B), both $ps < .02$. Mexican-Americans did not perceive a difference in the likely success of the Task and Task + Interpersonal committees, whether the Task committee was composed of Anglo-Americans or Latins, both $ps > .05$. The interaction between Culture and Committee (combining over Panels A and B) was significant, $F(1,64) = 3.99$, $p = .05$.

Thus, Anglo-Americans rated the likely success of the Task committee as substantially higher than that of the Task + Interpersonal committee and did so to approximately the same extent whether the Task committee they saw was Anglo and the Task + Interpersonal committee Latin or the opposite. Mexican-Americans saw relatively little difference in the likelihood of success of the two workgroups, also regardless of the ethnicity of their members.

Memory data

Participants wrote down four things that they could remember from the committee conversations. Separate ANOVAs on recall of socioemotional-related events and on recall of task-related events were conducted for participants presented with each combination of Committee (Anglo Task, Latin Task + Interpersonal vs. Latin Task, Anglo Task + Interpersonal).

Socioemotional-related recall. For participants presented with the Anglo Task and Latin Task + Interpersonal committees, a Culture X Committee ANOVA with Committee as the repeated measure was performed on recall of socioemotional-related events. As illustrated in Figure 6 (Panel A), we found the anticipated main effect of Culture indicating that Mexican-Americans recalled more socioemotional-related events ($\underline{M} = .60$) than did Anglo-Americans ($\underline{M} = .18$), $\underline{F}(1,29) = 4.27$, $\underline{p} < .05$. The main effect of Committee was not statistically significant nor was the interaction ($\underline{F}s < 1$).

For participants presented with the Latin Task, Anglo Task + Interpersonal committees, there was also a main effect of Culture. As shown in Figure 6 (Panel B), Mexican-Americans recalled more socioemotional-related events ($\underline{M} = .67$) than Anglo-Americans ($\underline{M} = .36$), $\underline{F}(1,36) = 4.18$, $\underline{p} < .05$. The main effect of Committee was not statistically significant ($\underline{p} > .20$) nor was the interaction ($\underline{F} > 1$).

Task-related recall. For participants presented with the Anglo Task and Latin Task + Interpersonal committees, there were no significant effects (all $\underline{p}s > .10$). For participants presented with the Latin Task and Anglo Task + Interpersonal committees there was a main effect of Culture, with Anglo-Americans showing greater recall of task-related events ($\underline{M} = 1.10$) compared to Mexican-Americans ($\underline{M} = .51$), $\underline{F}(1,36) = 4.74$, $\underline{p} < .05$. The main effect of Committee was not statistically significant nor was the interaction, (all $\underline{F}s < 1$).

In sum, the results from these recall measures are generally consistent with the hypothesized schema differences between Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans. Mexican-Americans recalled more socioemotional events than did Anglo-Americans for both Task and Task + Interpersonal workgroups, and this was equally true whether the groups were composed of Latins or Anglos. Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans recalled the same number of task-related events, but only if they saw Anglo Task and Latin Task + Interpersonal groups. When participants saw Latin Task and Anglo Task + Interpersonal groups, Anglo-Americans recalled more task events.

General Discussion

Relational Style versus Ethnicity

Two studies investigated whether Latins are guided by socioemotional relational schemas more than are Anglo-Americans. The studies also examined whether preferences for schema-congruent workgroups can be more powerful than preferences for ethnically similar workgroups. In fact, Anglo-Americans heavily preferred task-oriented workgroups and Latins were relatively favorable toward workgroups that also had a socioemotional orientation. It mattered very little whether participants thought they were evaluating members of their own group or members of an outgroup. Neither for perceived success (Study 1 and 2) nor for preference for workgroup (Study 2) did it make any difference whether Anglo-Americans or Latins were judging their own or the other ethnic-group. Evidence of ethnic group bias, however, was not completely absent. It appeared mainly in measures of recall for socioemotional-related and task-related events. Latins tended to perceive workgroups as being less socioemotionally-oriented when they thought they were watching Anglo-Americans than when they thought they were watching Latins. In addition, in Study 1 (but not Study 2), Anglo-Americans and Latins recalled more task-related events when

presented with workgroups that presumably shared their respective ethnic-group membership. Targets' ethnic-group membership mattered, but it appears to have mattered far less than whether their relational style was consistent with participants' schemas, and mattered for evaluation of success and preference for membership scarcely at all.

These results constitute "existence proofs" that the match or mismatch in relational schemas can be more important than the match or mismatch in ethnicity in determining how people evaluate others and decide whether to interact with them. The findings provide an important insight into the nature of prejudice and intergroup conflict. In most of the psychological literature on these topics, membership in an ingroup versus an outgroup is confounded with relational styles that match versus do not match one's relational schemas. The present research suggests that these two sources of prejudice may exert an independent influence on people's evaluations of outgroup members and their decisions to interact with them. Thus, they should be examined as distinct factors underlying intergroup processes.

"Political correctness" or True Feelings?

The lack of ethnic bias in the preference results might raise the question of whether participants were trying to be "politically correct." There is evidence that this was not the case. In Study 2, Anglo-Americans chose to work with Latins when that committee was strictly task-focused and the Anglo-American committee was both task- and socioemotional-focused. But the opposite was true when the targets' cultural identity and the relational style were reversed; Anglo-Americans' decisions to work with Anglos when that group was the strictly task-focused one were just as frequent. Similarly, Mexican-American preference decisions did not change as a function of the targets' ethnicity. If one wanted to be viewed in the most politically correct light,

each sample would have shown a tendency to decide to work with the outgroup. However, this was not the case.

Evidence for Relational Style Schemas

These cultural effects are well understood in terms of relational schema differences. We found evidence of these schema differences in how participants reasoned about the factors that facilitate and inhibit workgroup success and their memory of the workgroup interaction. When asked what would make the workgroups more successful, Mexicans provided more socioemotional-related suggestions than did Anglo-Americans (Study 1). In a counterfactual reasoning task, participants indicated how the social interaction would be affected if there was a greater focus on the task versus a greater focus on interpersonal relations (Study 1). Mexicans indicated that the workgroups would be more successful if they concentrated more on socioemotional factors and this was not true for Anglo-Americans. Moreover, Anglo-Americans, but not Mexicans, assumed that increased socioemotional emphasis and increased task emphasis would have opposite results (Study 1). For Anglo-Americans, the more they thought the meeting would have been improved by increasing task focus, the more they thought it would have been hindered by increasing socioemotional focus. In contrast, there was no negative correlation for Mexicans, who reported that workgroups could be improved by simultaneously emphasizing both of these dimensions. In addition, Mexicans (Study 1) and Mexican-Americans (Study 2) recalled more socioemotional-related information than Anglo-Americans: for Anglo workgroups in Study 1 and for both Anglo and Latin workgroups in Study 2. There were differences between the two cultural groups in recall of task events, though these differences were of a somewhat unexpected and inconsistent nature.

Overall, these results suggest that Anglo-Americans and Latins perceived the workgroups, and reasoned about their success, in line with the schema differences we proposed. The different cognitive frameworks that the two groups bring to their understanding of the interaction virtually guarantee that they will have differing evaluations of workgroups and coworkers. For Anglo-Americans, task success seems dependent on minimizing socioemotional concerns, whereas for Latins, emphasis on socioemotional aspects is compatible with efficiency and success.

Implications for Contact Between Other Cultures

Intergroup biases and misunderstandings similar to those we have focused on have been noted for U.S.- East Asian interactions (for a review see Triandis, 1995). For instance, in the context of international negotiations between Americans and Chinese, Americans often run into problems when they miss important socioemotional cues conveyed by the Chinese (Kimmel, 1994). The Chinese and also the Japanese are often dismayed when it appears to them that the Americans are only interested in the bottom line and not in establishing long term relationships (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1993; Shenkar & Ronen, 1987). However, for Anglo-Americans it is likely to be the case that in the context of business, focusing on the task is a way of establishing and maintaining a good relationship. Anglo-Americans may perceive any deviation from a clear task focus as an indication of lack of commitment to the work and to a proper, businesslike relationship.

Intercultural contact often comes in the form of negotiations for either political or business purposes. One approach to reducing problems in these contexts is to try to create a “culture neutral” environment where differences in social traditions are put aside and all effort is focused on the common interest, namely the task (Zartman & Berman, 1982). However, our analysis suggests that this approach is far from being culture-neutral. Directing all effort toward task

specific goals, putting aside social traditions and concerns about interpersonal feelings, reflects a culture-specific way of conducting business rather than a “culture-neutral” approach. Our findings support a large body of work demonstrating that, for many cultures, affective personal relationships are an inextricable component of doing business.

Implications for Future Research

Future research might profitably focus on the relative influence of these factors in vertical dyads. Each of our studies utilized groups that were relatively equal in status. The tutoring scenario in Study 1 contained only minimal elements of hierarchy and it would be useful to measure the effects of ethnicity and relational style from the perspective of individuals who clearly have a leadership role and from individuals who are unambiguously subordinates. Research on leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982), which focuses on these vertical linkages, strongly implicates the role of group membership on how superiors behave vis-à-vis subordinates (Tsui, Xin, & Egan, 1995). Future studies could examine, for example, whether over time initial group membership biases give way to biases related to relational style. To the extent that group membership and relational style do not overlap completely, this research could address the question of whether a supervisor’s initial preferences for people who share their ethnicity, gender, or other affiliations, are later aligned with people who share their relational style.

The present research utilized non-representative samples of Anglo-Americans and Latins, relying solely on college undergraduates. It is plausible that Anglo-American and Latin college students are more similar to each other than would be the case with populations outside the university. Interestingly, this would imply that the effects found in our studies might be

substantially stronger in studies conducted in traditional occupational settings where more representative samples from these cultures come into contact.

Finally, our findings suggest some interesting tools to evaluate the success of interventions in culturally diverse settings. If Anglo-Americans were successfully trained to consider socioemotional factors along with task-focused factors in work settings, then their tolerance of socioemotional behavior, and their acceptance by non-Anglo coworkers, should increase. Similarly, cultures that characteristically emphasize both task and socioemotional factors might be dissuaded from perceiving the absence of a familiar socioemotional script as an indication that the situation is a failure or that one is disliked. It might be possible also to show change in relational schemas. For example, Anglo-Americans might begin to notice more socioemotional behaviors and might become less likely to see such behavior as antithetical to task goals. The current research offers a new approach to address both theoretical and practical issues concerning the dynamics of intercultural contact.

References

- Abelson, R. P. (1981). Psychological status of the script concept. *American Psychologists*, 36(7), 715-729.
- Ambady, N., Koo, J., Lee, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1996). More than words: Linguistic and nonlinguistic politeness in two cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(5), 996-1011.
- Ayman, R., & Chemers, M. M. (1983). Relationship of supervisory behavior ratings to work group effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction among Iranian managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 338-341.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(3), 461-484.
- Bales, R., Cohen, S., & Williamson, S. (1979). *SYMLOG: A system for the multiple level observation of groups*. NY, NY: Free Press.
- Bales, R. F. (1958). Task roles and social roles in problem-solving groups. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bales, R. F. (1965). The equilibrium problem. In A. P. Hare, E. F. Borgatta, & R. F. Bales (Eds.), *Small groups: Studies in social interaction*. New York: Knopf.
- Bendix, R. (1977). *Max Weber: An intellectual portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Benne, K. D., & Sheats, P. (1948). Functional roles of group members. *Journal of Social Issues*, 4(2), 41-49.

- Black, J. B., Galambos, J. A., & Read, S. J. (1984). Comprehending stories and social situations. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (Vol. 3, pp. 45-86). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (1994). Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*(2), 233-257.
- Bond, M. H. (1986). *The psychology of the Chinese people*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 307-324.
- Brewer, W. F., & Nakamura, G. V. (1984). The nature and functions of schemas. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (Vol. 1, pp. 119-160). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cantor, N., Mischel, W., & Schwartz, J. C. (1982). A prototype analysis of psychological situations. *Cognitive Psychology, 14*, 45-77.
- Clark, M., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 12-24.
- Clark, M., & Mills, J. (1993). The difference between communal and exchange relationships: What is and is not. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*(6), 684-691.
- Condon, J. C. (1985). *Good neighbors: Communicating with the Mexicans*. Yarmouth, MI: Intercultural Press Inc.
- Coser, L. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- D' Andrade, R. G. (1981). The cultural part of cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 5, 179-195.
- Diaz-Guerrero, R. (1967). *Psychology of the Mexican*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Doi, L. T. (1962). Amai: A key concept for understanding Japanese personality structure. In R. J. Smith & R. K. Beardsley (Eds.), *Japanese culture: its development and characteristics*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M. M. (1974). *Leadership and effective management*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Fiedler, F. E., Chemers, M. M., & Mahar, L. (1976). *Improving leadership effectiveness: The leader match concept*. NY, NY: Wiley.
- Fischer, D. (1989). *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fiske, A. P., & Haslam, N. (1996). Social cognition is thinking about relationships. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 5(5), 143-148.
- Fiske, S., & Taylor, S. (1991). *Social cognition*. San Francisco, CA: McGraw-Hill.
- Forgas, J. P. (1985). Person prototypes and cultural salience: The role of cognitive and cultural factors in impression formation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 3-17.
- Gabrielidis, C., Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Pearson, V. M., & Villareal, L. (1997). Preferred styles of conflict resolution: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(6), 661-667.
- Garza, R. T., & Santos, S. J. (1991). Ingroup/outgroup balance and interdependent interethnic behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 27, 124-137.
- Glenn, E. S., Witmeyer, D., & Stevenson, K. A. (1977). Cultural relational styles of persuasion. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 1(3), 52-66.

- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums*. New York: DoubleDay.
- Graen, G., Novak, M., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 131-191.
- Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, A. (1993). *The seven cultures of capitalism: Value systems for creating wealth in the United States, Japan, Germany, France, Britain, Sweden, and the Netherlands*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hansen, C. H. (1989). Priming sex-role stereotypes event schemas with rock music videos: Effects of impression favorability, trait inferences, and recall of a subsequent male-female interaction. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(4), 371-391.
- Hirschfeld, L. A. (1996). *Race in the making: Cognition, culture, and the child's construction of human kinds*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Ibarra, H. (1992). Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 422-447.
- Jehn, K. A. (1997). A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3), 530-557.
- Kimmel, P. R. (1994). Cultural perspectives on international negotiations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(1), 179-196.
- Kool, R., & Saksena, N. K. (1988). Leadership styles and its effectiveness among Indian executives. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 26(1), 9-15.
- Kras, E. S. (1995). *Management in two cultures*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.

- Lindsley, S. L., & Braithwaite, C. A. (1996). "You should 'wear a mask'": Facework norms in cultural and intercultural conflict in maquiladoras. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(2), 199-225.
- Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, motivation, and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- McGrath, A. E. (1993). *Reformation Thought*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- McNeill, J. T. (1954). *The history and character of Calvinism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Misumi, J. (1985). *The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Miller, J. G. (1984). Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 270-276.
- Morris, M. & Peng, K. (1994). Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 949-971.
- Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 211-250.
- Parson, T., Bales, R. F., & Schils, E. (1953). *Working papers in the theory of action*. New York: Free Press.
- Pelled, L. H. (1996). Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes: An intervening process theory. *Organizational Science*, 7(6), 615-631.
- Roll, S., Millen, L., & Martinez, R. (1980). Common errors in psychotherapy with Chicanos: Extrapolations from research and clinical experience. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 17(2), 158-168.

- Sanchez-Burks, J. (1999). *Ascetic Protestantism and cultural schemas for relational sensitivity in the workplace*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shaw, J. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 626-645.
- Shenkar, O., & Ronen, S. (1987). The cultural context of negotiations: The implications of Chinese interpersonal norms. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 23(2), 263-275.
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In J. Sidanius (Ed.), *Explorations in political psychology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sinha, J. B. (1980). *Nurturant task leader*. New Delhi, India: Concept Publishing Company.
- Sperber, D. (1996). *Explaining culture*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Stephan, W. G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 599-658). New York: Random House.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. R. Porter (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology* (pp. 1-39). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press Inc.

- Triandis, H. C., Marin, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, H. (1984). Simpatía as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1363-1375.
- Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: The Economist Books Ltd.
- Tsui, A. S., & Egan, T. D. (1994). *Performance implications of relational demography in vertical dyads*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Academy of Management, Dallas, Texas.
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549-579.
- Tsui, A. S., Xin, K. R., & Egan, T. D. (1995). Relational demography: The missing link in vertical dyad linkage. In S. E. Jackson & M. N. Ruderman (Eds.), *Diversity in Work Teams*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Weber, M. (1904/1930). *Protestant ethic & the spirit of capitalism*. Winchester, Mass: Allen & Unwin Inc.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (Talcott Parsons, Trans.). New York: The Free Press.
- Wilson, T. D., & Capitman, J. A. (1982). Effects of script availability on social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8(1), 11-19.
- Wyer, R. S., & Gordon, S. (1982). The recall of information about persons and groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 18(2), 128-164.
- Zanna, M. P., & Olson, J. M. (1994). *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium*. (Vol. 7). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zartman, W., & Berman, M. (1982). *The practical negotiator*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Zea, M. C., Quezada, T., & Belgrave, F. Z. (1994). Latino cultural values: Their role in adjustment to disability. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 9(5), 185-200.

Author Note

Jeffrey Sanchez-Burks, Richard E. Nisbett, and Oscar Ybarra, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan. This research was supported by the Russell Sage Foundation and by a National Science Foundation Culture & Cognition Traineeship to the first author.

We would like to thank Silvia Valencia Abundiz, Elida Margarita Bautista, Hart Blanton, Forrest Burks, Lorraine Marie Sanchez Burks, Penelope Espinoza, José Guadalupe Salazar Estrada, Laura Tellez Guitron, Kenneth Jones, Andrew Karpinsky, Markus Kemmelmeir, Jason Lawrence, Fiona Lee, Alejandro Lequizamo, Ara Norenzayan, Rocio Rivadeneryra, Cecilia Colunga Rodrigues, Miguel Wong, and Michael Zárate for helping us conduct this research. We thank Diane Quinn and five anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of this article. We are especially grateful to Antonio Vásquez Gómes for his input and assistance with Study 1.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jeffrey Sanchez-Burks who is now at the Department of Management and Organization, Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089. Electronic mail may be sent to jburks@bus.usc.edu.

Footnotes

¹ Our treatment of subjective culture follows one shared by cultural psychologists and cognitive anthropologists. Simply put, subjective culture consists of shared representations by a group of individuals (D' Andrade, 1981; Moscovici, 1988; Sperber, 1996; Triandis, 1972). Task and socioemotional relational schemas are thus a specific type of such representations.

² All *p* values reported are based on two-tailed tests.

³ Permission to use the cover story was granted by the administration under the agreement that the findings of this study would be made available for the purpose of improving actual student committees on campus. Thus, participants were indeed providing information that would be used by the university as explained to them by the experimenter.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Mean evaluations of the workgroups as a function of participants' culture and targets' relational style (Study 1). Error bars represent one between-subjects standard error.

Figure 2. Mean number of weighted socioemotional-related suggestions provided as a function of participants' culture and targets' relational style (Study 1). Error bars represent one between-subjects standard error.

Figure 3. Mean counterfactual ratings of increasing socioemotional focus as a function of participants' culture and targets' relational style. (Study 1). Error bars represent one between-subjects standard error.

Figure 4. Percentage of Anglo-Americans (Panels A and B) and Mexican-Americans (Panels B and C) choosing to work with one of the committees.

Figure 5. Mean future success ratings for the Anglo-American Task and Latin Task + Interpersonal committees (Panel A) and for the Latin Task and Anglo-American Task + Interpersonal committees (Panel B) as a function of participants' culture (Study 2). Error bars represent one between-subjects standard error.

Figure 6. Memory for socioemotional-related events from the Anglo-American Task and Latin Task + Interpersonal committees (Panel A) and from the Latin Task and Anglo-American Task + Interpersonal committees (Panel B) a function of participants' culture (Study 2). Error bars represent one between-subjects standard error.