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Abstract

Leadership research has not adequately addressed the dynamics of how relationships evolve in multicultural dyads. This research addressed this gap in the literature using the grounded theory methodology. Nineteen interviews were conducted to map perceptions of relationship development among ethnoculturally similar and dissimilar dyads with diverse backgrounds and from various organizations in Hawaii. A model of relationships in multicultural dyads emerged from these diverse voices. Relationship development in these dyads was influenced by past experience and demands for interaction, and while different opinions existed regarding personal exchange at work, participants believed managing the personal-work exchange boundary was necessary. Supporting existing theory, multicultural dyads also reported processes of relationship-building, incremental and reciprocal influence, and in-groups and out-groups. Implications of the findings for Leader-Member Exchange Theory as well as other leadership theories are discussed.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Workforces are becoming increasingly diverse worldwide and much research suggests that interaction between individuals from different backgrounds can produce both challenges and opportunities (Bhawuk, Podsiadlowski, Graf, & Triandis, 2002; Cassiday, 2005; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). Attempting to ease conflicts and maximize the potential inherent in these relationships makes the study of diversity in the workplace an imperative. More specifically, because leadership plays a critical role in the functioning of the workplace, this study attempted to gain a richer understanding of the development of relationships between culturally diverse superiors and subordinates within multicultural settings.

Aside from Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), relatively little work has been done in the area of leadership relationships. Leach and Murray (1979) have conceptualized the superior-subordinate relationship in terms of a contract. Gabarro and Kotter (1980) investigated the often overlooked practice of how subordinates manage their bosses. In addition, Baird and Kram (1983) examined how superior-subordinate relationships evolve within the context of different career stages held by each individual.

LMX theory, on the other hand, has generated a wealth of contributions to the study of leadership relationships. However, little research has been done within this framework that has either examined leader-member relationships in diverse workforces or utilized methods aimed at thick description. Qualitative methods are especially useful when exploring new territories such as this and developing a deeper understanding of the
experiences of individuals embedded in this phenomenon can significantly enhance current theories of leadership.

An in-depth exploration of leadership in multicultural workplaces is also needed because previous research has not been successful in illuminating the impacts diversity can have within superior-subordinate relationships. In examining the literature, it appears that past efforts that have examined the effects of individual differences within the work setting have not generated conclusive findings with regard to the impact of differences between superiors and subordinates (for e.g., Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). That is, consistent evidence has not been presented with regard to any major impacts of various demographic variables on work outcomes, although studies of race and ethnicity have provided slightly more substantive findings (Chong & Thomas, 1997; Turban & Jones, 1988) when investigating differences beyond whites versus non-whites (Hooijberg & DiTomaso, 1996; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998).

More advances are beginning to be made as investigators recognize the importance of the underlying cultural differences between individuals (McGrath, Berdahl, & Arrow, 1996). Studies of cognitive prototypes (Lord & Maher, 1991) applied to extensive multinational research projects (e.g., House, et al., 2004) have demonstrated how culturally-based prototypes can contribute to individuals’ perceptions of leaders. Research on cultural value dimensions (e.g., Schwartz, 1994) has also increased the understanding of the ways in which values may differ between cultures. Although using different theoretical frameworks for examining the effects of values among superiors and subordinates, a few studies so far have revealed that value similarity and differences are important factors in leadership relationships (Dose, 1999; Gelfand, Kuhn, &
Radhakrishnan, 1996; Gessner, 1992; James, Chen, & Cropanzano, 1996; Steiner, 1988).

In addition, inquiries into diversity among coworkers or other peers are more abundant, and while important, are not the subject of this research. Leadership relationships consist of a unique set of dynamics that are worth examining exclusively.

Therefore, the intersection of culture, in contrast with other background or demographic characteristics, and leadership relationships, is an important area to pursue. While there have been related investigations of differences in leadership variables between national cultures (Pillai, Scandura, & Williams, 1999; Varma, Srivinas, & Stroh, 2005), little research has been done to examine leadership in multicultural organizations in which broad cultural diversity exists at the individual level.

This dissertation begins with a review of LMX Theory, since the search for a deeper understanding of leadership relationships provided the impetus for this work, and this literature has made significant contributions in this area. A discussion of the need to advance the theory toward a greater incorporation of culture is then presented, followed by a review of relevant research. Next, the multiple methods used in this research, with its emphasis on qualitative inquiry, are outlined. Results are then presented, leading to a discussion of the themes discovered and their implications for leadership research and LMX Theory.

The present investigation is a first step in understanding the dynamics of leadership relationships in multicultural workplaces. Expanding on earlier efforts, the current research was based on the following research questions:

How do relationships develop in multicultural leadership dyads?

What is the nature of the work relationship in multicultural dyads?
What factors impact the relationship?

How similar or different are the relationships among heterogeneous dyads compared to the homogeneous dyads reported in the literature?
Chapter 2. Literature Review

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory

An important contribution of Leader-Member Exchange Theory is its challenge to the idea that leaders are effective because of a certain style with which they lead all of their members. Early research on work socialization and role-making processes (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen, Orris, & Johnson, 1973; Haga, Graen, & Dansereau, 1974) in organizations discovered that leaders experienced both high quality and low quality relationships with their members – also referred to as “in-groups” and “out-groups.” These early studies suggested that leaders develop differentiated relationships, or Vertical Dyad Linkages (Dansereau et al., 1975), with their followers, and based on this finding, Graen and Cashman (1975) proposed the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) model of leadership development. LMX research subsequently began focusing on the dyadic relationship and its outcomes.

Much research on leader-member exchange has attempted to describe the nature of this relationship. A high quality dyadic exchange (high LMX) will have more levels of information, influence, attention, and support made available to the subordinate, thus aiding his or her development (Dansereau et al., 1975). These “mature relationships” are also characterized by reciprocal influence; extra-contractual behavior; mutual trust, respect, and liking; and internalization of common goals (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994). Studies have also found characteristics such as high agreement (Graen & Schiemann, 1978), attitude similarity and organizational citizenship behaviors (Basu & Green, 1995), and greater task performance and friendliness (Crouch & Yetton, 1988) in high LMX relationships. Leaders and members who have not developed mature relationships, on the
other hand, are characterized by unidirectional downward influence, contractual behavior exchange, formal role-defined relations, and loosely coupled goals (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994).

Investigations have also discovered that high quality exchanges were related to various positive outcomes. A meta-analysis found positive relationships between LMX and performance, overall satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, organizational commitment, role clarity, and member competence, as well as inverse relationships with role conflict and turnover intentions (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Other studies have found positive relationships between LMX and job climate, innovation, organizational citizenship, empowerment, and aspects of organizational justice (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Because of the importance of the leader-member relationship for organizational effectiveness, a greater understanding of the development of these relationships within multicultural settings is necessary.

The Need for Advancing Leadership Theory

With increasing globalization and diversity in the workplace (Bhawuk, Podsiadlowski, Graf, & Triandis, 2002; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998), there is a need to understand the dynamics involved in leadership relationships among culturally dissimilar individuals. To provide an example, research has shown that expatriate leadership assignments often fail, with significant costs financially, socially, and for future business endeavors (Cassiday, 2005). With its dyadic relationship-based approach, LMX initially appears to be a promising framework for research and practice in leading diverse workforces. Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) discuss three domains of leadership (leader, follower, and relationship) and suggest that a relationship-based approach to leadership
would be appropriate when there is “substantial diversity and stability among followers” (p. 224). This approach was therefore seen as a logical basis for further research on multicultural leadership.

However, much work needs to be done. Expanding the research involves filling in two major gaps in the current literature: the lack of thick description of superior-subordinate relationships and the paucity of knowledge on the implications of culture for the relationship. Needless to say, there is no known research that has sought a rich, qualitative description of leadership relationships in multicultural settings. While qualitative studies related to leadership in general are sparse, some of these studies, including Mintzberg’s (1973) classic interviews with five CEOs, have become important contributions to the field.

With regard to LMX research, one of the early studies previously mentioned (Haga, Graen, & Dansereau, 1974) utilized semi-structured and open-ended questionnaires. Managers were asked about their work and perceptions of their supervisors, as well as their expectations and perceptions of those reporting to them. This investigation produced insight into the effects of professional affiliations on organizational role making and assimilation. Later, Fairhurst, Rogers, and Sarr (1987) obtained taped conversational data from manager-subordinate interactions within a large manufacturing plant as part of a multimethod strategy to examine control patterns among dyad members and how they lead to members’ relational judgments. Then, using a more select subsample of those dyads involved in conflict episodes, which were anticipated to include influence attempts and ideal conditions for their topic of study, Fairhurst and Chandler (1989) used narrative analysis to examine how power and social distance-
related conversational resources are used to display social structure among leaders and members. This research gave a rich description of how conversational resources are employed to differentiate in-groups, middle-groups, and out-groups. A subsequent study by Fairhurst (1993) sought to build on findings from the previous study and to develop a deeper understanding of the role of gender in LMX development. Using a similar discourse analysis, the author discovered specific communication patterns that constitute established and emerging aspects of the social structures depicted in LMX theory. More recently, Sias (1996) investigated conversations among coworkers to determine how perceptions of differential treatment by leaders and fairness are constructed. Her research enriched understanding of how conversants create and reinforce their own perceptions based on differences in LMX quality between dyads. While such research has greatly contributed to knowledge of manager-subordinate interactions, much more thick description is needed, especially in the way of cultural implications for leader-member exchange.

Only very recently have a few empirical studies attempted to investigate the relationship of culture and LMX. A study by Varma, Srinivas, and Stroh (2005) examined differences in the workings of LMX between the U.S. and India. A sample of 16 supervisors and 166 subordinates from a U.S. electronics firm and a sample of 72 supervisors and 116 subordinates in an Indian iron and steel factory (companies deemed to have similar management structures and policies) were compared on how supervisors' and subordinates' perceptions of LMX differed, and how subordinate ratings of supervisor performance differed. With regard to cultural differences, this study found that supervisor ratings of LMX were significantly related to subordinate ratings of LMX in 8
both cultures, while the correlation was significantly higher in India. The authors attributed the difference to the unique characteristics of these cultures.

Pillai, Scandura, and Williams (1999) investigated the relationship of transformational leadership and LMX with organizational justice and job satisfaction, and how those relationships differed between the cultures of U.S., Australia, India, Columbia, and the Middle East (Saudi Arabia and Jordan). A combined total of 755 respondents completed survey questionnaires and variable relationships were examined using path analysis. Supporting previous research, this study found that both transformational leadership and LMX influenced organizational justice and job satisfaction in the Western samples (U.S. and Australia), while LMX was associated with both procedural and distributive justice in all the cultures except India, where LMX was only related to distributive justice. In addition, LMX was related to job satisfaction in all cultures. For these authors, the findings suggested “that a high quality exchange relationship with the superior is as important in other cultures as it is in the U.S.” They also speculated that LMX behaviors may be successfully transplanted in various cultures.

Although little research is currently available in this specific area, these few studies seem to indicate that LMX may potentially develop into a useful framework for leadership research and practice across cultures. However, these studies have taken a different approach than that proposed here. While they have begun to examine whether LMX operates similarly in other cultures among culturally similar individuals, this research will unpack the dynamics of how LMX operates among culturally dissimilar individuals. This research also builds from a previous study by the author, which found, among other things, that ethnocultural dissimilarity was not related to LMX quality.
As the findings from this study are contrary to what related literature suggests, an in-depth investigation into the processes of relationship building between culturally diverse superiors and subordinates is warranted.

**Demographic, Racial, and Ethnic Differences**

There have been numerous studies investigating the effects of demographic variables on work processes and outcomes. A few studies have examined the effects of demographic dissimilarity as a whole and argue for its importance on work related outcomes (Ferris, Judge, Rowland, & Fitzgibbons, 1994; Turban & Jones, 1988; Wayne & Liden, 1995). A literature review of organizational diversity research by Williams and O’Reilly (1998) found that group diversity can have notable effects on group functioning, which are often negative, unless differences are managed effectively. However, related literature has not provided compelling evidence for their effect on leader-member relationships (for e.g., Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993), and studies that have examined specific demographic variables within leadership dyads have not shown consistent effects.

Other researchers have investigated differences within the work unit in terms of race and ethnicity. This work has generally found negative effects of dissimilarity in terms of these categorizations. Tsui, Egan, and O’Reilly (1992) examined the effects of being different from others in the unit on the categories of age, tenure, education, sex, and race. One of their findings revealed that three of the five relational scores – tenure, sex, and race – were associated with their dependent variables of psychological commitment, absences, and intention to stay with the firm. However, the leadership relationship was not the unit of analysis in this study.
More related to the focus of this research, a study by Pelled and Xin (2000) examined the relationship between demographic similarity of supervisors and subordinates and their relationship quality in both U.S. and Mexican samples. Ninety production workers from the U.S. and 195 production workers from Mexico, all from the same electronics company, returned questionnaires measuring relationship quality, demographics, and performance. Results showed that similarity of race between supervisors and subordinates was positively associated with the quality of the relationship.

Unexpectedly, an earlier study by Tsui and O'Reilly (1989), while finding superior-subordinate demographic dissimilarity effects, found little support for a more specific race difference effect on work related outcomes. In a sample of 272 superior-subordinate dyads from a Fortune 500 corporation, subordinates in mixed race dyads were not rated differently from subordinates in same-race dyads on effectiveness. Also, subordinates in mixed race dyads were liked slightly more than subordinates in same race dyads. Interestingly, they also found that white subordinates with black superiors reported the highest level of role ambiguity and role conflict, but black subordinates reporting to white superiors reported the lowest level of role ambiguity. Similarly, Turban and Jones (1988) unexpectedly found that Black, White, and Hispanic subordinates were less satisfied with same-race supervisors than with different-race supervisors. Overall, these results related to race were contrary to hypotheses and conclusions are difficult to draw.

Tsui and colleagues have recognized that the study of diversity in leader-member relationships has been lacking (Tsui, Xin, & Egan, 1996). However, their research, as
As well as others' research, has primarily studied diversity in terms of age, sex, race, education, and functional background. Tsui and O'Reilly (1989) also reported that 9 out of 10 race studies they reviewed analyzed black-white differences, and argued that other groups should be avoided for clearer interpretation. However, the presence of other races and ethnicities, and their underlying cultural dimensions, necessitates a more discerning analysis. It may be the case that race dissimilarity does not have the same effect as cultural dissimilarity, as different races may identify with a similar culture (e.g., American). Williams and O'Reilly (1998) also argued that existing research in the area of diversity in organizations was limited because it primarily involved blacks or "others" versus whites. Hooijberg and DiTomaso (1996) stated in regards to racial differences (whites vs. non-whites), "research on differences in perceptions of subordinate satisfaction and perceptions of effectiveness is scarce and inconclusive."

The only study, which was conducted in New Zealand, that was found to examine different groups in organizations in terms of ethnicity found an interaction effect of leader and follower ethnicity on levels of satisfaction (Chong and Thomas, 1997). One hundred and fifty-six participants of four service organizations in Auckland completed questionnaires measuring members' perceptions of their leader and their satisfaction. They found that Pakeha (non-Maori New Zealanders of European heritage) rated Pacific Island leaders less favorably than others and were less satisfied with the degree of communication than were Pacific Islanders with Pacific Island leaders. They concluded that leadership prototypes held by members of the two ethnic groups seemed to have culturally specific differences. It is these cultural differences that researchers are
beginning to recognize as having much explanatory power in diversity studies (for e.g., McGrath, Berdahl, & Arrow, 1996).

Cultural Differences

The building literature on cultural differences appears to have made more progress. An explanation of the effects of cultural differences between superiors and subordinates has been offered by studies of cognitive prototypes. Research has shown that individuals use a cognitive prototype for evaluating a leader (Lord & Maher, 1991). That is, leadership perceptions are based on cognitive categorization processes in which followers match the perceived attributes of potential leaders they observe to an internal prototype of leadership categories. The better the fit between the perceived individual and the leadership prototype, the more likely this person will be seen as a leader (Foti & Luch, 1992). It has also been suggested that being perceived as a leader is a prerequisite for being able to go beyond a formal role in influencing others (Lord & Maher, 1991), which is an important aspect of high quality leader-member exchange.

The research on leadership prototypes provides evidence for the detrimental effects of cultural dissimilarity between leaders and members. Since different cultures have different ways of interpreting the social environment, prototypes of leaders are also assumed to be different across cultures. Thus, if the leader prototype held by a follower contrasts with the culturally dissimilar leader, the follower will be less likely to be influenced by the leader. Much current research, especially the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research project, is examining the assumption of culturally endorsed leadership prototypes and has so far shown this to be
The House and associates (1999) findings are consistent with the hypothesis that selected cultural differences strongly influence important ways in which people think about leaders as well as societal norms concerning the status, influence, and privileges granted to leaders. At the time this study was published, Phase 2 of their GLOBE research program involved tests of this hypothesis, among others, through the collection of 17,000 questionnaires from middle managers of 54 countries. With respect to the global leadership dimensions of team oriented leadership, participative leadership, humane orientation, and charisma, the findings revealed that both societal and organizational cultural variables have substantial influence on individuals’ implicit leadership theories.

Another study (Brodbeck et al., 2000) of cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries also supported the assumption that leadership concepts are culturally endorsed. Brodbeck and colleagues utilized a European subsample of GLOBE consisting of 22 countries with a total of 6,052 middle managers. Similar to the other GLOBE studies, participants completed 112 questionnaire items that asked how strongly leadership attributes facilitate or impede “outstanding leadership” based on a 7-point scale. Hierarchical cluster analysis and discriminant analysis techniques supported the hypothesis that leadership prototypes vary as a function of cultural differences.

Overall, it seems that followers have different conceptions of a leader based on their culture, and a leader from a different culture than the perceiver may be less likely to be perceived as a leader, thus inhibiting the leader’s influence and the quality of the
relationship. However, one may question the assumption that individuals from different cultures think about leaders completely differently. That is, there may be certain characteristics of leaders that all people believe are effective.

Indeed, some research has found leadership strategies that may be universally endorsed and others that may be universally seen as impediments across cultures. Studies conducted by the GLOBE research program have found specific aspects of charismatic/transformational leadership to be strongly endorsed across cultures (Den Hartog et al., 1999; House et al., 1999). The leadership dimensions of team-oriented, humane, and participative leadership were universally or nearly universally endorsed. However, these authors, along with others, have noted that although these strategies may be universally endorsed, their evidence reveals that the expression of such transformational/charismatic leadership might be very different across cultures.

Other research has shown similar phenomena. One study found that aspects of Performance and Maintenance leader styles have similar factor structures in Britain, the U.S., Japan, and Hong Kong, but the behaviors of the leaders were significantly different and reflective of their national cultural values (Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Peterson, & Bond, 1989). This study included a questionnaire measuring Performance-Maintenance leadership style and specific leadership behaviors, which was distributed to 1,177 shop floor workers and their immediate supervisors.

Schmidt and Yeh (1992) also found common leader influence strategies, although the relative importance and tactical definition of these strategies differed across Australian, English, Japanese, and Taiwanese managers. A total of 2,833 managers from all four countries completed surveys examining the structure of leader influence behavior.
toward subordinates. Seven leader influence strategies — reason, bargaining, higher authority, sanctions, friendliness, assertiveness, and coalition — were present in each country, although the factor loadings for the definitions of each strategy varied by nationality.

More recently, Dickson and colleagues (2003) provided a review of research on leadership in cross-cultural contexts, including project GLOBE. With support from more recent findings, these authors reiterated the propositions offered by House, Wright, and Aditya (1997). The first proposition is cultural congruence — effective leader behaviors are determined by cultural values. The second proposition is cultural difference — slight differences in leader behavior from the dominant cultural values, which may be seen as unexpected, may promote growth and development. Third, is near universality — some leader behaviors appear effective in nearly all cultures, such as some dimensions of charismatic or transformational leadership.

Another factor appears to be the extent to which the individual identifies with his or her culture. An experimental study by Thomas and Ravlin (1995) attempted to examine the outcomes of a cultural adaptation strategy using 223 employees of a U.S. subsidiary of two large Japanese multinational corporations. Although not part of their major findings, they discovered that Americans for whom nationality was of greater importance to their self-identity were less likely to perceive a Japanese manager as similar to themselves, less likely to associate with the manager, and were perceived as less effective. The relationships occurred regardless of whether the Japanese manager behaved in a culturally adaptive manner or not.
Contrary to these findings, however, Helgstrand and Stuhlmacher (1999) unexpectedly found that the highest leader ratings were not in conditions with a cultural match between participants and leader candidate. However, this may be due to the fact that they only compared two cultures (Danish and American), and possibly because of sample characteristics. They utilized a sample of 35 male and 51 female Danish respondents and 36 male and 95 female American respondents. The cultures were then compared on how they rated the effectiveness and collegiality of leaders who varied on the two dimensions of Masculinity-Femininity and Individualism-Collectivism.

Lending more explanation to the dynamics of cultural differences are findings that describe how cultures may differ. The research on cultural dimensions is presented next.

*Cultural Value Dimensions*

Dickson and colleagues (2003) note that cross-cultural leadership research has shown a tremendous expansion in recent years, and cultural dimensions, in its various conceptualizations, have played a major role in this endeavor. Cultural differences have been described using various dimensions and at different levels (Bhawuk & Triandis, 2000). Bhawuk and colleagues (2002) conceptualized culture in terms of three dimensions: complexity vs. simplicity, tightness vs. looseness, and hierarchy vs. equality. Cultures that vary along the dimension of complexity vs. simplicity basically differ in how complex the social organization is. Complex cultures, usually associated with the world’s largest economies, have a greater variety of roles, more stratification, and more affluence, while simple cultures possess these characteristics to a lesser degree. The dimension of tightness vs. looseness refers to the extent to which the behavior of individuals is regulated by norms. Tight cultures are more norm-driven than loose
cultures. Cultures may also be distinguished along the dimension of hierarchy vs. equality. When people behave differently towards others who are at higher or lower levels of the social structure, the culture is more hierarchical, while cultures high in equality see and treat others more similarly.

A widely used summary dimension to explain cultural variation is individualism-collectivism. “Maximum collectivism occurs in simple, family type relationships, in tight cultures, and where there is considerable emphasis on hierarchy. Maximum individualism occurs in complex societies that have market-type relationships, are loose, and favor equality” (Bhawuk et al., 2002, p. 126).

On the individual level, people from individualist and collectivist cultures can vary along a number of other dimensions (Triandis & Bhawuk, 1997). One dimension is definition of self. Individualists and collectivists have divergent views of the self. Individualists perceive the self as a separate entity and tend to exchange resources based on individual considerations. On the other hand, collectivists perceive the self as part of a group, which favors a freer exchange of resources. Another dimension is structure of goals. Individualists and collectivists vary in their pursuit of goals. Individualists tend to seek goals independently, while collectivists see goals as shared among their group members. The next dimension is emphasis on norms versus attitudes. Behavior is guided differently in individualists and collectivists. The behaviors of individualists are primarily directed by personal attitudes, while those of collectivists are directed by group norms. A final dimension is emphasis on relatedness versus rationality. Individualists and collectivists can be distinguished by whether they perceive relationships as based on communal or exchange values. In other words, individualists evaluate relationships in
terms of their costs and benefits, while collectivists value relationships as meeting others’ needs.

Another conceptualization of the value dimensions that exist across cultures that seeks to provide greater explanation than individualism-collectivism was offered by Schwartz (1994). Building from Hofstede’s (e.g., 1980) work uncovering four cultural dimensions, Schwartz proposed a new set of two overarching cultural dimensions with seven more specific dimensions and offered supporting evidence. He found that cultures can vary along the dimension of Autonomy versus Conservatism as well as Hierarchy and Mastery versus Egalitarian Commitment and Harmony with Nature. The value type of Autonomy can be further distinguished into the values of Affective Autonomy and Intellectual Autonomy, which gives the seven dimensions. He also argues that culture-level dimensions should reflect individual level dimensions: the cultural dimension of Autonomy corresponds to the individual-level dimension of Openness to Change, as Conservatism corresponds to Conservation, Hierarchy and Mastery corresponds to Self-Enhancement, and Egalitarian Commitment and Harmony With Nature corresponds to Self-Transcendence.

Schwartz defines these values as follows. *Conservatism* refers to a concern with security, conformity, and tradition. Cultures high on Conservatism do not see the individual as having different interests than the group, and value group harmony and order. *Intellectual and Affective Autonomy* are values opposed to Conservatism, as individual interests take precedence over the group. More specifically, Intellectual Autonomy refers to a more rational self-directed orientation while Affective Autonomy refers to a hedonistic orientation. *Hierarchy* reflects a preference for unequal role and
resource allocation. It is related to values such as wealth, power, and influence. *Mastery*, along with *Hierarchy*, is part of a self-enhancement orientation, and emphasizes self-assertive control of the social environment. Values such as being successful, ambitious, and capable are associated with *Mastery*. *Egalitarian Commitment* represents an interest in the welfare of other people. Whether made explicit through social persuasion or inherent in a people’s belief system, *Egalitarian Commitment* describes the extent to which people are committed to social justice. The final value, *Harmony*, is opposed to *Mastery* and *Hierarchy*, as it emphasizes self-transcendence along with *Egalitarian Commitment*. Instead of an interest in actively controlling the world, this value places importance on harmony with nature, as well as social harmony.

Schwartz’s theoretical framework may be useful in understanding relationships between leaders and members with different culturally-based values for a couple of reasons. Schwartz’s framework not only describes a comprehensive set of value dimensions at a cultural level, but at the individual level. Thus it may be theoretically applicable at the relationship level. It also reveals values that are closely related as well as opposed to each other. This may provide insight on the effects of different levels of value opposition between individuals.

These unique value orientations of different cultures help to explain how people’s worlds are structured differently. It is expected that a leader and a member from dissimilar cultures, who differed on these dimensions, would be more likely to experience differences in expectations, misunderstandings, and more difficulty maintaining the relationship and a positive work environment. Considering the work on culture, cultural
dimensions, and the other studies reviewed earlier, it seems logical to expect that cultural differences between leaders and members would have an impact on their relationship.

Supporting this argument are several studies that have looked at work-related values and its contribution to supervisor-subordinate exchange. Dose’s (1999) investigation (which also looked at Team-Member Exchange [TMX], although that is not the focus here) found that perceived similarity between leaders and members in the Protestant work ethic, as well as preferences for the work environment, were positively related to LMX, but demographic variables were not. Steiner (1988) found a positive association between work values similarity and favorable supervisor-subordinate interactions using the Survey of Work Values (Wollack, Goodale, Wijting, & Smith, 1971), and Gessner (1992) found a positive relationship between work values in general (and not individual work values) as measure by the Work Values Scale (Nevill & Super, 1989) and LMX quality.

Only a couple of studies were found to examine general cultural values and their relationship to leadership. James, Chen, and Cropanzano (1996) examined how Taiwanese and U.S. samples differed in cultural values along with leadership and motivational ideals, and how these constructs were differentially related to each other. They found that cultural values differed between the two samples and that their cultural values were not related in the same manner to their leadership and motivational ideals. Gelfand, Kuhn, and Radhakrishnan (1996) examined how value differences affected employee-supervisor social interaction processes and subsequent job outcomes. They found that the data largely supported their model, which predicted that value differences
hinder communication and employee attributions of supervisor behavior, which in turn
appeared to affect job satisfaction and organizational withdrawal.

*Other Literature Related to Cultural Differences in Dyads*

Examination of literature on intercultural/interracial marriage or dating offered
little insight into the dynamics of intercultural leadership relationships. Perhaps due to the
assumption that spouses (often) choose their mates based on compatibility or mutual
benefit, research in this area that examines the impact of dyadic differences has primarily
focused on the externally-imposed challenges, such as discrimination, for dating or
marriage partners (Bratter & Eschbach, 2006; Gaines & Leaver, 2002). No studies were
found investigating cross-cultural implications for relationship development between
dyadic members. Regardless, because leadership dyads are often involuntary, and can be
considered relatively temporary relationships, there may be different phenomena than
that inherent in marriage relationships, making it difficult to generalize theories across
disciplines.

In the recent cross-cultural literature, some progress is being made in looking at
leadership relationships as specific forms of intercultural relations. The few articles
uncovered argue that cross-cultural interactions are susceptible to misunderstandings and
disagreements. Chen and colleagues (Chen, Tjosvold, & Fang, 2005; Chen, Tjosvold, &
Su, 2005) conducted interviews with 111 Chinese employees related to their conflicts
with their Japanese or American managers. The authors’ findings suggested that
cooperative goals, as opposed to competitive goals, were more likely to lead to
constructive controversy and subsequent innovation and commitment. They proposed that
such an approach may be important for cross-cultural leadership relationships among Chinese employees and their managers.

Cassiday (2005) reviewed literature that suggests how expatriate leaders who are sent on international assignments meet with considerable challenges, and presented results of a qualitative study with 11 middle and upper level managers who were interviewed about their values, beliefs, and assumptions regarding effective international leaders and about how they relate to leadership practices in international settings. The investigator found that successful expatriate leaders had the capacity to balance more than one worldview and possessed effective relationship-building skills, which enabled them to integrate different cultural practices.

This research also suggests that unique challenges are inherent in cross-cultural leadership relationships. In addition, it points to the need to unpack the development of such relationships. Considering the sparse research into these phenomena overall, which, in addition, have not yet attempted an in-depth exploration of leadership relationships in multicultural organizations, the proposed research will pursue this subject using qualitative methods as a basis.
Chapter 3. Methods

Participants

Consistent with much qualitative research, a purposive sampling strategy was utilized. This involves gathering data from individuals who are or have been embedded in the phenomena of interest (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Participants were sought from various multicultural organizations in Hawaii through associations with the researcher and colleagues. Access to many of the individuals (seven individuals consisting of three leaders) was provided through referrals from the researcher’s acquaintances. The researcher’s Committee Chair also provided referrals to leaders (two) and their subordinates (six individuals total). Three leaders were direct acquaintances of the researcher, but chosen because of the unique cross-cultural leadership relationships they were involved in. One leader, along with her subordinate, as well as a different employee, were staff from an organization the researcher had previously consulted with.

To the extent possible, individuals from a broad diversity of settings who are or have been engaged in a relationship (high and low quality) with a leader or member were asked to participate. Also, individuals who perceived themselves as different from their supervisor or subordinate in terms of culture, as well as similar to their supervisor or subordinate in terms of culture were sought. Obtaining insight from the broadest diversity of participants possible was expected to facilitate greater understanding in this area.

Interviews were conducted at locations most convenient for participants. All supervisors and subordinates were interviewed separately. In most cases, interviews were conducted at the participants work site. Three interviews were conducted at a nearby café, while one was conducted at the participant’s home. All interviews that were
conducted at work sites were one-on-one and private, with no one else present in the room or nearby. Interviews conducted off-site were also one-on-one, and did not involve others that the participant knew.

A total of 19 individuals participated in interviews, which provided data (some indirectly) on 24 individuals, or 14 dyads. Three supervisors provided data on more than one of their relationships, with supervisors having described between one and three of their dyadic relationships. Positions of supervisors included three senior executives, two directors, one district manager, and four supervisors. Participants worked in industries including social service, research, technology, utilities, medicine, sales, food services, and administrative services.

Of those who participated in interviews, supervisors ranged in age from 30 to 60 with a mean age of 42.2, while subordinates ranged in age from 34 to 59 with a mean age of 45.5. Regarding gender, 40.0% of supervisors and 50.0% of subordinates were female. In terms of ethnicity, of the 24 individuals for whom data was directly or indirectly available, 37.5% were Japanese, 16.7% were Caucasian, 12.5% were Filipino, 8.3% were Hawaiian, 4.2% (one individual) each was Chinese, Mexican, Okinawan, Portuguese, Thai, and Other Asian (mixed). Of the total number of dyads, 57.1% of these were composed of different cultural identities between the superior and subordinate.

Table 1 displays the basic characteristics of participants, organized by dyad, to allow easier comparisons. Ethnicity and gender labels in the table are those reported by participants on the questionnaire when asked which they most identified with. Labels in parentheses are researcher categories that were uncovered through interviews. Individuals in brackets were not interviewed but were discussed by their dyadic counterpart.
Table 1. Basic Characteristics of Dyad Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>James</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancer</td>
<td>Miss Aloha</td>
<td>Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hawaiian-American)</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>(Japanese-American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 yrs old</td>
<td>43 yrs old</td>
<td>41 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX=4.00</td>
<td>LMX=4.14</td>
<td>LMX=4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Mixed Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Portuguese-Amer.)</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>(Asian-American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 yrs old</td>
<td>48 yrs old</td>
<td>55 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX=3.43</td>
<td>LMX=4.14</td>
<td>LMX=3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(German)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>(Japanese-American)</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 yrs old</td>
<td>51 yrs old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX=3.86</td>
<td>LMX=5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Aran]</td>
<td>[Carol]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Thai]</td>
<td>[Bob]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Japanese</td>
<td>[Caucasian]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Japanese-American)</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>(Japanese-American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 yrs old</td>
<td>39 yrs old</td>
<td>54 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX=4.57</td>
<td>LMX=4.86</td>
<td>LMX=4.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: LMX = LMX-member (Leader-Member) exchange.*
This qualitative inquiry explored perceptions within superior-subordinate relationships and about the development of these relationships within a cultural context. The grounded theory approach as described by Charmaz (2006) provided the paradigmatic foundation for this inquiry. The specific method consisted of interviews using semi-structured, open-ended questions that asked the participants to talk about their work, their relationships with their leader or member, and the factors they perceive as affecting their relationship. The lists of questions which served as a guide during interviews are included in Appendix A for employees and Appendix B for supervisors.

The lists of employee and supervisor questions include the following additional items that were added to the first draft (with the exception of #1 on the supervisor survey, which was not added): 1) What are the relationships like between your coworkers and the manager/supervisor? 2) Would those qualities (of an ideal employee/supervisor) be different than those you would desire in a friend? 3) How long do you think it takes to know someone well? 4) What kind of personal knowledge is needed to feel like you know them well? 5) What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship? 6) Can you have a good work relationship without personal knowledge? and 7) From your observations, what process do people go through to move up in the company/organization?

These questions were meant to enable a broad understanding of the individual, the relationship, and the optional pursuit of more specific, relevant aspects of relationship development when considering culture in superior-subordinate dyads. Consistent with the qualitative paradigm, an overly structured method during this stage
was purposely avoided. The researcher sought to understand diverse leadership relationships from the participants’ perspectives. Thus, the interview questions focused on in subsequent interviews depended on the results from previous data.

Along with the qualitative methods, quantitative strategies employed included two brief survey measures. These included the LMX-7 (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) and the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992). These measures were used to quantify some central features under investigation, namely, relationship quality and cultural values.

**LMX.** The LMX-7 is a 7-item scale by Graen and colleagues (for e.g., Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) used to measure the quality of exchange between employees and their superiors. This measure has been used with leaders as well as members with only slight modifications to the questions needed. Cronbach’s alpha for this measure has been consistently in the .80-.90 range.

**Schwartz Value Survey.** The Schwartz Value Survey is a 57-item questionnaire by Schwartz (1992) that measures 10 individual level values: conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, and security. Participants are asked to rate the importance they place on various specific values. The survey also includes items examining background information such as gender, age, education, religion, and ethnicity.

Before collecting data, an overview of the research was provided as well as information regarding respondents’ confidentiality and the voluntary nature of the research (Appendix C). Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Interviews were also tape recorded with consent of the participant. Because of the possible sensitive nature of this research, several additional steps were taken to ensure protection and
confidentiality of participants. First, pseudonyms were given to all participants and company or organization names were removed in all transcripts. Next, recordings were destroyed following transcription. In addition, scale measures were labeled with ID numbers, and the master list containing names and IDs as well as signed consent forms were kept separately in a locked filing cabinet.

**Analysis**

The guidelines of coding interview data provided by Strauss and Corbin (1998), and originally described by Glaser and Strauss (1967), were used for the analysis of interview data obtained in this study. Upon the recording and transcribing of interviews, the analysis developed with coding procedures until sufficient conclusions from the data were reached. This type of analysis is a circular process in which earlier findings lead to the collection of more data to resolve questions until a satisfactory interpretation of the data is reached (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). According to Strauss (1987), coding allows the analyst to develop and build upon generative questions, identify and link abstract themes, and identify core categories. These findings then generated further questions to be explored in subsequent interviews.

Questionnaire data consisting of the Schwartz Value Survey and LMX-7 were explored for possible associations between endorsement of individual values and quality of superior-subordinate relationships. Due to the small sample size and non-normal distributions of variables, non-parametric tests of correlations were used. Kendall tau (Siegel & Castellan, 1988) was utilized to explore whether relationships existed between LMX and value scores. In addition, to control for Type I error among the 50 individual
correlational tests performed, including supervisor and subordinate scores, the 0.05 significance criteria was divided by 50, yielding a criteria level of 0.001.

Specifically, three sets of relationships were examined. The first examined whether basic individual values (e.g. benevolence, achievement, etc.) were related to quality of leader-member exchange. The second attempted to determine whether differences in value scores between leaders and members were correlated with quality of leader-member exchanges. The third tested whether differences in value scores between leaders and members were associated with differences in LMX ratings. Difference scores for both value scores and LMX scores were calculated by simply subtracting the superior’s score from the subordinate’s and taking the absolute value of that difference.
Chapter 4. Results

Dyadic Characteristics

To provide an overview of dyadic characteristics for each of the dyads represented in the study, Table 2 is presented. The information provided in the table allows simple comparisons between dyad members and gives a brief synopsis of their relationship. “Basic Individual Characteristics” were those reported in the brief questionnaire by each participant. Similar information was not available for dyad members who were not interviewed, but were discussed by their respective counterpart. The “Relationship Synopsis” is a brief summary of key issues that were gathered from interviews. This background information was also intended to facilitate understanding of the conclusions reached in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th>Leader and Member Name</th>
<th>Basic Individual Characteristics</th>
<th>Relationship Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lancer</td>
<td>Hawaiian-American female 30 yrs old LMX=4.00 Director</td>
<td>Overall perceptions: Supervisor perceived relationship more highly than employee perceived relationship; they do not know each other well on a personal level. Development: Began before hiring member; leader previously knew her background and felt member was committed since she waited for the position. Key issues: Member not as satisfied with communication and does not want to cross the professional relationship boundary; leader is more willing to develop personal relationships; good, open communication, although leader does not want the constant &quot;checking in,&quot; while member thinks leader could be even more communicative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fern</td>
<td>Portuguese-American female 45 yrs old LMX=3.43</td>
<td>[Miss P.] Filipino female supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ms. Aloha</td>
<td>Hawaiian-American female 57 yrs old LMX=4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender/Origin</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Japanese-American male</td>
<td>43 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dexter</td>
<td>Filipino-American male</td>
<td>48 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Japanese-American male</td>
<td>43 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Asian-American (mixed) male</td>
<td>41 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Caucasian (German) female</td>
<td>41 yrs old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Aran]</td>
<td>[Thai male]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (Continued) Dyadic Characteristics with Relationship Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Characteristics with Relationship Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J.T. Okinawan-American overall perceptions: Leader has a lot of personal knowledge and rates personal relationship higher, but rates their work relationship and LMX low. Development: Leader did not like member’s work habits in the beginning and never could improve them; they did not communicate well on the job and could not develop good work relationship. Key issues: Very different cultures; Leader likes member on a personal level and would “party” with her outside of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Cameron] [Mexican female]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mike Japanese-American male overall perceptions: Both rate overall relationship and LMX highly Development: Had worked with each other before current work relationship and helped each other; both go beyond contractual obligations to assist each other; high communication. Key issues: Similar cultural backgrounds; work requires a lot of interaction; know each other well on a personal level, enough to where member planned baby shower for leader’s girlfriend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese-American female 37 yrs old LMX=5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Evan Asian (Japanese) 55 yrs old LMX=3.57 Director overall perceptions: Member rated relationship and LMX more highly than leader; leader doesn’t feel like he knows member personally, but member feels he knows leader somewhat on a personal level. Development: Relationship develops strictly during work, as leader prefers separating personal and work domains; work relationship developed mainly from daily visits. Key issues: Different values between leader and member; leader believes in keeping personal information out of workplace, while member believes in building friendship; high communication between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese-American male 34 yrs old LMX=4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Martin | Caucasian-American male  
60 yrs old  
Executive  
LMX=4.57 |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Kristen | Caucasian-American female  
39 yrs old  
LMX=4.86 |
| Andrew | Japanese-American male  
51 yrs old  
Executive  
LMX=5.00 |
| Kyle | Japanese-American male  
41 yrs old  
LMX=4.86 |

**Overall perceptions:** Member believes they are very different but that it improves work outcomes; both have high trust, which allows high autonomy for member; both believe in allowing staff freedom.

**Development:** Over time, leader trusted member because of members successful activities; member following career path of leader; relationship developed slowly although there were 2 major incidents.

**Key issues:** Similar ethnicities; long-term relationship that remained positive for over a decade; leader describes as friendship; high agreement; both emphasized organizational culture of not "micromanaging," which has attracted high quality staff and increased productivity.

**Overall perceptions:** Both believe they are similar in personality to each other; leader has high trust in member; both describe high quality relationship.

**Development:** Leader described how he trained member on IT work and felt member was able to “take the ball and run with it”; member proved trustworthiness as he was able to maintain confidentiality of sensitive company and employee information.

**Key issues:** Similar ethnicities; member believes culturally-based values are shared between them and facilitate the relationship and work; high agreement; member describes how cultural differences sometimes cause conflicts at work.
Table 2. (Continued) Dyadic Characteristics with Relationship Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Overall perceptions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Key issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Japanese-American male 51 yrs old Executive LMX=4.71</td>
<td>Both rate relationship highly; leader feels member is highly capable, but could be a little more detail-oriented.</td>
<td>Relationship began before current positions; trust established previously.</td>
<td>Leader describes as friendship; both feel some personal knowledge is helpful; member perceives differences in work ethic of certain cultures contributes to problems in the workplace and believes culturally-based values are important for work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Japanese-American male 59 yrs old LMX=4.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Japanese-American male 51 yrs old Executive LMX=5.00</td>
<td>Both describe work relationship as effective despite potential challenge of being married.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to remain professional at work and keep home and work separate is described as important; however, member feels she is more able to communicate freely with leader compared to other members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Japanese-American female 54 yrs old LMX=4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Preliminary Model of Multicultural Leadership Relationships

Qualitative interviews with superiors and subordinates in multicultural work settings generated an abundance of thick description on their relationship development process. These data provided a preliminary model of leadership development between diverse superiors and subordinates. The elements of this model are described first in the following sections, and then summarized with an integration of the elements.

To provide a brief preview, six themes emerged from the data that describe different facets of the development of relationships between diverse leaders and members. First, it was found that dyad members have different preferences for and
opinions on the importance of personal level knowledge in the work relationship; however, high quality relationships were possible despite these differences. In addition, they believed managing the boundary between the personal and work domains was critical. A taxonomy of personal exchange management is also presented. Second, relationship development is influenced by the demands for interaction placed on the superior and subordinate. In other words, different levels of interaction may be required of dyad members, and two sources of these demands were identified, individual demands and job demands. Third, perceptions and behaviors of supervisors and subordinates toward their counterpart were often tied to past experiences. Two types of past experiences were discovered, those from prior dyadic experiences and those from prior cultural experiences.

The other three facets of the model describe long-term processes of leadership development, and are similar to processes elucidated in existing leadership literature. The first of these is relationship building. Many of the successful leaders expressed the opinion that actively engaging in building their relationship with their subordinate was necessary. Second, superiors and subordinates also described processes of incremental and reciprocal influence existing in their relationships. Briefly, dyad members engaged in a long-term “give-and-take” process (incremental influence) and over time were able to develop a relationship consisting of equal influence, in which subordinates also influenced the leader (reciprocal influence). Third, leaders’ relationships with each of their members were not all equivalent. Usually, only a few subordinates received extra attention from their superior (in-groups) while most others received less attention (out-groups). These aspects of the model are further explained below.
One of the first general themes that became salient during the course of inquiry was the connection between dyad members’ personal knowledge of each other gained through personal exchange and the exchange based strictly on their working relationships. The definition of “personal” knowledge that evolved from this study is any knowledge of the individual that does not directly relate to the work. However, it is recognized that it is impossible to define precisely what areas are not related to the work. For example, knowing that an employee has a wife may not be necessary at work, but if his wife is ill and the employee needs to take time off, then it will affect the work. Many aspects, on the other hand, are clearly not essential to the job, such as knowing the wife’s name. It is the presence of these non-essential elements of an individual’s life outside of work that makes a general distinction between these two domains possible.

Through the first five interviews, it became evident that many dyad members who were reporting relatively high quality leader-member exchange relationships (high LMX) also felt like they did not know their leader or member personally or did not interact with them much. This phenomenon appeared contradictory to LMX Theory, which seems to suggest that high quality leader-member relationships are based on ample levels of personal knowledge, which allows dyad members to draw on the personal resources of each other for the benefit of the relationship and the organization. Graen and Wakabayashi (1994; pg. 422) and Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995; pg. 230) indicate that relationship development involves the sharing of information and resources on the professional as well as the personal level. Thus, it was assumed that high LMX dyads
would also report greater knowledge of each other on a personal level, but a number of participants described their relationship to the contrary. These findings are reviewed first. Next, a more in-depth investigation was attempted to explain these results. Two additional questions were added to the interview protocol: “What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?” and “Can you have a good relationship without personal knowledge?” In the first of these, participants were asked about their perceptions of how personal knowledge is related to the working relationship. They described a range of experiences of and preferences for personal level involvement in the work relationship. In addition, what they had in common was that they felt the need to pay special attention to the boundary between the personal and professional domains.

The next question sought to determine participants’ beliefs about how important personal knowledge is for developing a good work relationship. A range of opinions were given on this issue as well. The perceived importance of personal knowledge varied from being unimportant to the relationship, even detrimental, to being critical to the work relationship. A visual depiction of how this inquiry emerged is given in Figure 1.
Emergent Question – What is the connection between work and personal domains?

*Work exchange-personal exchange distinction.* As illustrated in Figure 1, initial interviews uncovered instances in which dyad members reported having a good relationship/high LMX, but did not know each other well on a personal level. One supervisor, Lancer, who identified as female and Hawaiian, felt like she did not know her employee, Fern, who identified as female and Portuguese, very well, but rated their relationship highly. Her level of personal knowledge appeared not to exceed the awareness of specific personal issues that were problematic for Fern and that might affect her work. When asked if she knew Fern well on a personal level, she responded,

“Um, well it’s kind of a dynamic where it’s a... I don’t think well, I know enough about her to know when there’s a problem or if there’s a problem at home. I know enough about her to know when she’s not doing well health-wise.”

Later during the interview, she was asked to rate the quality of the relationship on a scale of 1 to 10, and she rated it a 9. In addition, her LMX-7 mean score was 4.00 on scale of 1 to 5.
Fern reported even less personal knowledge of Lancer. If not for a chance meeting, she would know practically nothing about her supervisor beyond work. The following is a passage from her interview after being asked how well she knew Lancer on a personal level:

F: I do not. I don’t think in the time I’ve spent at [removed agency name] allows me to do that, since it’s only been, what, 14 months? I think, I think it takes longer than 14 months to get to know somebody on a personal level.

D: So, um…do you know anything, like, about her family, or her friends, or anything? Spend time with any of them?

F: No.

D: Okay.

F: I know that she has a sister and a mom. Um, I know her mom goes to my doctor, cause just by chance I saw her mom there and her there one morning.

D: Oh.

F: So I know me and her mom shares the same physician, and more than likely has the same illness, um, cause I’m a diabetic and more than…and I go to see an endocrinologist who specializes in diabetes, so I’m more than sure her mom has diabetes, too.

D: Oh.

F: Um, and I might be wrong but um, that’s the only thing in common that I can think of.

Another employee, Ms. Aloha, who identified as female and Hawaiian, commented on her relationship with her female Filipino supervisor, Miss P., although her
supervisor was not available for interview. Ms. Aloha described how little contact she has
with her supervisor, and she was not able to elaborate much on her personal knowledge
of Miss P. Although she was fairly new to the organization, having been there only 3
months, Ms. Aloha was acquainted with Miss P. before entering the position. The
interesting finding is that Ms. Aloha rated their relationship an 8 out of 10, and scored
4.14 on the LMX-7, despite having little contact with or knowledge of her supervisor:

D: Okay...okay...how often do you see her?
A: Um, when I’m in the office. So, you know, it could be daily, it could be, you
know, when I...when I come in.
D: Okay. And how...how long of a time do you have with her when you see her?
A: Um...it’s usually just passing.
D: Okay.
A: Unless we have to meet. Um, it’s pretty much just passing.
D: And what are the types of ways that you usually communicate with her?...like
email...
A: Um, in person, verbally...
D: In person?
A: Yeah, for the most part, I mean...
D: Um...is there any activities you do together with her?
A: Um...I think probably just planning.
D: Okay, and how often does that occur?
A: Mmm...maybe on a monthly basis.
D: Do you get to go out to lunch with her and stuff too, or...
A: No, not really. We’re...we’re kind of on a different schedule, like they...they come in at 7:45, and then they have a certain routine. So we don’t always get to eat lunch, but, you know, she’ll call me, or if I need to, you know, to find her or whatever, I mean, she’s available, you know, or I’ll make myself available to her.

D: Okay. How well do you know her on a personal level?

A: Umm...you know, fairly casual. I mean, you know, like I know a little bit about her family and her trip to the Philippines, and you know, how long she’s been working here, what is she...you know, things like that.

D: Okay.

A: Her concerns, I guess, her personal concerns. She takes care of her mom, an elderly mom...

D: Have you met her family before?

A: No. No, I haven’t met her family yet, uh uh.

Here, Ms. Aloha mentions that her contacts with Miss P. are usually just in passing, and the only activities they have together are usually planning, which only occurs once a month. She also reports that they do “not really” spend time together at lunch. Thus, her knowledge of Miss P. is fairly limited.

These cases, which were uncovered in initial stages of the investigation, prompted the researcher to reexamine the LMX literature in an effort to resolve the apparent contradictions. However, little mention has been made in the research about personal level involvement within the work relationship. As far as the development of the construct of Leader-Member Exchange, it likely has been refined so that the working relationship is distinguished from any other relationship levels. One of the only
clarifications found on this issue was made by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), who stated in the same article as the one cited earlier, “Development of LMX is based on the characteristics of the working relationship [italics inserted] as opposed to a personal or friendship relationship…” (p. 237); in addition, the LMX-7 scale items focus the respondent on the working relationship. Absent in the literature is an explanation of how personal information, resources, and involvement contribute to or interact with the working relationship. In contrast with Graen and Wakabayashi’s and Graen and Uhl-Bien’s contradictory description on the importance of personal level information and resources, it seems fair to argue that LMX Theory has not adequately addressed this important aspect. The ensuing research attempted to fill this gap.

Perceived connections. Additional investigation attempted to uncover the extent with which diverse leaders and members distinguished between work and personal domains. It was evident that there were differences of opinion on what degree personal lives should permeate the work setting. However, many of the participants felt that the distinction between the work and personal relationship held significant importance in their jobs, and required a considerable amount of their attention.

Some believe that the two domains should be clearly separated, with personal lives kept out of the work setting as much as possible. This tendency is illustrated in Figure 2. A male Japanese supervisor, Evan, provided an example of these values while he discussed his relationship with a male Chinese subordinate, Merle:

D: Do you ever have lunch with Merle?...together with him...

E: No.

D: No? Or after work...
D: Get a bite to eat or anything like that?
E: No.

D: Okay. Do you feel like you know Merle on a personal level?
E: No.

D: So you say wouldn’t know his family and friends and stuff?
E: No.

D: Okay. Um, what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with Merle?

E: I think we’re very frank and honest with each other. I think he can…he feels that he can be honest with me. And then I’m basically pretty honest with him. Um…I think with all the managers…and this is my own personal opinion…Uh, you asked me about do I know him outside of work, do I socialize with him…I don’t think we do that with, um, all managers, any managers, whether it’s Merle or anybody else.

D: Okay.

E: Um, it seems to…um, I think…it needs to be a separation of work and social…In that, um, I think part of being honest with somebody is so that you’re not too close to the guy as a friend that you would feel bad telling him something he needs to hear that is probably not very pleasant at times.

D: Mmhmm.

E: And so I found that, um, socialize very little one-on-one with the managers. There may be times when we may go out as a group, all the managers together...
and we go have dinner, but that is pretty much the extent of any socializing that we do outside of work.

D: Oh, okay.

E: If I go into the units, we may sit down and have lunch together, in the unit, but, um...I personally believe you kind of need that separation where you don’t really...we do very little socializing outside of work.

D: Okay. So when you folks have, like those, um, I guess, meals together, that’s mostly, like, work-related stuff?

E: Mmm.

Figure 2. Schematic Illustrating Separation of Work and Personal Domains.

| Leader-member relationships with separated work (W) and personal (P) domains | (W) | (P) |

In contrast, Carl, a male Japanese supervisor, believes that building personal relationships is essential when working with someone. Below, he explains that knowing someone at a more personal level helps one to better deal with issues that are sensitive for the other person. His fairly new work relationship with his male Filipino employee, Bob, already revealed a large amount of personal involvement, as depicted in Figure 3. They both had shared a great deal about their personal histories with each other and opened up to each other on an emotional level.
“Um... I think, um... I think when you have personal knowledge, you know where the landmines are. So you’re not... not necessarily trying to tiptoe around things, but you know where not to... not to step, you know? You know certain... certain topics are gonna be hot button issues, and you know how... you can tell whether there’s a level of, uh, uncomfortableness or... or, um, comfortableness, whatever it is, um, by understanding their personality a lot more. Um, so you don’t have to guess. Lot’s of times you... it’s less of a guessing versus understanding that if this is good, or, you know, good or bad...”

In another part of the interview, Carl shared how he and Bob became close, even “brotherly.” Carl also talked about the close relationship he had developed with another of his staff, Mary, a Filipino female.

D: Like any kind of story that stands out for you, or that happened during work, or something that they told you about their life... some kind of story.

C: Well, Bob shared a lot about his, uh... his marital situation. Um, he, um... he had to leave for work for a year, and his wife, um, cheated on him, basically, and, um... he was, um... it was hard for him to share that, but he was able to open up to me. It was good... it was a good breakthrough... Um... I think with Mary there’s a lot of just, uh, really... on a personal level, it’s just a... it’s a... we just have a lot of... a lot of things that, in common, just we kind of enjoy just the, uh... the laughter of it, just the fun. Um, you know, just the joking around we always kind of run into the same mentality on certain things. So it’s just, it’s probably just more situational versus a personal [unintelligible].

D: Like similar interests, would you say?
C: Yeah, well we just really think alike, probably. We share the same humor, I think.

D: Um, what are some positive things about your relationship with Bob?

C: Um... Well, we’re just very, uh... very, like, brotherly. It’s a...uh, it’s very like a kind of a nurturing and encouraging, and, uh...you know, you find a lot of similarities with Bob, too, on a lot of levels.

Figure 3. Schematic Illustrating High Overlap Between Work and Personal Domains.

Leader-member relationships with high overlap between work (W) and personal (P) domains

From the perspective of an employee, Fern believed that it was a supervisor’s responsibility to be there for an employee’s needs, even in areas where the boundary between work and personal life is unclear. Although perhaps less so than Carl’s case, recognizing that Fern does place a boundary between work and personal life, her actions during work seem to suggest that she requires attention from her supervisor, Lancer, beyond what is necessary for her work.

D: Okay. How often do you see her?

F: Every day.

D: Okay, and how long do you get to spend with her when you see her?

F: Probably more than she wants to [laughs]. Um, I’m always addressing her everyday. It’s important for me to let her know where I am with my work, how I
feel about my feelings during the day. If somebody irritated me, I’ll be sure to tell her, whether it may be a coworker, or a client, or... or if I have a concern... um, am I treating my client properly, did I give them the utmost care, did I forget about something... I will always go to her. Um, I prefer to go straight to my superior than to my coworkers to ask for advice, because otherwise you got the blind leading the blind.

D: Mmm.
F: Yeah?
D: Yeah.

F: I mean, I’m not saying that I don’t trust my coworkers’ input, but Lancer has higher education, she’s my supervisor, and that’s why I go to her. That’s her position. She’s my guidance, so, um, I think that kind of explains how I feel about her.

In this instance, Fern explains how she seeks advice from Lancer on work issues, which often involves personal feelings. The following excerpt gives a better picture of how she is dependent on her supervisor for meeting her emotional needs.

F: And... and I think I’m Lancer’s most trying and pesky employee.
D: Oh really?
F: Because I need that one-on-one attention from her. I need to know she’s there for me daily, because why am I doing what I’m doing? Partially... not only to please my clients, but to know that I’m being... I’m being efficient in what I’m doing. Who’s the best person to ask, but your supervisor?
D: Yeah.
F: If she cannot be there for you, to answer even the smallest questions, or for the smallest direction or guidance, in any day, may it be near or far... if I call her from D.C. and say, ‘You know what, I had a bad day here.’ My boss should be able to help me through that.

D: Mmm.

F: Or give me direction. That’s her job. That’s what she gets paid for.

Although not included here due to length, both Fern and Lancer described incidences in which Fern needed to resolve some personal issues and she felt the need to continually contact Lancer to provide every detail of what she was doing (see Appendix E). While most of the issues they related had some impact on Fern’s work, it was clear that Fern provided much more personal information than was needed or wanted.

Perhaps due to the tendency of many individuals to perceive less of a boundary between the personal and professional domains, managers recognized the need to pay special attention to managing that boundary. This is evident in Evan’s description above, in which he revealed a more uniform approach with his direct reports. Evan represents one end of the personal involvement spectrum, because he maintains distance with everyone he supervises equally.

At the other extreme of the personal involvement spectrum is J.T., a female Okinawan, and her approach in supervising her employee. She had a difficult time with one particular female Mexican employee, Cameron, in making her follow orders and take initiative, despite feeling close to her on a personal level. As J.T. explained, she thought her mistake was becoming friends with Cameron and taking on a laissez-faire style of
leadership with her at work. From this incident, she later realized the importance of managing the personal and professional domains.

D: You ever do stuff outside of work with Cameron?

J: Yeah, Cameron’s fun to party with.

D: Oh yeah?

J: She likes to drink.

D: But you don’t like to work with her?

J: Yeah, she’s lazy that’s why.

D: Would you say you know Cameron on a personal level?

J: Yeah.

D: Do you know her family and friends?

J: I know her husband, met some of her friends, um…but her family is in another country.

After a few more statements, J.T. reveals how she may have made an error in her approach with Cameron.

J: So yeah, she’s just a little complainer. But I probably…she’s probably had me trained in a way that I wouldn’t bother her so much or try to, you know, boss her around in a way that I should’ve. And then my problem was making...becoming friends with her. I think that was a...I think it’s hard not to make friends at work, you know?

D: Yeah.
J: But then my friend told me one thing before. He goes, cause he’s manager, 
right, at his job? He goes, “I’m your boss. I’m not your friend.” He’s just there to 
supervise. So he knows how to separate that, you know?

D: Mmm.

J: I think I’m too sensitive, too, so...

Mike, a male Japanese manager who takes a slightly different approach, is willing 
to be more personally involved in the relationship, but modifies his approach based on 
the individual. The relationship he described seemed to fit the pattern illustrated in Figure 
4, although the area of overlap varies depending on his subordinate. Mike describes his 
relationship with his female Japanese subordinate, Michelle, while his general approach 
may be considered a contingency approach, since he manages the relationship based on 
the needs of the individual and situation:

D: So would you say you know Michelle on a personal level?

M: Personal? I think I know some personal things about her. Uh, I think ‘cause 
you...well, I think, with some of my philosophies, right, uh, I don’t mind being 
the coach for a lot of people. So, depending on each person, right? If they open up 
and they need help, I’ll definitely help. Um...obviously being very careful about 
the relationship, yeah? About being their boss, but if there is a...a need to help, 
then I’ll help. You know, sometimes you take off the hat as a boss, and then 
you...you become more of a coach. Um...so do I know everything personal, her 
likes and dislikes, and all that kind of stuff? No. But do I know a little bit about 
her personal life? Yeah.
However, Mike also recognizes that becoming personally involved in an employee’s life can become detrimental. Below, he explains that becoming too comfortable with a person sometimes encourages the person to question authority, and can be seen as favoritism by others. Therefore, he perceives the need to constantly monitor the relationship:

D: What are some negative things about your relationship with Michelle?

M: I think sometimes you can have a relationship that is too comfortable.

D: Okay.

M: So, especially in a boss-subordinate relationship, because you want them to be open, but sometimes they can be too open, so um...and it’s not really bad, per se, but the perception can be bad, right? If you have a good relationship with an employee...cause you never wanna make...you never wanna have that opportunity for somebody to say that there’s favoritism or anything like that.

D: Yeah.

M: So, sometimes it’s like that, right? You gotta watch the perception on the outside. The other part is...sometimes you give direction or whatever, and you get feedback too fast, too instant.

D: Oh.

M: Right? At the end of the day, they know they’re gonna do it. But sometimes, as a...as a boss, you don’t want to hear feedback. You just want the thing to get done.

D: Yeah.
M: And so you gotta...that’s a negative, right? Sometimes there’s more explaining, because they’re more comfortable with you, um, they’re not as accepting sometimes, right? If you have a...if you don’t have a good relationship with your boss, let’s say he tells you to do something...tough, right? You gotta do it.

D: Yeah.

M: Sometimes when the relationship is too good, there can be a lot more questions, which at the end of the day, is a good thing, but for the boss, you’re not always wanting to hear all that kind of stuff, right?

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: Um, so discussions sometimes come a little bit more [unintelligible] than you would like.

D: So that happens with Michelle sometimes?

M: Yeah. I mean, anybody, well, for me, I’ll be honest, Michelle, yes, but some of my other direct reports, too.

D: Oh, okay.

M: But, um, yeah. I think if there’s any negative, I think that becomes a negative. And then if you get too close to a person, in terms of the boss, it becomes...you want them to succeed, so you have that need for yourself to coach somebody to succeed, uh, and sometimes it’s hard to give the harsh reality of what it is, right? Whether it be job performance or whatever. Um...so that sometimes is hard, but at the same time...Like, I’m a person, I tell it like it is, pretty much every time, so
it just becomes interesting sometimes with those conversations, I guess, is a way to say it. Does that make sense?

Figure 4. Schematic Illustrating Moderate Overlap Between Work and Personal Domains.

Although each of these managers underwent different experiences and took different leadership approaches, the boundary between the work and the personal was something that was clearly important to them. Managers and employees may have different preferences on how much overlap is acceptable between the personal and professional domains. Therefore, the working relationship-personal relationship distinction was found to be an important issue for leadership in this multicultural sample.

Importance of personal knowledge. While preferences for maintaining distance between personal lives and work lives may vary, an attempt was also made to discover the importance that different individuals place on personal knowledge in the workplace. In other words, how necessary is personal knowledge, regardless of whether it is preferred or not? Participants were not only asked their opinion of what role personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship, but also whether they believed it was possible to have a good work relationship without any personal knowledge. These findings revealed value differences in these areas as well.
Again, Evan demonstrates one side of the spectrum. He believes knowing an individual’s personality is important, but anything else should not have a place at work except, maybe, for emergencies. Evan also believes a person can have a good work relationship without any personal knowledge:

D: Mmm. Okay. Um, what role do you think that personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship? Like, knowing kind of more about their personal lives, or, I think that could be like their personality...like, how much of that do you need to know...

E: I think knowing their personality is important. Uh, their personal lives, basically, to be very honest, like, you know, “What? You got problems at home? Leave ‘em at home.” Yeah. I think that’s...uh, so...I think the only time it comes into play is if it’s something that somebody’s going through a personal crisis at home that it’s affecting them at work.

D: Mmm.

E: Then, you know, I think those things need to be addressed. And...and, uh...but, other than...on a day-to-day basis, where you’re managing people, uh, their personal struggles or what have you, outside of work, should really not impact, um, you know, how you would manage them at the job.

D: Kay.

E: I know that’s easier said than done. Like I said, you know, if know somebody’s dad is sick or something, and, you cut...kind of want to cut ‘em some slack when they’re late or they have to leave early. Um, so, you know, that’s easier said than
done. However, um, in…in the reality of things, well, that’s your own personal thing, right?…I should manage you like I do the other people.

D: Mmm. Kay. Do you think you can have a good working relationship without any personal knowledge?

E: Um…yes I do. I think…you as a person…as a manager…need to control that, ‘cause you will have some people that want to share their whole life story with you, outside of work. And…and…and, you know, if…I think you could sit there and listen to that, you become more involved [unintelligible], it’s kind of outside of work, and I really don’t want to, you know, discuss that, or hear about your personal…so let’s kind of focus in on work…just work-related.

Offering a similar point of view is J.T., although she speaks from a recent experience with her employee, and is still not quite sure about how these issues should be approached. She appears to be tending towards the opinion that one should avoid getting to know someone too personally at work:

D: What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?

J: Personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?

D: Yeah.

J: Personal knowledge of what?

D: Of the person. Like, do you feel like you need to have a lot of personal knowledge about that person to have a good work relationship?

J: Mmm….as a supervisor, I think that you should try to avoid getting to know people personally, [laughs] so that you’re not gonna, um, you shouldn’t treat them
differently from people you don’t know. Um....but, I think...I think work-wise, to
make work just work, maybe you shouldn’t really get to know people that well,
but it’s hard not to though. Like some people, they’ll just go to work and they
won’t socialize with anybody. They just come to work. And I don’t know if those
are the type of people that make better associates versus people you’re getting to
know on a personal basis while you’re working, because then you’ll notice that
people end up sitting there and they like talking stories, and then they’re not doing
tings they’re supposed to do, or they might get treated differently by their, you
know, their fellow coworkers. So I don’t know if it’s a good idea to get to know
people personally at work.

D: Yeah. So you think, then, you can have a good work relationship without too
much personal knowledge?

J: Um...I think...yeah, maybe.

Mike and Michelle, who have a good working relationship and know each other
fairly well on a personal level, both believe one can have a good work relationship
without personal knowledge. However, they differ from Evan in that they view personal
knowledge as potentially helpful for the relationship. Michelle related how she works
well with her clients even though she knows nothing about them except what their vision
and goals are. Although, she does feel like knowledge of a personal nature is “a bonus”
and helps in conversations with others. Below, Mike reveals that he takes special care in
trying to get to know the managers that report to him in order to use that knowledge to
improve their relationship:
D: Okay, um... what role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a
good work relationship?

M: What role does personal knowledge play in developing a good work
relationship... personal knowledge of what?

D: Like just about the person, their background, maybe their strengths and
weaknesses...

M: And how does that help professionally?

D: Yeah.

M: I think in the boss-subordinate setting, the more you know, and I’m not saying
you gotta know everything, but the more you remember, maybe, would be the
more interesting thing. Right? The more things that you remember about a person,
the easier it is for the relationship on the professional side to grow. So, in terms of
professional relationship, right, those personal questions become lead-in questions
to make a person feel comfortable. The faster you get comfortable with a person,
the faster the relationship develops. So, for example, if I have 26 managers report
to me... Um, I’ll be honest and say I’m not gonna remember everything about
them, I’m not gonna have great relationships with all of them, I’m not gonna have
personal relationships with all of them, but over time I will.

D: Mmm.

M: And as a boss, it’s my job to make sure that, hey, if there is personal
information that is shared, that I remember it, so that I can check up on people.

Because if you genuinely care about the person, then the relationship will
develop. And usually, the care in the relationship, especially on a professional level, is personal.

D: Mmm.

M: Right? How you’re doing outside of work. ‘Cause I see what you’re doing at work. You know? A good work relationship?

D: So is it possible to have a good relationship without personal knowledge? A good work relationship?

M: A good work relationship? Yeah.

D: It’s possible.

M: I think it depends on what level you’re talking about. Right? Like I worked with a lot of people from the mainland, right? So, I can call certain amount of people anytime and I know they’ll help me out. But that doesn’t mean I know crap about them. Some of it is because it’s work. It’s...it’s you’ve proven yourself, they’ve proven themselves...and in the work setting, you know, you both flourish. Now, I’m not gonna say it’s as fast, but it’s possible. Um, I think the personal stuff just helps you get there faster and builds a deeper relationship with that person. But I can mention a lot of people that I don’t know too much about, except in the work setting, yet have a good relationship. Did that make sense?

D: Yeah.

M: Part of that, too, I’ll tell you something, it’s respecting the title sometimes.

D: Mmm.
M: Right? You don’t always gotta love the person, but you respect the title, and that’s important for any of our jobs, right?

D: So like, what they’ve achieved and stuff?

M: What they’ve achieved, but, or let’s say that you don’t always agree with your boss. Right? You hate his guts on a personal level, or whatever. But he’s your boss.

D: Mmm.

M: So you need to respect the title, even though you hate the person.

D: Yeah.

M: So can you work on that relationship, and have a good working relationship?

Yes. And at the end of the day, 5:00, never talk to the guy until the next day, 8:00, or whatever it is, right?

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: It can happen.

From Merle’s perspective, getting to know more about your employees is almost required, putting him at the other end of the spectrum from Evan, even though he is Evan’s subordinate. Merle supervises a food service establishment, and in other parts of the interview has mentioned how it is important for them to maintain a lively, fun atmosphere. Whether his perspective is influenced by his work setting or not, he clearly places more importance on developing closer relationships:

D: ...What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?
M: Um...well, I guess, a good work relationship with your employees would be working with them, you know? Um, not just by supervising or managing them, you need to, um, be there with them to work with them, you know? Um, that’s the only way, I guess, you can form a relationship. ‘Cause most times, you know, you would talk with them while you work, about things, and try to get to know the person, you know, and its kind of hard to just talk to the person, like, if you’re just supervising them and not...not working with them.

D: Yeah.

M: You know, it’s like...

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: You know, if you work with them at the site, it’s easier to talk to them. Um, it’s easier for them to talk to you, too.

D: Um, does it help when you get to know personal things about them? Does that help with your work relationship with them?

M: Um, yeah, ‘cause you get to know things about, uh...about the person itself, you know, um...um, what are their tendencies, you know, what...you know, sometimes, you know, who they work good with, who they don’t work good with. So...um...sometimes [unintelligible].

D: Do you think you can have a good relationship without personal knowledge?

M: Um, no...not really. Without any personal knowledge, it’s hard to get to know employees, yeah? Or people you work with.

In addition to Merle’s, Carl’s statements also clearly reflected the perception that personal knowledge is critical to the work relationship. Despite individual differences of
opinion on how essential personal knowledge is for the work relationship, in each case, it was still possible for most of these individuals to maintain positive work relationships. In effect, these findings have helped to map the landscape of work relationships in relation to personal exchange.

To review, participants from the outset described relationships that seemed divergent from existing LMX theory. Subsequent interviews found that leaders and members have different preferences for personal level involvement in the work relationship and how to manage the boundary between the two domains (Figure 5). Regardless of different opinions, they believed that managing that boundary was important. Beyond preferences, participants were also asked about the extent to which they thought personal knowledge was required for a good relationship, and they shared differences of opinion on this aspect as well.

Figure 6 also displays a qualitative pictorial representation of the different patterns of development of personal and work exchanges for each dyad. For clarification, these diagrams are not quantitative measurements but qualitative approximations based on information from interviews. Dyadic developmental patterns are clustered into the three types, with Cluster 1 representing separation between work and personal domains, Cluster 2 representing some overlap between the two domains, and Cluster 3 representing high overlap between the two domains.
It should also be noted that no outstanding differences were evident in the range of preferences regarding personal exchange between culturally homogeneous and culturally heterogeneous dyads. While the sample size is not large enough to provide examples of a homogeneous dyad as well as a heterogeneous dyad to reflect every type of preference, many examples were evident that suggest how this element of the model may apply to all dyads. To illustrate, heterogeneous dyads showed preferences for low personal exchange (for e.g., Evan) as well as high personal exchange (for e.g., Carl). Similarly, homogeneous dyads (for e.g., Andrew and Kyle, both male and Japanese) have shown relatively low personal exchange as well as high personal exchange (for e.g., Mike and Michelle).
Figure 6. Dyad LMX and Personal Exchange Development.
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A Taxonomy of Personal Exchange Management. Based on these findings, a classification system was constructed identifying the specific methods for which leaders manage the boundaries between the work and personal domains (Figure 7). Two main variables were used: the level of personal exchange they allow at work and whether their management style is dependent on the individual (particularistic) or equal among all individuals (universal). This categorization presents five major personal exchange management styles.

The first is labeled "Type 0" because it lacks any management of personal exchange due to the superior's preference for keeping the work and personal domains separate. The other four types describe management that allows at least some personal exchange at work. Thus, they can be classified along the dimensions of level of personal exchange and particularistic-universal, yielding the following types: Type I-Limited-Particularistic, Type II-Limited-Universal, Type III-High-Particularistic, and Type IV-High Universal. These personal exchange management types are described below.
Figure 7. Taxonomy of Personal Exchange Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Personal Exchange Type of Personal Exchange (PE) Management</th>
<th>No PE</th>
<th>Limited PE</th>
<th>High PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 0 (Evan)</td>
<td>Type I (Mike)</td>
<td>Type II (Martin)</td>
<td>Type III (Wendy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Names in parentheses provide examples for that PE management type.

- **Type 0 (No Personal Exchange Management):** Type 0 Management is characterized by preferences for work relationships that resist the encroachment of the personal, or non-work related, domain. Because these managers do not allow personal matters to be introduced at work, there is no need to manage the boundary, except for maintaining its externality. An example of this type of management was provided by Evan’s quotes, stated above, who felt personal issues do not have a place at work.

- **Type I (Limited-Particularistic):** Type I management is distinguished by its preference for limiting personal level involvement in the work setting, while
adjusting the amount of personal exchange depending on the individual. This type of manager believes that some personal knowledge is helpful, but allowing too much can be detrimental. He or she will also grow closer to selected subordinates depending on the demands of the situation. Mike’s approach reflects this style, as he described how he limited the personal involvement with his subordinates, how he adjusts his approach based on the person, and how he becomes closer to subordinates in certain job positions.

- **Type II (Limited-Universal):** Like Type I management, Type II management is exemplified by managers who believe it is important to limit personal level involvement at work. However, Type II managers differ in that they attempt to maintain the same level of limited personal exchange with all of their subordinates. Martin provides a relevant example of this type. In regards to his personal involvement with his subordinates, he shared instances of how he has been there for many of a subordinate’s significant life events (wedding, child, etc.) and stated that, in general, he knows his subordinates “to some extent” on a personal level. He also showed how he takes a more standard approach with all of his subordinates by the statement, “I’m very cautious about getting into personal stuff at all, because I don’t want to interfere, but I want to let them know I’m there to support.”

- **Type III (High-Particularistic):** Type III management is typified by managers who are highly involved with their subordinates on both a professional and personal level. Also, they are more highly involved with selected individuals. This may be made explicit to subordinates, as in Wendy’s case, in which she clarifies
expectations with her subordinates early on to determine whether they will be committed to her particular area or whether they prefer to focus on other areas. If it is agreed that the subordinate will be committed, the superior can focus her attention on building the relationship with that subordinate, including the more personal domains.

- **Type IV (High-Universal):** Type IV management reflects managers who feel it is important to develop extensive personal level relationships with all subordinates. It was evident that Carl engages in this management style. He believed that it was necessary to know subordinates well if working with them everyday, especially to be able to address morale issues. This type of management may be involved in frequent off-hours events with subordinates or spend a lot of time engaging subordinates in positive non-work interaction or communicating with them about personal matters.

In conclusion, all of these types of managers were shown to be successful. The examples given of each type were of superiors who had high quality relationships with their members. These findings provide a useful classification system to help conceptualize the complex patterns of possible management types that can lead to successful leadership.

**Demands for Interaction**

The demands for interaction between supervisor and subordinate can be a considerable factor in relationship development. These demands can stem from the needs of the individual (individual demands) or the work context surrounding the dyad (job demands). A dyad member who has a high need for communication can demand more
interaction from the other member. In addition, work that requires more teamwork to complete a task can require greater interaction within the dyad as well. Needless to say, individual demands, job demands, or both, may be low or non-existent as well. These demands, and the resulting interaction, or lack of interaction, have consequences regarding how the relationship develops.

**Individual demands.** Individual differences in the amount of interaction they demand from their counterpart can be a major factor in their experiences in the relationship. One case that clearly reflected this divergence was Fern and Lancer. Fern felt that more communication was necessary, both in terms of length of time and frequency, for the work and personal relationship to develop, than did her supervisor, Lancer.

While most participants felt that a person could get to know someone within one year, Fern felt it takes longer. Even 14 months was not enough for her, as evident in her reference to Lancer below.

D: Okay. Okay, how well do you know her on a personal level?
F: I do not. I don't think in the time I've spent at [removed agency name] allows me to do that, since it's only been, what, 14 months? I think, I think it takes longer than 14 months to get to know somebody on a personal level.

This passage shows how Fern requires interaction over an extended period of time to feel like she knows a person well. In addition, she also mentions how she prefers greater frequency of interaction on a day-to-day basis. The excerpts given earlier reveal how Fern admits to needing daily attention from and communication with Lancer.

Another indication of the importance she places on interaction is that Fern did not feel
satisfied with the amount of communication coming from her supervisor. Fern values openness, which she associates with a willingness to share discontent. In response to an inquiry about some negative things about their relationship, Fern noted, "Um...openness. I think if she's dissatisfied, she...she needs to know that she can tell me. I think that's one of the negative things, is being open..."

While Fern has a high need for interaction, Lancer's demand is lower. Lancer described how she gets frustrated with Fern's persistence in wanting to meet with her. Interestingly, Lancer also believes she is being open with Fern, while Fern perceived her as not being open enough. What follows is a portion of Lancer's interview.

D: Okay. What are the types of ways that you communicate with Fern?

L: Um, I’m very open to her. I tell her exactly how it is. And, like, if I’m frustrated with her for being persistent about coming in and out of my office, I just tell her, ‘You know what? Can’t do it now. Just gotta wait. Can we schedule something so that I set aside the time that’s necessary to meet with you? Maybe in the afternoon, or tomorrow?’

Lancer also explained that there are times, especially during grant writing season, when she is extremely busy, and Fern's persistence can be troublesome. When asked to share some negative things about their relationship, Lancer gave the following response.

D: Um...what are some negative things about your relationship with her?

L: Um, I think just her persistence...um, can be...for me it can be very...a negative thing, because especially when it's grant writing season, and our timeline to get a grant in goes from a whole, a full month down to, like, three weeks...
Obviously, the differences in these dyad members’ personal demands for interaction were very perceptible to them, and they both mentioned it as a negative aspect of their relationship. Fern, whose communication needs were not as fulfilled as Lancer, rated the quality of their relationship lower, as well.

Conversely, dyad members may have similar personal demands for interaction. In the case of Ms. Aloha and her supervisor, Miss P, they both appeared to show a low need for communication, and they shared a high quality relationship, from Ms. Aloha’s point of view. Ms. Aloha revealed that she and Miss P. usually only interact with each other in passing, and she is only required to meet together about once a month or on an as-needed basis. The following is a relevant clip from a passage cited earlier.

D: Okay. And how...how long of a time do you have with her when you see her?
A: Um...it’s usually just passing.
D: Okay.
A: Unless we have to meet. Um, it’s pretty much just passing.

Ms. Aloha also said that she spends time with Miss P. and other co-workers infrequently, only occasionally having lunch with them. Thus, Ms. Aloha seems to display a low need for interaction, and based on her description, so does Miss P. At the same time, Ms. Aloha rated their relationship quite highly.

While it is not yet clear how differences or similarities in individual demands for interaction affect the relationship, it was evident that these differences do exist and can play a role in their relationship. Communication was one of the most highly regarded values among these participants, which also suggests that when communication needs are not met, it may have important implications in the relationship. However, another factor
also may determine whether higher or lower communication is warranted, the context of the job.

_job Demands._ In addition to individual differences, the demands posed by the job can impact the amount of interaction that takes place between superior and subordinate. Certain jobs encourage individuals to work independently while others require increased collaboration. Even within a work unit, differences in tasks between direct reports foster differences in their interaction with the supervisor. To illustrate, two examples are given which show how job demands influence the exchange between supervisor and subordinate:

First, Mike explains that there are two positions that he must interact with frequently, the marketing manager and the controller. The marketing manager he refers to is his direct report, Michelle. His use of the term “always gonna have interaction” gives an indication of how his communication with these individuals are highly dictated by the position. He also goes on further to attempt to clarify why those relationships exist as they do.

M: Oh yeah. Oh yeah. There’s two people that always gonna have interaction, right? The marketing manager for me, and the controller, because the controller wraps all the finances… the marketing manager is all the… I would say the soft things in the business?

D: Yeah.

M: So, all the project work would go to a marketing manager, per se, you know, compared to the regular general manager. The general manager’s are there for operations. They make sure the door opens and the door closes.
D: Yeah, yeah.

M: You know, so time spent with them is a little bit less than with projects, because she’ll do the projects for the general manager.

In another excerpt, he further elucidates the differences in his relationships and how they are dependent on the time he is required to spend with them. With Michelle, he reveals that his relationship has grown faster with her because of the necessity of frequent interaction.

D: How would you say your relationship with Michelle compares to your relationship with other of your...

M: managers?

D: Yeah.

M: I think it’s uh, it’s not similar to all. It’s similar to some. Um, the reason is...time spent, right? Because she’s in a role that she doesn’t open and close the doors, uh, you see the relationship grow faster with her than some that I only see once every other week or whatever.

Similarly, Evan described how his interactions differ depending on the responsibilities of his direct reports. He goes somewhat in depth on how frequently he meets his direct reports and how he meets Evan more frequently than others because of Evan’s position.

D: Daily, okay. Uh, like, how long...how long are your interactions, or how much time do you spend...
E: [unintelligible] formal meetings. Um... just basically, you know, as I go in, I’ll stop in three or four times a day, with him. Uh, it depends a lot on my interaction with other managers depends on, uh, their experience level.

D: Mmm.

E: We have, um, a new catering manager. So, I meet with him weekly. Okay?

And we have a new manager down in [removed place name], so I have formal meetings with him weekly, for like about an hour. Um, [removed place name], I just go down there and just very informally talk with the managers down there, see what they’re doing, and if they need any help. Um, once a week, on Wednesdays, we have management meetings where all the managers on campus come to this room, and we sit down, and I share...it’s more of an informational meeting with them...I share with them information. Once a month, at month end, they come and bring information on their, um, P and Ls, profit and loss statements, and they share with us. We talk about finances, what they were budgeted to do, or what they did in actuality, if there’s variances, why? So, once a month they come to bring us information. The rest of the time it’s me sharing information with them. Uh, also use that as a training session...train managers on different things that are coming up.

D: Okay. Okay, so with Merle, um, is that more interaction than with most other folks, or less interaction?

E: Mmm...probably more because he’s a supervisor. Both he and [removed name] are supervisors, so I try and spend more time with them, uh, cause their hourly supervisors. The salaried managers and all the other operations, um, my
expectation is that they’ll manage their business, and they reach out to me, uh, when they need help with certain situations or [unintelligible] that come up, uh...

Later, Evan illustrates how he is more directly involved with Merle’s operations. Within their dyad, they solve problems and Evan gives more instructions for running Merle’s operation.

D: Kay, how would you say your relationship with Merle compares with your relationship with other people that you...that report to you?

E: Um...I am probably closer to the operation, in Merle’s operation, managing Merle, than I am with some of the other operations. Um, like I said earlier, um, Merle, um, not only is a working supervisor, so I, uh, work with him directly, and, uh, we solve problems that come up, whereas in other operations, there’s a manager in-between me and the hourly employees. So basically, uh, you’re setting, uh, big goals for the other managers, like, I need your, uh, labor cost to be ‘X’. And your telling them, but then how they go about doing it, you kind of let them do it. With Merle, I’m more directly involved in that I’ll go into his operation and say, “Rather than running it with five people, I wanna run it with four people at this time frame.” So I’m actually giving specific instructions as to how I want to achieve certain goals, whereas in the other operations, I go to a manager and say, “You know you were budgeted ‘X’,” and so you need to reduce it.” I don’t tell them how to reduce it.

These cases demonstrate how job type can largely determine how much time a supervisor spends with their subordinate. Both Mike and Evan stated that their higher interaction with Michelle and Merle, respectively, was due to the position their
subordinates are in and their need to be more involved with the work they do. This is in
counter with other direct reports whose positions do not require them to communicate
with Mike and Evan as frequently.

Other findings on this theme also point to the possible association between the
amount of interaction between dyad members and the quality of their relationship.
Although data was not sufficient to undeniably confirm a relationship, initial findings
appeared to show that a greater amount of interaction leads to higher relationship quality.
Three cases are presented to illustrate this pattern.

The first case is of J.T. and Cameron, who began with a low quality work
relationship, had little interaction, and continued with negative work outcomes. The
second case is Wendy and Aran, who began with a low quality relationship, engaged in
frequent interaction, and developed a high quality relationship. The third case is Mike
and Michelle, who communicated frequently and maintained a positive relationship from
the beginning to the present.

In J.T. and Cameron’s case, a couple of hindrances are evident in their work
setting that prohibit interaction between them. J.T. reveals that staff usually do not work
on activities together. Since there are many tasks to do, they each should be working on
particular activities, which would tend to minimize interaction. In addition, due to a
discontent with Cameron’s work habits from the beginning, J.T. admits to purposely
scheduling their shifts separate from each other. Consequently, J.T. would only have to
work with her for “two hours in a day.”

D: How much contact do you have with Cameron...on a typical day?
J: Um...with this particular associate that I had problems supervising, I would
purposely, um, make the schedule so that I’m only working with her for like two
hours in a day. Cause I couldn’t stand her work habits.

D: And for those several hours, would you work kind of closely together?

J: Yeah. We all just work in one single office, so there’s not, like, space between
us. It’s not separated by cubicles...nothing.

D: Mmm. Do you guys...you and Cameron, get to work on stuff together...like
you both have to work on something together at the same time?

J: Mmm...that’s...I don’t think that’s ever really the case, unless, um, two people
are trying to work on a deposit together. So they’re, like, say, if they’re doing a
pull for the day, they went downstairs to pull money from the cashiers, one might
be plugging the cash, and the other might be plugging the checks. But for the
most part, there’s a lot to do in that office, so two people shouldn’t be working on
the same things together.

D: Oh...everyone kind of concentrates on their own part?

J: Yeah.

D: You ever take breaks together with her, or have lunch with her, or...

J: Um, sometimes I do, but for the most part, um, I think there should be
somebody in that office as much as possible, at least one person.

D: Oh, you kind of gotta separate the breaks and stuff?

J: So, yeah, like, um, if downstairs calls and we have to collect from our customer
that had a bounced check with us, its always nice to have at least one person in
that office to be ready for anybody on the floor if they need help with something.
Earlier quotes from J.T. showed how she disliked Cameron’s work from the start. The minimal interaction required of the job and J.T.’s avoidance of Cameron appeared to contribute to her difficulty in improving the relationship. J.T. also revealed that she was never able to restore their working relationship, which contributed to her resignation and her negative perception of supervisory positions.

However, the case of Wendy, a female German, and Aran, a male Thai, provides an instance of a difficult relationship that transformed to a positive one. Wendy’s position as a surgeon and Aran’s position as a medical resident necessitates a great deal of interaction between them. Wendy’s describes this below.

D: Okay. Okay, so how often do you see Aran?

W: Um, everyday.

D: Everyday?

W: I mean everyday that I’m on call, which is usually, 5 to 6 days...in that...in that area.

D: Oh, 5 to 6 days a week?

W: Mmhmm.

D: Okay, um, when you meet with Aran, or you have encounters, how long of a period do you get to spend with her?

W: During the whole call, because I work nights and so then when he’s on call with me, then we are the whole night working together.

D: Oh, ‘he’?

W: Yeah.

D: Okay.
W: But he’s on call every three or every four nights with me, so it may overlap or it may not.

D: Oh, okay.

W: Otherwise I see him in the morning and in the evening before they leave if they are not on call, or if he is not on call.

D: So you spend a lot of time with him, then, on the shift?

W: Mmhmm. So I make rounds with him and go over everything that happened during the day.

D: Okay.

W: And then we do some teaching based on clinical cases, and then, um, we do procedures as needed, and um, we check on new patients or patients whose status changed. Um, we follow up on any studies that are done, and discuss the result and how that changes the management

D: Um, so is it mostly in-person that you’re interacting with him? Do you folks do email kind of thing?

W: In person.

D: In person.

W: By phone.

D: Oh, okay.

W: I mean, you know, because he might not be ready when something occurs, and I have to run ahead, or the other way around. Sometimes we have to divide and conquer.

D: Oh, okay.
W: So, he’s doing, um, you know, some of the things he’s doing autonomously, and he just asks me about things when he has questions, and some things we have to do together.

Some of Wendy’s earlier excerpts reflect how she began developing a more successful relationship with Aran. Initially, however, she had a difficult time with him. In this passage, she reveals the negative opinion she had held toward him and how it changed for the better.

“And the first time he was there, I really didn’t like him, because I thought, ‘He’s very superficial, and, um, doesn’t pay attention. He really doesn’t care.’ Yeah? But now, he seems to me that really cares because he sees how it affects the patients. It’s not just that I drill him and he needs to obey orders. It’s because it’s a patient he cares for and that’s why it needs to be paid attention to and needs to be done in the right way. So I think his perspective changed and he has the right priorities now.”

Finally, Mike and Michelle’s case offers an example of a dyad with a pattern of high interaction, and which sustained a positive relationship throughout its existence.

With daily contact, except for when traveling or during certain times of year, Mike believes that, overall, he and Michelle share “a lot of communication.” He also gives an illustration of a project they are working on together.

D: Michelle. Uh, how much contact do you have with Michelle?

M: Contact? Probably daily.

D: Daily. Um, what kind of...is that, like face-to-face, mostly email, or...
M: I think it’s...mostly on the phone...phone and email I guess...um...face-to-face...ah...almost everyday. Because I travel, yeah, so I don’t always see her face-to-face. Um...a lot of communication, though.

D: Okay. Just estimate, like, how much time you would spend actually communicating with her during the day.

M: Oh...in total?

D: Yeah.

M: Maybe half an hour, hour, at the most. And it depends on time of year too, yeah, ‘cause her job is marketing, so, some times of the year it’s a lot and sometimes it’s none.

D: Oh, okay.

M: But right now about half an hour, maybe to an hour.

D: Do have stuff where you’re working together on something?

M: Projects?

D: Yeah, like, you’re actively doing something, like, face-to-face together, working on some project or planning or something?

M: We do, I guess, you know, I can bring up...we’re gonna open up the [removed name].

D: Oh, okay.

M: So, technically, I don’t have a general manager for that account, so it’s...I’m the client contact ‘cause we just started. So I’m working with her on...we’re gonna set up a retail store there. Um, and we’re working with...well I’m working with her directly and our client to set up this retail store...its gonna be like a 450
square foot store, that the client wants…um…local first, right? Buy Hawaii policy. So, I’m working with her to identify vendors, identify products, what is gonna be the strategy of the store…you know, that kind of stuff. Um…

D: So a lot of interaction, then, with her?

M: Oh yeah. Oh yeah. There’s two people that always gonna have interaction, right? The marketing manager for me, and the controller, because the controller wraps all the finances…the marketing manager is all the…I would say the soft things in the business?

Michelle also revealed similar perceptions of her and Mike’s frequent communication with each other. Below are two passages from Michelle’s interview. In these, she shows how her interaction is among the highest with Mike, and she even calls him outside of work hours while driving if they were not able to meet during the day.

D: …do you work with a lot of people…?

M: Yeah, well actually more on a day-to-day basis it’s…a lot of it is with Mike, um, Evan, and I guess the people in my office is in the main office with the…they service people at the window…

Providing more detail is the following excerpt.

D: Uh…how much contact do you have with Mike?

M: Um, everyday.

D: Like how much time would you say you spend every day?

M: Um, maybe like…a couple hours.

D: Okay. I think he was mentioning, um, a lot of face-to-face, email…

M: Yeah.
These results demonstrate how leaders may adjust the amount of interaction they engage in with their subordinate depending on the subordinate’s job position. Mike maintains substantial interaction with Michelle because of her position as the marketing manager, and Evan interacts frequently with Merle because of his position as an hourly supervisor versus a salaried manager. These leaders also reported spending less time with subordinates in other positions.

In addition, the data suggest a possible causal relation between the amount of interaction required for the type of work and dyadic relationship quality. In the case of J.T. and Cameron, in which interaction was not required and almost discouraged, J.T. was not able to improve an initially low quality work relationship. Wendy, however, was able to improve her relationship with Aran amid constant interaction that was necessary for the work. Mike and Michelle provided an example of a high quality relationship that continued from the start, and in which communication had always been frequent. Thus, it appears that required interaction on the job may have positive effects for the superior-subordinate relationship.

Regarding the applicability of the model for both culturally similar and dissimilar dyads, this aspect of the model also showed similar patterns for both types of dyads. As for individual demands, a heterogeneous dyad that demonstrated a high individual demand was evident in Fern’s relationship, while a similar dyad that demonstrated a low individual demand was seen in Ms. Aloha’s relationship. Although no examples were
available of a homogeneous dyad showing a high individual demand, an example of this type of dyad with a low individual demand was Martin and Kristen. As for job demands, a heterogeneous dyad that demonstrated a high job demand was represented in Wendy’s relationship, while a corresponding dyad that demonstrated a low job demand was revealed in J.T.’s relationship. Furthermore, an instance of a homogeneous dyad showing a high job demand was Mike and Michelle, while the same type of dyad displaying a low job demand was revealed in Martin and Kristen.

Overall, what was evident among these participants was that interaction among dyad members was influenced by two different sources. One source was the communication needs of individual members which place demands on the other member. These individual demands vary, creating relationships with similar or divergent demands for interaction between its members. These findings neither conclude that similar demands for interaction among dyad members lead to high quality relationships, nor that dissimilar demands for interaction lead to low quality relationships. There is not enough data at this point to infer such relationships. However, the results show an important pattern, that these differences or similarities can have an impact on perceptions and relationship quality. The second source is the communication requirements dictated by the work. Some types of work necessitate more frequent interaction than others, and supervisors may spend more time with subordinates in certain specific job roles. Additionally, the findings reveal a possible positive influence of work contexts that require frequent interaction. Even when relationship quality was initially inadequate, one supervisor in a high-interaction work environment was able to change her relationship for the better.
Past Experience

When asked about their perceptions on various topics, it became evident that supervisors and subordinates often associated them with past experiences. Especially when thinking about their dyadic counterpart, comparisons with previous individuals were often made, and participants revealed how those prior relationships influenced their behavior. Thus, prior dyadic experience was found to be an important aspect of relationship development, and is described below. In addition, when asked to elaborate on multicultural work environments, participants explained how they have learned a great deal through experiences in these settings and have become better able to deal with intercultural relationships. The effect of prior cultural experience is also detailed below.

Prior Dyadic Experience. A factor that was found to influence dyad members’ perceptions of each other was their experiences with previous supervisors or subordinates. When asked about their current relationships, some participants spontaneously related it to previous relationships they have had. To provide illustration, both Dexter and Michelle described previous experiences with their supervisors, and Lancer explained from a supervisor’s point of view that she hires individuals using a method that has worked with previous employees.

First, an example is presented from the interview with Dexter, a male Filipino, which shows how he associates positive and negative supervisor qualities with previous experience. He felt that his current relationship with his supervisor James, a male Japanese, was “real good” compared to a previous supervisor who he would become violent towards. He also referred to previous experiences when asked about qualities of a not-so-ideal supervisor. To clarify his other statements below, he mentions that one
positive quality of his supervisor, James, is his concern with safety, and that James would put himself in harm’s way before his employees.

DJ: What are the qualities of your ideal supervisor?

D: What I have now is real good. I’ve had far worse, where I’d become violent toward him. James has the “buck stops here” attitude, (in other words) if anyone died today it would be me.

DJ: What are the qualities of a not-so-ideal supervisor?

D: I had one supervisor who asked me to “rat out” everyone else. He was always on your back. He wanted me to steal from our own customers.

In Michelle’s case, she described why she was cautious toward her supervisor, Mike, in the beginning of their relationship. She attributed it to her experiences with a former supervisor who she described as a “tyrant.” She also goes on to mention the awfulness of that supervisor’s behavior and how it affected other coworkers similarly.

D: Oh...okay, how would you say your relationship developed with Mike, when you first met him ‘till...

M: Um, in the beginning I think I was more...like, I didn’t really say too much, because I didn’t know how he was, so I was more...I would talk to him but not...I didn’t share as much. You know, ‘cause I was...prior to him coming, I had a...like a boss that was like a tyrant...[laughs]

D: Oh.

M: Yeah. He was like...and he knows it, too. But he was a terror, you know, and anything that he would say, he would either want you [unintelligible] he would just fight you on it. You know, before, right? So, I think all...I can’t think for all
of us, but some of us were, like, oh, we don’t know how to approach, you know, with your own thoughts and views with Mike, because you don’t know how he’s gonna react, right?

D: Yeah.

M: So yeah, in the beginning, yeah, I didn’t really say too much. It was just, um, just basic things. But then after, like, three or four months I got to know him, it’s like real…extremely easy to talk to now. You don’t have to worry about…I mean he’ll just tell you it’s stupid. Or, you know, you don’t feel offended. That’s what it is. Yeah. Um…it’s just a different comfort level, yeah. It went from, I guess, cautious to comfortable.

Through Michelle’s responses, it is evident how much impact past experiences can have, as she brought up the topic several times. Below, she connects all the qualities of a “not-so-ideal” supervisor to this same person. Then, she contrasts it with Mike’s behaviors, reflecting a strong connection between past experience and current perceptions.

D: Okay. What are the qualities of a not so ideal supervisor?

M: Oh…let me just think back two years ago. [laughs] Um, lying…

D: Oh.

M: That’s what he did…um, I don’t know if strong-arm is the word to use anymore…but, he had strong-arm tactics…um, threatening…yeah. Not physical, but more like, “You know, you better do this or else…” kind of stuff.

D: Wow.

M: Yeah, he was weird.
D: What happened?

M: Huh?

D: He got fired or something?

M: He found another job. But um...

D: Oh, wow. Same company?

M: I think ‘cause, um...yeah, different company, but then, um, he just, he just...I think he just wanted more than what [removed company name] was gonna give him.

D: Oh.

M: Like, he wanted to be DM (District Manager), but there’s no way he could be DM. He couldn’t even take care of [removed place name]. Yeah.

D: Oh, wow. Okay, so threatening...is there others?...qualities?

M: He was unknowledgeable about the business.

D: Unknowledgeable?

M: Yeah, he couldn’t actually physically do the work. He had to be able to be hands on, I think.

D: Mmm.

M: Um, I guess that’s...I guess...what Mike is, I guess, different is, like, he’ll tell you what, what needs to be done, but if, you know, shit hits the fan, he’ll be able to jump in and do it.

D: Mmm.

M: The other guy, no.

D: ‘Cause he’s been...he’s had those experiences, yeah?
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M: Yeah. I mean, even, from unit level all the way to something like my job. You know what I mean? Like, being able to, you know, put together a strategic plan, and um, physically set up the computer, design a...design a poster, you know what I mean? Or a flyer. My boss couldn’t do that.

D: Oh.

M: Like, he couldn’t even check email.

D: Oh.

M: Yeah, yeah. So it was pretty bad. You know what I mean? So, yeah, a lot of it was political.

D: Oh.

M: [unintelligible].

D: Ah...

M: But yeah, so, I mean...Mike shows me stuff on Excel that I don’t...you know, that I never really knew before. Or like Adobe, or something...you know, programs, yeah?

From a supervisor’s perspective, Lancer also demonstrates how her past experience affected her expectations of her current employee, Fern. In the following excerpt, she disclosed how she had made contact with a potential employee and kept in touch, but did not hire that individual until later. Lancer believed that was a method of attracting a more committed employee. Since that worked out successfully, she believed that approach would work with Fern as well. So, Fern was “tucked away” until a position came up.

D: Okay, um, how in your recollection did your relationship progress with Fern?
L: You know, it’s interesting, cause I had actually wanted to hire her a while back, and she had…wasn’t able to come on board to [removed agency name] so we just, we just kind of tucked her away and said if an opportunity ever arose in the future, we would call her up, and there was a time where we were down outreach workers and we could hire her, and it was a perfect time for her. And so we were able to pick her up. And I think just being able to um, meet with her, and…in the past, and then meet with her now, and then bring her on board, that helped with building our relationship, because I already knew what her background was in. And, in fact there was another staff member, um, that we did the same thing, and the relationship, and their commitment to us is stronger. Um, they’re committed to staying with us, they’re committed to working with us, and they don’t take anything personally. And they just…they work really well.

This analysis attempted to reveal how dyad members’ perceptions and behaviors in their current relationships were highly influenced by prior dyadic experiences. These participants made many comparisons between their former and current leadership relationships and showed how their former relationships influenced their current ones. These cases also provided examples of how past experience can be a factor in both culturally homogeneous and heterogeneous dyads, with James’ relationship being a heterogeneous dyad and Mike’s relationship being a homogeneous dyad. What was not yet evident from this data was the extent that past relationships affect current perceptions and the role of positive versus negative experiences.

*Prior Cultural Experience.* When asked about their experiences in a multicultural work environment, participants expressed their belief that working with a diversity of
individuals helped to expand their capacities. They emphasized how they learned a great deal from interacting with people from different cultures. In addition, they described how the insight they acquired facilitated successful communication with other cultures. In effect, their prior cultural experiences promoted more success in subsequent relationships.

Presented first are several examples of how participants believed they learned from their multicultural experiences. They described these experiences as enriching, broadening, and helping with understanding differences between individuals. However, dealing with such diversity can also be challenging.

In this excerpt, it was evident that the difference among her coworkers was a significant aspect of how Fern thought about them. When asked what she thought of her coworkers, her first response was how different they were. She then explained that through dealing with such diversity, she came to “respect, understand, and learn from others.” However, she mentions that there will always be challenges associated with those differences, which makes every day interesting.

D: Okay, tell me about some of your experiences with your coworkers…like what do you think of them…you know, how do get along with them and stuff?
F: Mmhmm. Um, my coworkers…everybody is different here in every way—personality, nationality, background, uh, professionally, and work experience—we’re all different. So, it’s like having this big fruitbowl with numerous kinds of fruit in it, and everyone’s gotta fit into this bowl. And, I came in with a positive outlook to this company, knowing from the very beginning, I’m not Native Hawaiian, but I was willing to give it a try and to see what I could do for the
Native Hawaiians. Um, I’ve been born and raised here. I think the most interesting thing is working with people with different nationalities, different professions, different backgrounds, and different outlooks, and being able to respect, understand and to learn from others. I...think...I get along with everyone professionally quite well. But because we’re so different, we’ll always have differences.

D: Mmm.

F: But that’s part of...

D: Yeah.

F: ...that’s part of adults in a professional world.

D: Yeah.

F: Um, and I think that’s what makes the challenge everyday, is everybody being different, cause if we were all the same, then it would be boring.

In another part of the interview with Fern, she clarified how one transforms when dealing with racial or ethnic issues. She stated that it can be an issue in the beginning, but over time, one becomes better able to deal with those issues. Fern also seems to associate this change with a development of strength of character and groundedness.

D: Five, okay. Okay, do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

F: It can be. It can be. I think you need to just...um, as character, strengthen that, and put it behind you, or aside...you as an individual, how you view it...in the beginning, yes, it is an issue, but you learn how to deal with that. It’s you as an individual, how grounded you are.
J.T. expressed a similar opinion in that she felt “you can learn a lot from other people” through intercultural interactions. She also provides an interesting point of view, as she mentioned how she feels as though she is traveling when conversing with people of other cultures.

D: What do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

J: Intercultural? I think you can learn a lot from other people. Um, I especially love, like, other cultures’ foods and stuff, and I think that that’s a good way for other people to, uh, intermingle with just their food alone. But I love learning about other peoples’ cultures and stuff, cause it makes me, kind of like, feel like, oh, I’m traveling a little bit through them. When you talk… you know when you’re, like, talking to them and stuff?

Wendy also provided a valuable perspective, coming from a largely homogeneous organization and now working in a multicultural one. She was able to contrast the norms of interaction between Germany and Hawaii’s hospital settings and contemplate the uniqueness of Hawaii’s multicultural work setting. Based on her experiences, she felt that intercultural relationships enrich the workplace and help considerably, particularly in her role as a physician, in which it contributes to better patient care.

D: Um… what do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

W: Um… it’s special because it really enriches it. Um, in… in… I worked in Germany for a while also, and in Germany it’s much, much more homogenous. Um, you really have 80, 90 percent Germans that you work with… in the hospital setting, at least, where I was, yeah?
D: Mmmmm.

W: And, um, so the topics of conversation and of communication are focused on completely different issues, yeah? But here, with different cultures and religions you have different holidays, and you speak about different things and different perceptions on things. And it also helps very much, because where it affects the patient care, for example, death and dying patients and how the families deal with that... so much culture goes into that...culture and religion, and if you can understand that better, then you can help them better, communicate better. So, if I have a Filipino patient and...and Filipino nurses can explain to me what’s going on, you know? Or what...how usually Filipino families deal with, you know, a dying [indistinguishable] situation, it’s a lot different than if I don’t know anything about it.

Below, she also elucidates on how the lack of cultural knowledge can be problematic. Not knowing cultural norms, she felt, could lead to offending people and miscommunication.

D: Ah...Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

W: Yeah.

D: Yeah? How so?

W: You can offend people if you don’t know what’s important culturally for them.

These examples revealed how experiences with other cultures can help one’s personal development and help one learn more about personal differences, as well as avoid problems. In addition to learning more, cultural experiences also help in
communicating with dissimilar individuals. Similar to Fern’s view that one changes positively with cultural experience, other participants also expanded more on this subject.

Ms. Aloha, for instance, also believed that you learn more through intercultural relationships, but further articulated that it helps to have experiences with someone from a particular cultural background when you need to deal with other individuals from that background. She also thought that racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace, as she states below.

A: Um, I think you tend to learn more. You know, definitely you learn to appreciate other peoples’ culture, belief systems. I think it can help you, you know, in all aspects, but primarily on the job if you have to deal with someone in that culture and you’re not that familiar with it.

D: Do you think racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

A: I think so…

From previously cited and other statements, Wendy also indicated that cultural experience facilitates communication with other individuals. She provides an example from her experience of differences in perceptions of time for families in Hawaii and, consequently, how communication regarding time can be a barrier.

“And it also can impede communication a lot, yeah? The perception of time in Hawaiian families is completely different than our Western perception of things. So if I try to explain to them, ‘You know, he can die, and he can die any minute now,’ they still tell me, ‘Oh, the uncle is coming in from Samoa next Friday.’ And I said, ‘Yeah, that’s not gonna work. He’s gonna be dead before then.’ It’s a… it’s
something that continues to amaze me, because it’s a completely different perception of time. As if time bends to their rules, of their own perception, yeah?”

Next, Martin, a male Caucasian, elaborated on his various experiences on the U.S. Mainland as well as Pacific Islands. He acquired substantial long-term exposure to several different cultures and felt that it has helped him at work. In fact, he alludes to the fact that dealing with cultural differences in Hawaii was less extreme than what he previously went through. Below, in addition to his statements about how his prior experiences contributed to his later work, he shares his more refined understanding of cultural versus personality differences.

D: So you think those experiences helped in the workplace?

M: Oh yeah.

D: Yeah?

M: Well, it helped just understanding that people are very different.

D: Mmm.

M: And, you know, there’s a fine line between cultural differences and personality differences. I mean, I’m convinced that there’s...there’s as much variation in terms of beliefs and styles and behaviors within cultures as there is between cultures.

D: Mmhm.

M: It’s just that, you know, you tend to see a norm in the...in the middle of culture. So for example, um, in general, um, Japanese Americans tend to be quieter, less confrontational, less...more risk averse, than your average mouthy haole is.
D: Mmmmm.
M: Uh, and, uh, but you still have as much...there’s as much variation among...
D: Within...
M: [unintelligible] with Japanese ancestry as there is within them.
M: Yeah, yeah.

These examples reveal a couple of mechanisms through which cultural experience may affect superior-subordinate relationships. First, participants felt that exposure to other cultures is personally “enriching” and “broadening,” and one can learn a great deal, as well as gain a strengthening of character to deal with differences. Second, past cultural experience helps in communication with dissimilar cultures and helps to avoid offending others and miscommunication.

Benefits of prior cultural experience were not only described by participants who currently have a culturally dissimilar counterpart, but by participants, such as Martin, who currently have culturally similar counterparts. Martin revealed a wealth of previous experiences with other cultures and described how those incidents helped change his perspective. Thus, these cases support the applicability of this aspect of the model for both heterogeneous and homogeneous dyads for this sample.

Taken together, these findings on the theme of past experience indicate that development of a current relationship can be highly influenced by prior incidences. Specifically, former dyadic relationships and past cultural experiences contribute to how a supervisor or subordinate approaches a current relationship. It is conceivable that other
types of past experiences could affect the dyadic relationship; however, these areas appeared to be particularly salient for these multicultural dyads.

Relationship Building

Many of the managers who rated their relationship with their subordinate highly, also revealed that the process of developing relationships with their subordinates was of central concern and was something they attempted to engage in. They tried to allocate some one-on-one time with all of their subordinates and wanted to get to know them. However, for subordinates who were not open to spending extra time with their manager, these subordinates tended to report lower quality relationships.

Lancer described how she attempts to get to know her staff, including Fern:

“...well I work with a very dynamic group of people. They’re very...each person has their unique qualities about them. And one of the challenges that I face daily is how do you best approach certain people. So I have about three new staff members that I’ve never worked with before, and I’ve had to take some time to learn more about them and how to interact with them. And then I’ve had others who I’ve worked with on different projects in the past but I’ve brought them on board under me for specific projects. And so it’s easier to work with them because we kind of already have that relationship built. But with the newcomers it’s a little...you know...its time to get to know you, get to know one another and build that relationship.”

However, she admitted that she does not spend as much time with Fern outside of work as she does with other staff. In Fern’s interview it was discovered that, although her personal life sometimes infringes upon the work context, as discussed later, she tries to
keep work out of her personal time. This may be a reason Lancer reported not spending time with Fern. Below, Lancer shares additional information about how she tries to develop relationships with her staff, although not as much with Fern.

L: And then, like, most of the time, or sometimes, our staff is really good about, um, having lunches together. So we’ll have lunch in the back in the kitchen together, or have our breaks together. So, you know, I try to...I try to make the time to do that with every staff member at least once a month to, just you know, take that outside of work time, but still getting paid for it yeah? Lunches, and uh, breaks and stuff.

D: Okay. Do you do things with them, like, outside of work time?

L: Not particularly with Fern. Some of my other staff members I do, but not...not with her.

It was evident that Lancer places a high value on relationship building, as she brought the subject up many times during the interview. In this excerpt, it seems she is mindful of opportunities for building relationships with staff:

“Yeah, um, most of our staff who are...have about a month orientation, and the orientation is divided up to ten days of, like, in-services and then ten days of fieldwork. So that’s another time when I’m able to build relationships with staff, especially new staff, because most of those ten days of in-services are spent with me going over program structure, agency structure, the history of the agency, as well as all of our policies that pertain to program stuff, so...yeah.”

Even though Lancer did not have as much bonding time with Fern, she still rated their relationship highly, giving their relationship a 9 out of 10 and scoring 4.00 (on a
scale of 1 to 5) on the LMX-7 scale. Interestingly, Fern, who did not seem to value spending extra time on relationship building, rated their relationship slightly lower with a 5 out of 10 and an LMX score of 3.43.

Mike also believes it is necessary to develop relationships with his subordinates. He and his subordinate, Michelle, rated their relationship extremely highly, with Mike scoring 4.57 and Michelle scoring 5.00 on the LMX-7 scale. Early on in his interview he mentions that, ultimately, he believes his job is about “building a team.” While his position requires him to interact highly with a few people, including Michelle, he attempts to spend time with all of his direct reports. Being a golfing enthusiast, he also sometimes takes his subordinates to the driving range, especially when they appear to be “stressed out.”

M: ...but all my managers, or the managers that I can, you know, I’ll take them to lunch once in a while. Um, now that it’s summertime, if we have some free time, like, I’ll take them down to the driving range. The ones who golf, you know.

D: Yeah.

M: Um, but totally hang out on a social level, no.

D: Okay.

M: If that makes any sense.

D: Yeah.

M: But like, you know, part of that is team-building.

D: Yeah.

M: And then part of it is, when I see everybody getting all kind of stressed out, whatever, it’s a relaxed kind of thing.
For those that do not golf, he mentioned that he tries to think of other opportunities for them to get involved in extra-curricular activities, such as encouraging them to attend company activities outside of the normal work schedule. He seems conscious of ensuring that everyone is treated equally.

M: Um, in terms of, you know, like, taking people to lunch and stuff like that? Hey, whoever's around that wants to go, can go. Whether you can or not, that's another story, but, um, the offer's always there.

D: Okay.

M: In terms of things like we mentioned, the driving range, like that? Hell, I tell all my managers, just gotta have the time [unintelligible] wanna go. You know, um, so I try to be, well, let's put it this way, to the ones who golf, um, I try to be fair. Even with, let's say, like we sponsor a lot of golf tournaments. Um, I don't always take the same people. I...sometimes it's a business decision...it's a strategic thing. Um, and other times it's, who hasn't gone, or I haven't taken care of before, I wanna make sure I take care of. So, for example, [removed name] has a golf tournament. I'll take our controller, [removed name], because the other ones that we played last year, he didn't...he couldn't go. This year he can, so, um, I try to offer it to everybody.

D: Okay, give opportunities for everybody.

M: Oh yeah. Oh yeah. One's not more special than the other. You know, at the end of the day, it's everybody. Everybody gotta pull their same weight, or else, the ship doesn't run right?

D: Yeah. So people that don't golf, do you do other things with them?
M: I try, um, it depends what their interests are, yeah?

D: Yeah.

M: So, some of them have no interest in doing anything outside of work, so if that’s the case then, I spend time with them at work to see...we do, um, some community events that I encourage everybody to be a part of. Like, our big thing is [removed name]. So, we go out on the side of the road, you know, collect with the fish nets.

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: Right? Our company...I think this year I think we had like 30 or 40 people that went out. So I encourage everybody to get involved...um...if they can.

The following statement by Mike reveals his philosophy behind his efforts to build relationships. He believes that relationships involve assisting others with the expectation that they will provide help in return, reflecting a give-and-take process. Mike seems to contribute positive resources to his relationships, such as coaching others or helping them to relieve their stress, with the expectation that the other members will respond when needed. Interestingly, he also mentions how relationships may be more important for their business in Hawaii, which may be due to the large size and visibility of their business and the need to keep positive relationships with their stakeholders.

M: ...relationships, I think, mean more today, in our business in Hawaii, only because of the nature of our business.

D: Yeah.

M: You know? But, relationships are important no matter what, because there’s always a time and a need. Everybody has a time and a need, and you wanna make
sure you can count on people, or they’re gonna help you out. The only way you
get that, right, is relationships.

In a very different work setting, a physician, Wendy, described her relationship
with one of the residents in training, Aran. Wendy described herself as Caucasian, and
recently moved from Germany, while Aran was a Thai male. She explained how she
often does not get close to her subordinates, but she became heavily invested in Aran’s
progress, because of the potential she saw in him. Thus, she spent more time in
developing the relationship and teaching him about the work.

W: Yes [laughs]. Because I… I can see his potential, yeah? And that’s always
what really interests me, when… when people have this great potential but they
have a lot of trouble to… to realize it.

D: Mmm.

W: That’s when I… I get more personally involved for some reason, and I don’t
know why. I think he can be really good. Yeah. Be a really good physician if he
sticks with it. I also think he still has to find out what he really wants, and I’m just
trying to help him there, yeah, by showing him the aspects that I can show him, so
that he can make a… you know, what do you call it… informed decision.

D: Yeah. Okay. Do you feel like you have to act differently towards him than any
of the other students?

W: I have to calm down more. [laughs] I have to um… I have to tell myself,
‘Yeah, okay, wait… just.’

D: Um…
W: And I have to also, I have to uh...um, really do more criticism. I mean, constructive criticism, but sometimes in the beginning, though, I really scolded him, and I thought...I told him, ‘You know, I really didn’t think that I need to say that. You know, you are at this level now, and this is the kind of things that are very basic.’ You know, go over things with him like that. But, I mean, I also tell him, you know, how it feels for me when...when he does something that I really think is an oversight or is really bad. Um, I tell him that I feel disappointed, because I didn’t expect that from him. So, I mean, I think it’s important that...that one shows it’s a personal thing always, too, yeah? It’s not just a role-type thing between a teacher and student.

While Wendy’s rating of LMX was not extremely high at 3.86, on a scale of 1 to 10, she rated her relationship with Aran between a 7 and 8. She also qualified that by saying a score of 10 would only be reserved for a “lover,” making a score of 7 or 8 relatively high. Not included here are the dramatic changes that Wendy described in Aran’s performance and attitude. Thus, Wendy also appeared to take a relationship-based approach with Aran, which has resulted in positive outcomes for both of them.

In sum, these leaders who created the opportunities for relationship building with their members were more able to develop the high quality relationships evident in these multicultural dyads. The examples provided also support a broader applicability of this aspect of the model, since both culturally heterogeneous (Lancer and Wendy) and homogeneous dyads (Mike) described similar processes of relationship building. However, it should also be recognized that relationship building does have its limits, as
described by one supervisor who developed a relationship with her employee that she considered too friendly. These issues were explored in other sections.

*Incremental and reciprocal influence.*

Highly-rated relationships also displayed processes in which dyad members influenced each other in two different ways. The first, incremental influence, is accomplished through making positive investments into the relationship. This could be through such behaviors as offering their counterpart opportunities or offering help with personal tasks. When positive investments such as these are reciprocated by the other and outnumber the negative investments, it contributes to trust and the strengthening of the relationship. This process is incremental, as it develops slowly from an accumulation of positive investments by both parties. Over time, another type of influence process emerges, reciprocal influence, in which both leader and member are able to influence the behavior of each other, rather than the leader solely influencing the member. This is evident when a subordinate makes suggestions to the supervisor, and the supervisor takes into consideration and implements those suggestions. This process is reciprocal, or as one participant put it, “a two-way street.”

An example of the incremental influence process was Miss Aloha’s situation with her supervisor. Miss Aloha explained that she knew her supervisor before her current position and felt that their support of each other has helped their relationship grow over the years. To provide some background for the following passage, she related how her supervisor provided her with an opportunity a long time ago and because she was successful with it, it was a positive outcome for both of them. As a result, her supervisor could trust her abilities, and they both developed respect for each other.
D: Just an acquaintance. Okay, how would you say your relationship has or hasn’t developed through that whole...

A: Well, um, it was one of...I guess for the fact that she, whatever she saw in me to allow me to go to that training, you know, I have a sense of respect for her.

Um, and I think that continues. So there’s respect and loyalty. You know, kind of like, well you helped me, you know, so I want to make sure that I’m, you know, looking good for you, kind of a thing. You know, local kine stuff, yeah?

Mike’s description above also reveals the process of incremental influence. His point was basically that everyone needs each other at times, so by helping others as much as possible, one is more able to “count on people” to provide help in return. As he mentions, that is part of the relationship building process. In another passage, he reveals his desire that he and Michelle can “help each other out” on a professional as well as a personal level and alludes to a recent time when Michelle helped to organize a baby shower for Mike’s girlfriend.

“Positive things about the relationship...I think, uh, we developed a trust, where...we can share ideas or comments sometimes or whatever, without fear of it leaving the room. Um...for me, a big positive is because I have that trust, and for work, and stuff like that, I know things will get done. Um, other positives of the relationship I think is that...hopedly she feels the same that it’s reciprocal, where we can help each other out, whether it be personal and/or professional. Uh, and hopefully it grows into something more, in terms of...I think because we spend so much time at work, you need to have good relationships at work...whatever that means to you, yeah? So for me it was nice to see, like,
[removed name], pregnant, whatever, she took the time to throw [removed name] a baby shower. So that’s above and beyond, right? It has nothing to do with work or whatever. So I think in that sense, that’s huge.”

Ultimately, that mutual regard can foster an openness of both parties to be influenced by each other, also known as “reciprocal influence.” While usually it is primarily the leader who persuades the member, in a high quality relationship, the member also persuades the leader. This is evident in Al’s interactions with his supervisor, James, both Asian males (although James identified more as Japanese).

D: What would you say are some negative things about your relationship with James?

A: Um...I don’t know if I...yeah, I don’t know if I have any. Uh, since I’ve been here, I don’t think I’ve...I don’t think I’ve had a disagreement with him. I guess there are times where we’d do something and then I thought, “Oh maybe what if we did it this way?” Then if it works better than [indistinguishable]...um, [indistinguishable] “No, no, no, we gotta do it this way.” “All right.” So I don’t think we’ve had any type of disagreements.

D: Did you guys know each other for 14 years?

A: No, uh, we’ve been, uh...only since I’ve been working here in this department. And then, for say, a year before he was deployed. So, so, maybe out of that three years, maybe two years I’ve known him.

D: Oh. Um, how would you say your relationship with him developed over the last two years? How was it like in the beginning, how did it change?
A: Um, I guess in the beginning, it’s always going to be like a ‘feeling out’ process – see how he works, and how he wants the job to be done. And then just, uh…maybe…cause I was a new guy, he’s telling us how jobs was supposed to be done, do it that way, and then, through the process, if I see something, that maybe if we did it this way, and he was open to it, so some things that we did before, we’re doing it differently now, but its better. And if I was doing something, and he thought, “Oh, you know what? Maybe you should do it this way,” and then I tried it, and then, oh yeah, it’s actually easier for me. So, we always kind of watch how each other works, and he has a few pointers and I have a few pointers, and we just kind of bring it up, and both of us are open to change, in the end it works out all right.

D: What would you say are some of the reasons for the positive aspects of your relationship?

A: Uh, I think just willing to work together…keeping an open mind.

In these multicultural, high LMX dyads, it was evident that both incremental and reciprocal influence processes took place. Participants described how their relationship developed incrementally through offers of help or other positive contributions to the relationship. The ability of both parties to influence each other reciprocally was also evident in the more long-term high quality relationships. Furthermore, these examples reveal how heterogeneous dyads such as Ms. Aloha’s relationship as well as homogeneous dyads like Mike’s relationship reflect similar patterns of incremental and reciprocal influence.
In-groups and out-groups.

Through these interviews, it was clear that leaders do not share the same quality of relationships with all of their members. There are one or a few members that the leader feels closer to and feels is more capable than the others. Thus, they tend to spend more time with those members and invest more in their careers. These differentiated relationships have been termed “in-groups” and “out-groups” in the literature, and the same characteristics of leadership relationships were evident in this multicultural sample.

Lancer revealed that she sometimes gets together with some of her staff outside of work, although not with all of them. Whatever goes on during the off-hours usually does not get discussed in their office, reflecting the mutual trust and exclusivity that those select members share with Lancer.

D: Um…what are some things that you do with all of your staff?

L: Hmm…other than eat…we eat well together…[laughs]…we do do that at least once a month. Um…as a whole we do that. Yeah.

D: What are some things you only do with certain people?

L: Um, some people, like will come over for, um, weekend get-togethers, or I’ll go out with some staff on the weekend, but not with everybody.

D: Okay.

L: Yeah.

D: Do you feel like you need to act differently towards every person?

L: No, I don’t think I have to…uh…I think it’s, uh, I think I react or interact with people the way who I am as a person, and I don’t think it, uh, that it needs to be different with each person. Um, although when you’re building a relationship, you
just need to kind of figure the person out, but still stay within your boundaries. So like, if we interact on the weekends, we know the weekend stuff is weekend stuff, it’s personal time. Personal time is not company time. But, when you’re coming to work, we know that, you know, even though we just spent the weekend together, we know that there’s a line, and yeah we can talk about it, but don’t, you know, whatever was discussed over the weekend doesn’t really get discussed in the office...at least openly in the office. It might be discussed behind closed doors and stuff, but yeah...

In Wendy’s previous quote, she related how she spends more time with certain people like Aran. Her selectiveness depends on the potential she sees in the individual as well as their desire to learn, which she determines during their initial interactions that often focus on their expectations of each other. Below, she provides more explanation:

W: And some people, it’s not...it doesn’t really disappoint me, because I know they’re not interested, and they...they won’t deal with that anymore after they’re out of this rotation, yeah? They’re never going to be in this situation. And then it doesn’t disappoint me, or it doesn’t make me sad, yeah? Because I know that’s what...they’re not interested. They’re gonna do something completely different, so they just need to get through this. That’s all right, yeah?

D: Yeah.

W: But in him, I expect more, so I’m disappointed more...if...if he doesn’t do what I expect.

D: So for some people, um, you don’t invest as much into them because...
W: Because they make it very clear that they just really want to get through the basics, and be able to handle things, and...and not really, um, you know, be...be extensively involved in details...management person...or also on, you know, the questions of what we know...uh, science –wise, yeah? What’s the evidence? What’s...what’s just assumption?

D: Mmm.

W: So with...with, uh, some people, I really discuss the matter in detail, and with others I don’t, because they are really not interested.

D: Mmm.

W: It usually becomes clear up...right up front. So, uh, or I ask them and then, you know, we find a level of where everyone is comfortable, because, you know, I mean, there is no point in wasting time.

Similarly, James and Al have a relationship that appears closer than the other two dyads in their workgroup, while his relationship with Dexter seems the most distant. Dexter does not spend as much time with James as the others do outside of work. James’ tone also was less enthusiastic when talking about Dexter:

D: So you guys must spend a lot of time together, yeah? On each shift?

J: Oh yeah. We’re with each other the whole shift, every day. We even have breakfast after work.

D: Everybody?

J: Yeah, everybody except Dexter. [unintelligible] Yeah, we went surfing together after work.

D: So everybody surfs?
J: Except Dexter.

D: Why, he has family or something?

J: Huh?

D: He has family or something? He gotta go home?

J: I don’t know. He’s just a homebody I guess.

Greater enthusiasm was evident in James’ voice when asked about Al. He mentioned how Al is a great worker and catches on to things. Also, Al usually assumes the supervisor role when James is absent. Similarly, Al believes he holds a higher position than the others in the group, but attributes his status more to his seniority in the company. Overall, however, Al appears to hold the in-group status in the work group.

D: How would you say, from your perception, your relationship with James compares with the other guys’ relationship with him?

A: Um...well just amongst our crew here...with James, I’ll give him more respect because he has been here (for a long time). With the other guys, I’ve been working here longer, so I’m like more of a...not...I wouldn’t say like a James kind of thing, but I’ll be like, more like how James is to me, I’ll be to them, where I’ll be explaining how to do things. So it’s kind of like, um, with James, its like I’ll be listening to what he says, and these guys I hope they’ll be listening to what I say.

D: Are there things that you noticed that he does only with certain people, or some things he does with all people?

A: Yeah, I think, um, because he and I have, uh, the same amount of seniority, sometimes he’ll be harder on less senior guys. [indistinguishable] He’ll just be a
It's not a personal thing. It can be taken badly, it just
that he wants to see them perform better or work safer, or...

The in-group-out-group distinction was a pattern that was clearly discernible in
these multicultural work settings. Members of the in-groups were treated differently, such
as having more attention from the leader (including time outside of work), having more
responsibilities, and having their leader invest more in their careers. In this sample, out-
group members either did not seem to be aware of differential treatment among
leadership dyads, or they did not mention it. However, in-group members were cognizant
of the fact that their relationship to their leader was closer than their peers.

Also, in-groups consisted of both heterogeneous and homogeneous dyads.

Wendy’s relationship was an example of a heterogeneous dyad with an in-group
relationship, and Mike’s homogenous dyad also reflected an in-group relationship. No
pattern was found of culturally dissimilar subordinates tending to be out-group members.
Aran, the Thai subordinate, was part of Wendy’s trusted cadre and who she devoted a lot
of resources to. At the same time, the culturally dissimilar Fern was not part of Lancer’s
in-group. Therefore, this element of the model also appears to be relevant for
multicultural workplaces with relationships of various types, including heterogeneous and
homogeneous dyads.

Integration of the Model

To summarize, the total themes uncovered fit together into a model which can
serve as a preliminary model of multicultural leadership relationships (Figure 8). It is a
model that is expected to apply to leadership dyads of diverse compositions, since it was
built on common themes from a sample with heterogeneous participants. Also, the
connections between the elements of the model were supported by participants’ statements reviewed earlier as well as by reasoning (for example, past experiences are a logical antecedent to the current relationship). Although these key themes were discovered, it is possible that other important aspects of multicultural leadership relationships exist which were not found in this study.

In review, two antecedents were found that influence relationship building among dyads: demands for interaction and past experience. Demands for interaction included individual demands, such as a person’s level of need for communication, and job demands, including job positions that require more or less interaction with the superior. Past experiences that were found to affect the relationship included prior dyadic experiences and prior cultural experiences. The main process of relationship building undoubtedly includes many processes, but two significant sets were found in this research. The first is the management of the boundary between personal and work exchange, owing to differences in individuals’ perceptions of how much personal exchange should occur at work. The second set of relationship building processes identified was incremental and reciprocal influence, or the mutual and gradual “give-and-take” activities of both superior and subordinate. The level of success of these processes leads to differentiation of subordinates by the leader into in-groups and out-groups, with in-groups representing higher quality relationships and more positive outcomes.
Figure 8. Preliminary Model of Multicultural Leadership Relationships.
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Other Cultural Implications for Relationship Development

In addition to implications of prior cultural experience for superior-subordinate relationships as specified in the model, this section expands on another cultural aspect that may or may not be unique to Hawaii’s multicultural population. For this reason, it was not included in the model for its possible limited generalizability to other multicultural populations. Specifically, feedback from these participants suggested that while ethnocultural differences may impact the relationship, a greater factor may be cultural differences between locals and non-locals.

Only a few participants expanded on their perception of how ethnocultural similarities or differences can affect the leadership relationship. A larger proportion of participants brought up issues related to dissimilarities between local and non-local culture. The belief that local and non-local disparities were more influential than ethnocultural disparities was also expressed.

In addition, quantitative analyses were also conducted using data from the questionnaire to supplement interview findings. These analyses attempted to explore correlations between cultural values and supervisor-subordinate relationship quality. However, no significant findings were revealed in this area, which is described in Appendix H.

Ethnocultural Differences

Ethnocultural related issues were examined using several methods. The ethnicity that participants identified with most highly was assessed through both the interview and questionnaire. Superiors and subordinates were also asked during the interview whether
they thought anything was special about intercultural relationships in the workplace and whether they thought racial or ethnic issues are sensitive.

Based on the data gathered, no identifiable general patterns emerged related solely to ethnocultural differences in the participants’ relationship development. That is, both ethnically similar and ethnically dissimilar dyads experienced high quality exchanges. However, ethnocultural differences did appear to play some role, as evident in conversations with a few participants.

J.T., an Okinawan female, described how ethnocultural differences affected her relationship with her subordinate, Cameron, a Mexican female. In the first excerpt, she explains how they are “very different” ethnically, and provides an example of how Cameron deals with family issues, which J.T. believed to be a culturally-based difference.

“I think ethnically, we’re like, um... I think we’re very different because she’s very, um... and I don’t know if this is very common in a lot of Mexican households, but she’s very united with her family, and is very concerned about her family, and, um, misses them a lot, that she made a sacrifice to come here because her husband wants to be in Hawaii. Which doesn’t mean that she doesn’t care about her family, but when she got married, you know, it’s gonna... she’s gonna lead a whole different life now, you know?”

In another part of her interview, J.T. admitted that she prejudged Cameron because of the language barrier, believing she was less intelligent because of it. In other parts of the interview, she also described how those first impressions of Cameron’s work habits continued to have a negative impact on their work relationship until J.T. moved to another department.
D: Mmm. Do you think that cultural part plays a role in your relationship with Cameron?

J: I think I prejudged her too soon, before I... because I... I... because her English wasn’t very good, I thought, well, she’s stupid, and that’s not... that’s not a good way to look at it. Just because she doesn’t speak English very well, doesn’t mean that she’s, you know, not up to par having a conversation with you. She just can’t explain things in the same way, you know? I think she’s a smart girl, but I think the English was the barrier.

An example of how similarities can facilitate relationship development was provided by Michelle. Both she and her supervisor, Mike, identified as Japanese. Below, she expresses her belief that having a similar cultural background as another individual makes it easier to work with them. She also felt that having different cultural backgrounds can lead to miscommunication.

“Yeah, sometimes if you have similar cultural backgrounds it’s easier to work with the person, I think, um, because sometimes your mindset is probably similar. Um, if you have different cultural backgrounds, I guess the ways of dealing with people, personally, some may think that they’re too rough, or not [unintelligible] from Hawaii so to speak, right?”

Thus, ethnocultural similarity and dissimilarity does appear to contribute to relationship development. However, this was not as significant a factor as local versus non-local cultural differences for most participants. These findings are described next.
Local versus Non-local Cultural Differences

Many of the participants when asked about cultural differences perceived many culturally-related problems as deriving from differences between local and non-local culture. These distinctions are commonly referred to as “local” and “haole,” respectively (haole being the Hawaiian word for “foreigner”). These differences were especially noticed by those who have worked in both local and non-local settings.

Evan had worked both in Hawaii and the U.S. Mainland for many years, and thus was able to provide insight regarding those differences. Although in his last statement of this excerpt he stated how ethnic differences have some significance, he attributes most of the disparities to local versus mainland methods. Evan recounts his experiences regarding how management styles differ, which he thinks could be due to the distance between Hawaii and the U.S. Mainland.

D: Do you think there’s anything special about racial or ethnic differences in the workplace? Differences or similarities?...Does that play a role at all you think?

E: There’s differences in that, um...see, I think you need to understand that there’s, there’s like, yeah, obviously if you say “What race?” you would check off, you would say “Asian.” Characteristics, of you as a person, I think, um, there is some dissimilarities in that, um, Mike and I, uh, have spent years on the mainland, working for, you know, with Hispanics, African Americans, and of course, a lot of Caucasians. And...and so, I think, uh, when you...like I was gone for 25 years, and then coming back, um, you know, I think, to some extent, um, the local guys here still view me as an outsider. I’m not familiar with a lot of the things...or recent things that have happened here in Hawaii.
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D: So more like a mainland-local difference...

E: Yes.

D: ...versus, like...

E: Yes. ‘Cause there’s...there’s very different ways that you manage, um, people. I think, um, priorities seem to be different. And I think a lot of it is, um...I think proximity to people that manage you. Like, out here, we’re kind of out here on our own. Uh, on the mainland, a lot of those units, you have people from corporate stopping in all the time, and seeing what you’re doing. So I think you have more of a tendency to, um...need to follow the procedures as outlined by the company. And then the other thing, too, is that out here in Hawaii, because ethnically it’s so different, um, the way they do business out here, you know, I think there’s something to be said for that also.

Also, Evan further elaborated on the management differences between local and U.S. Mainland managers. He believed that the basic message that both local and U.S. Mainland managers attempted to get across was similar; however, it was the delivery of the message that was different. That difference in communication style was problematic and would lead to clashes between U.S. Mainland managers and local workers. Another source of difficulties that Evan perceived was that local workers often do not think “out-of-the-box,” and do not want to learn other methods such as those on the U.S. Mainland.

Michelle also believed the local versus non-local difference was important. Below, she describes how issues are often attributed to the fact that an individual comes from the U.S. Mainland. In her quote, “Oh yeah, they come from the mainland,” what is
not evident, but very telling, is the sarcastic tone with which it is stated, reflecting the attitude that many locals have toward non-locals.

M: But, um, you know how sometimes you have, like, um, people from the mainland, right, and you have local people, right, and sometimes, a lot of times you hear, like, “Oh yeah, they come from the mainland,” you know, kind of thing.

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: Yeah, so that kind of thing, sometimes affect it. I would hear it before, not so much now, but, um, the past year, I think. Well, before... before Mike came, I think, you would hear more of it.

D: Oh, okay.

M: Yeah. Like, “Oh, ’cause they haole, that’s why.” You know?

James was also asked what he thought was special about intercultural relationships in the workplace. Similarly, his first perception of cultural differences consisted largely of disparities between local and haole values. According to James, haoles can be less honest in their quest for success, while locals are more willing to accept their limitations.

J: Uh... I think culturally, we have different values. Whereas, you know, to me, haoles... Haoles, they just want to, they’re willing to, I don’t know, I hate to say this, but they’re willing to B.S. their way to the top. And uh, whereas, to me, locals... locals, they know their limits. They got a few exceptions. But most locals, they only willing to proceed to their limit, and they won’t go past it. I don’t know if I’m making sense.
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Another example of the importance of local versus non-local differences among these individuals was provided by Mike. Here he offers an example of how meanings of words can be interpreted differently with negative consequences. Specifically, Mike describes his experience of how the value of “political correctness” in language can be different between Hawaii and the U.S. Mainland.

D: Yeah, yeah. Okay. Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues can be sensitive in the workplace?

M: Oh, definitely…definitely.

D: Mmm…is there any examples that you can think of?

M: Well, I can give you the opposite example when I went up to the mainland.

D: Okay.

M: ‘Cause I think that’s a better example. In Hawaii, people are a little bit more lenient, because we use a lot of slangs, when we don’t understand, we usually just turn away, we don’t care. Um, I can tell you that some of the slangs that I use here were not acceptable in the mainland.

D: Okay.

M: A good example is, I was in a meeting with a couple ladies, going over a catering event, and just by nature, um, I would use the term “you guys.”

D: Oh yeah.

M: Right? Like “a bunch of you,” “you guys.” I used it and the lady got pissed.

D: Oh.
M: She stopped the conversation and said, “I’m not a guy. You can address me by…” whatever, whatever, whatever. Um, and that’s like the opposite effect, right?

D: Yeah.

M: She wasn’t open, and I wasn’t politically correct, don’t get me wrong, I wasn’t. But because I didn’t know any better, that’s just the way I was.

D: That just comes from, like, a Hawaii cultural thing…

M: But it’s not accepting, right? In a workplace, up there, where everything needs to be, well, especially San Francisco, it’s so politically correct, right?

D: Yeah.

M: Um, so the issues are there. Um, we don’t want them to be there, we try to keep those things out of the workplace, but the issues are there, regardless of who you are, or whatever. And it depends what lens you’re seeing it through. Definitely there is.

D: More on the mainland than Hawaii?

M: Yeah, but Hawaii is a little different, right? It depends on your sensitivity to things. Depending if you know. We call everybody haole. Why is that? You know, it can have a negative connotation depending on how you use the word. Um, we use non-politically correct terms, so it depends who your audience is, whether it’s bad or good.

D: Mmm.

M: If a mainland HR person was here, I think they would go crazy, right? But if it was a local HR person, certain things would be okay.
D: Mmm.

M: Um, in the mainland standards, none of what we say would be okay. Um, so, you know, that’s the interesting part about the marketplace we...we work in.

D: Yeah, yeah

M: You know, um, we’re a little bit laxed. We don’t have structure like the mainland has structure.

In another of Mike’s responses, he stated that local culture “overrides a lot of different things.” He dissects these issues even further and seems to conclude that individuals from the U.S. Mainland tend to use “cultural lenses” more than locals, but that locals in Hawaii tend to be more norm-driven and less accepting of unique behaviors.

M: Um, in Hawaii...I think it depends on sensitivities, but in Hawaii, I say it probably plays a small role. Um...now, it should not, right? An employee or whatever, it shouldn’t. But the reason why I say it plays a small role is because depending on personalities and where they come from, their belief systems are different, so I don’t wanna say people get, um, discriminated, because I don’t think that’s true. But I think that you look at certain cultures a different way based on those beliefs. So you see them through cultural lenses, right? In the mainland that happens, too. In fact, in the mainland it probably happens a lot more in that sense. But, I find Hawaii to be probably more prejudicial in that sense than anywhere else, because there’s a norm here. And the norm is “the Hawaii way” or “the Hawaiian way” or “the local way.” Whereas in the mainland, everybody comes from all over the different places. So, that is pure cultural in a sense that I
don’t understand. But in Hawaii, if you don’t act or do it in a certain way, then, yeah, people look at you funny. So I think...

D: So, kind of like, local culture...

M: It overrides a lot of different things. It’s hard for people to fit in. Like if we were in California today, I don’t care if you’re from Hawaii, New Jersey, New York...you do your job, you do your job well, you’re good. In Hawaii, there’s a stigmatism attached to your...the way you look, the way you talk. Because, we’re...we’re ingrained in that sense.

D: Yeah.

M: So ethnic makeup makes a little difference, I think. Or the lack of understanding the ethnicity sometimes, maybe.

Through J.T.’s account, it is apparent that “Whites,” especially from the U.S. Mainland have different attitudes that are difficult for local people to accept. She seems to believe this to be true for Hawaii in general as well as at her workplace. Interestingly, she also mentions a seeming cultural clash with Korean business owners in the area.

D: Um...okay, almost pau with this part. Do you think racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

J: Racial or ethnic issues? Sensitive in the workplace?

D: Yes.

J: Um...probably...racial, ethnic issues...um, in Hawaii, I think a lot of people just don’t like White people.

D: Mmm.
J: Um, sad to say, but a lot of our managers come from the mainland, so...I mean I don’t even have to explain it, you know what I mean? White people just act so, like, self-righteous, and that’s just annoying with Hawaii people, cause, they’re not, you know, they’re not used to that, cause we don’t, we’re not part of the mainland, so attitudes are different, yeah?

D: Mmm.

J: But I would say, probably, amongst the associates, yeah, just the White folks. And then they don’t like our Korean customers, cause you know, like, we’re right in K-town, right? Over there, all the “buy-me-drinkie” bars? Oh, they’re so demanding those Korean business owners, but not like work-wise.

From this evidence, it has been shown that ethnocultural differences can have an impact on the supervisor-subordinate relationship. However, a factor that was brought up more often and perceived to have a considerable influence is local versus non-local dissimilarity. The category of non-local was most often labeled as White, haole, or “from the U.S. mainland.” A majority of participants discussed cultural issues between locals and non-locals and some even suggested that it may have more of an impact than differences in ethnicity. Some of the differences given include locals being more norm-driven and having different communication styles than non-locals. Lastly, it should be noted that there was no racism evident within the dyads, and any racial comments and experiences were described about other individuals or experiences.

Additional Qualitative Analyses

Additional analyses were undertaken to examine the possible influence of gender, including whether cultural differences between men and women impact the leadership...
relationship. Gender culture’s possible interaction with superior and subordinate roles were also explored.

Very little indication was given in interviews of any perceived influence of gender in the development of relationships between superiors and subordinates. When asked about whether they felt gender issues were sensitive in the workplace, most participants replied that they did not. However, a few participants mentioned particular issues that they noticed.

Dexter, a male Filipino, responded to this question as follows:

“Yeah, absolutely. Especially this company. Even at [removed company name of former employer], there was the gender thing. I supervised men and women, and there is the issue of harassment, which could be anything. A lot of it has to do with the Filipino culture, because Filipinos touch each other a lot.”

Here he provided an indication of how cultural values and practices can affect how gender and harassment issues play out in the workplace. A similar comment was also given by Carl, who has employees in the Philippines. He believed gender was a salient issue in the Filipino culture but not in the workplace, although he wasn’t able to elucidate more.

Also, Michelle’s first response to the question was, “I don’t think so.” However, she immediately noticed that she was the only female manager at her site and that there was only three others in her company statewide. She also conveyed much surprise as she contemplated her discovery.

Although not in response to this question, another telling incident related to gender was relayed by a different participant. In this instance, the beginnings of a
romantic relationship was described outside of the interview—a situation between a male supervisor, Carl, and his female subordinate (Mary), who was not the main subject in his interview. After the interview, Carl mentioned how his frequent personal (non-work related) interaction with Mary developed into some romantic feelings, although he was not sure the feelings were reciprocated. When he was later followed-up, he described how he temporarily discontinued contact with Mary when reflecting on the inappropriateness of such a situation and the suspicion of other coworkers. Later, he was able to normalize relations with her, but developed the belief that it was best to limit contact when it comes to work relationships with the opposite gender.

The “lessons learned” from Carl may also be reflected in the successful relationships between male supervisors and female subordinates in the sample. Four cases existed with this combination and all of the superiors preferred a personal exchange management style in which some personal exchange is allowed, but it is kept to a limit. It is interesting to note that this was the only personal exchange management style that existed among male supervisors and female subordinates.

Exploration of other dyadic gender combinations (See illustration in Appendix F) revealed no other clear patterns or relationships between gender and LMX or personal exchange. Different levels of LMX and personal exchange existed for other dyadic combinations except the female superior-male subordinate combination, for which only one dyad existed. Cultural differences between men and women were not brought up in any interviews.

Additionally, a chi-square test to examine whether an interaction effect existed between dyadic gender differences and amount of personal exchange revealed no
significant interaction between these variables ($\chi^2=2.39, df=2, p=0.303$). Specifically, dyads with superiors and subordinates of opposite genders did not reveal different levels of personal exchange as categorized by low, limited, and high exchange.

Differences between dyad members in terms of age were also explored to determine whether generational culture appeared to impact LMX or personal exchange. Appendix G illustrates the grouping of dyads together based on whether leaders and members had a 10 year or less age difference or whether they differed in age by more than 10 years. A fairly even distribution existed, although no patterns were evident in terms of the age difference being associated with levels of LMX or personal exchange. The group of dyads with similar ages and the group of dyads with divergent ages both consisted of relationships in which LMX was high or relatively lower as well as personal exchange that ranged from high to low. In addition, there was no indication in interview data of age or generational differences impacting the relationship.
Chapter 5. Discussion

The results of this investigation into multicultural leadership relationships provide a richer understanding of the meanings inherent within superior-subordinate dyads. It is an interpretive representation derived from thick description from individuals embedded in the phenomena of interest, a method which has been lacking in practically all of leadership research. The present study also attempted to address the need for investigation into matters associated with cultural differences within leadership dyads. While a deeper appreciation of these phenomena has been gained, numerous questions have also been raised. The following discussion highlights the findings of this study and relates previous literature, when available, to each topic. In addition, the questions raised from the research are presented as future research directions.

Dyadic Characteristics

A critical aspect of the research design was its attempt to sample from a diversity of participants and dyads to enhance its ability to apply to other multicultural populations. As a detailed description of the sample was already presented in the Methods section, it will not be repeated here. However, a few important issues are highlighted.

Participants displayed a broad range of a number of characteristics including gender, age, ethnicity, education, profession, and job position. This diversity contrasts with typical samples used in leadership research, which have largely been more homogeneous (for e.g., university staff) and based on participants with a Western cultural background. Of particular relevance is that a majority of participants were of Asian or Pacific Islander backgrounds. Thus, the diversity of this sample improves generalizability of leadership phenomena much more than previous research and begins to significantly...
expand the reach of investigations on leadership relationships. As many workplaces worldwide are becoming more multicultural and diverse in general, research such as this promotes greater applicability of the field of leadership. However, leadership research must expand on the qualitative multicultural research presented here in order to provide a useful wealth of knowledge for global leadership.

Despite its valuable and unique contribution, this study also possesses a limitation with regard to its sample characteristics. A majority of the dyad members interviewed described relationships that they rated fairly highly. Participants were given a choice of which superiors or subordinates they felt comfortable talking at length about, which likely allowed them to select their “better” relationships. Thus, descriptions of low quality relationships are underrepresented in this sample.

However, the focus of this study on describing how high quality relationships develop is not unlike LMX Theory. LMX Theory presumes that all superior-subordinate relationships are initially low quality, or at the “stranger stage.” The contribution of the theory is on describing how certain relationships develop beyond this stage toward a “mature stage” and the resulting positive consequences. The present research also reflects this pursuit, and puts less emphasis on examining relationships that may be considered low quality or even dysfunctional.

The study of dysfunctional superior-subordinate relationships is an area especially in need of attention that this study could not address. Especially considering cross-cultural relationships, it is hypothesized that diverse dyads may be more likely to engender dysfunction. Some indication of this was revealed by participants in this
research who related stories of conflict between dissimilar coworkers. For future research to respond to issues that this study was not able to address, a first question is offered.

Are multicultural leadership dyads more likely to experience dysfunctional relationships, as characterized by miscommunication, distrust, lack of respect, and dissolution of the relationship, than homogeneous leadership dyads?

A Preliminary Model of Multicultural Leadership Relationships

The preliminary model of multicultural leadership relationships and its elements were constructed through common themes present in superior and subordinate interpretations of their work and relationship experiences. It is a model that seeks to apply to a broader range of leadership dyads, regardless of whether they are homogeneous or heterogeneous, or whether they consist of Western or non-Western cultural identities. All of these types of dyads were included in this sample. However, it is impossible to include every category of diversity and cultural identity, which is why continued research is necessary.

Obviously, this preliminary model does not provide an exhaustive set of themes applicable to multicultural dyads. Further research must follow to identify other salient aspects that were not obvious from this data. The development of a grounded theory of multicultural leadership relationships, initiated by this study, can facilitate the expansion of a more comprehensive theory based on this foundation. For this preliminary model, the major themes are discussed and questions for future research are presented.

Work vs. Personal Exchange

One of the most noticeable themes that emerged in this research was the relationship between work exchange and personal exchange. Supervisors and
subordinates preferred personal level involvement in the work domain to different extents and revealed a divergence of opinions on the essentiality of personal knowledge as well as the best method of managing the boundary between the two domains. Nevertheless, they felt that managing that boundary was a necessary activity.

This research also uncovered five different approaches to managing personal exchange at work. Supervisors varied on two different dimensions: the level of personal exchange they allow at work and whether they take a particularistic or universal approach. These variations yielded the following types of personal exchange management:

1) Type 0 (no personal exchange management) – managers who keep personal exchange out of the workplace as much as possible, eliminating the need to manage the boundary

2) Type I (Limited-Particularistic) – managers who limit personal exchange, but adjust the amount depending on the individual

3) Type II (Limited-Universal) – managers who limit personal exchange equally with all of their subordinates

4) Type III (High-Particularistic) – managers who allow high personal exchange with only selected individuals

5) Type IV (High-Universal) – managers who allow high personal exchange with all of their subordinates

Although the distinction between work and personal exchange is seemingly an obvious facet of work in light of one’s first hand experiences with professional life, little research was found examining this aspect of work relationships. Even the major
relationship-based leadership paradigm, LMX Theory, has been relatively silent on this important aspect of leadership relationships. It is possible that Western theories either assume that work relationships should be kept professional or that personal exchange is not a critical factor in relationship building. Only a few allusions to this theme were found in the literature.

With regard to differences of opinion on the necessity of personal knowledge for a high quality work relationship, some felt that one could have a good work relationship without personal knowledge, while others felt that personal knowledge was critical. It was shown that despite these differences of opinion, high quality relationships were still possible. These findings may be in line with Crouch and Yetton’s (1988) speculation that social interaction may be independent of whether a subordinate is an in-group (high quality relationship) or out-group (low quality relationship) member. These authors only found positive relationships between performance ratings, task contact, and friendliness, but friendliness was not associated with social interaction. These findings appear consistent with the present research, since different preferences for personal exchange were shown to exist along with the similar outcome of a high quality relationship.

Crouch and Yetton’s (1988) assumptions regarding the management of the work-personal boundary is also consistent with the present study, as they conjectured:

“There is reason to avoid letting task activity develop into a social relationship, even with IN Group members, since encouraging such behavior can diminish the manager’s authority. A manager adopting this principle would discourage social interaction with his/her subordinates. Other managers might take a different
undifferentiated approach and attempt to be friendly with everybody in the belief that friendliness stimulates performance.” (p. 77)

Participants such as Mike and Evan described how work relationships can be difficult when one grows too close to their counterpart. Also, in line with these authors’ statement, different approaches on managing the “task” and “social” components were evident in this research. Although minimal research was found related to personal exchange at work, these previous findings appear to correspond well to the present findings.

A wealth of related, but distinct literature exists that looks at the boundary between professional life and personal life (e.g., Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007). However, the findings of the current study reveal the boundary between work exchange and personal exchange within the work context. There is an important difference between these two lines of inquiry.

Often, a distinction is made between professional life and personal life, with personal life consisting of aspects such as home-life and family (Clark, 2000; Hall & Richter, 1988; Nippert-Eng, 1996). An important issue in this area is the conflict that occurs at the boundaries of those two domains. However, participants in this study have identified a similar, but distinct, issue that is present within the work setting, namely, the extent that supervisors and subordinates should be familiar with each others’ personal lives. The former is an individual dilemma, while the latter is a relational dilemma. From another point of view, the former relates to a dilemma between two different contexts, while the latter relates to a dilemma within the single work context.

Only in the cross-cultural literature has investigations related to the work-personal boundary within the work context been found. Chang (1985) compared Chinese and
American managers on their beliefs about and attitudes toward their jobs. Among their findings, Chinese and American managers differed in paternalism, or “familism,” with Chinese managers feeling more strongly that “supervisors should help with subordinates’ personal problems, that companies should look after the welfare of employees and their families, and that companies should do as much as possible to help solve society’s problems” (p. 151). Paternalism was also examined in Japanese firms by Uhl-Bien, Tierney, Graen, and Wakabayashi (1990). These investigators found that belief in paternalism was related to formal and informal career investments, LMX, and job satisfaction.

As paternalism reflects an involvement of a supervisor or company in an employee’s non-work domain, the research on paternalism provides one possible explanation for the present study’s findings. If different cultures value paternalism differentially, it follows that their perception of how much personal exchange should be involved at work will likewise be dissimilar. It is probable that there are other values in addition to paternalism that contribute to preferences for greater personal exchange at work, such as values related to collectivism.

The work-personal exchange distinction was perceived by Western culture-influenced participants along with non-Western participants, lending support for the preliminary model to develop as a broader leadership relationship model. However, it is likely that the work-personal exchange distinction will be even more pronounced when considering other cultures. Some cultural groups may tend to think highly of their working relationship with their superior or subordinate, but keep personal aspects separate. Other cultural groups may distinguish less between a work relationship and a
personal relationship and prefer to think of professional colleagues and friends or family more similarly, as might be the tendency in collectivist cultures.

Because this research has raised more questions about the work-personal distinction rather than answer them, there is much room for future inquiry. Undoubtedly, there are many levels of personal knowledge, and some may be more critical to the professional setting than others. Future investigations may pursue questions such as the following.

*Are there contexts (type of job, situational, cultural, etc.) in which greater personal exchange is necessary, contexts in which personal exchange is unnecessary, and/or variations in between?*

*Which aspects of personal exchange (individual cognitive abilities, skills, resources, etc.) are critical or unnecessary for specific settings?*

*Do cultures that value personal exchange function adequately when it is discouraged in the work setting?*

*When does too much personal exchange become a hindrance to an effective relationship?*

**Demands for Interaction**

Another aspect that was uncovered that may be viewed primarily as a precursor to relationship development was the demands placed on supervisors and subordinates to interact with each other. This research found two sources from which these demands originated: an individual’s needs and the requirements of the work. Some individuals have a high need for communication, as was the case with Fern, who placed demands on her supervisor to interact with her. Also, the type of job held, as in the case of the marketing manager, may always require the incumbent to interact more with the
supervisor, irrespective of the individual in that job position. Additional findings suggest a potential positive effect of work that requires higher interaction. Examples of these types of jobs found in this study included those that require the superior and subordinate to engage in joint activity, in which they need to interact to attain a goal, such as success in a marketing project or helping a medical patient.

The amount of interaction taking place between supervisor and subordinate clearly will affect the development of their relationship and other outcomes. Evidence is available in the LMX literature for its positive effect on performance ratings, as Kacmar, Witt, Zivnuska, and Gully (2003) found that frequency of communication plays a role in performance ratings for high and low LMX dyads. For cross-cultural relationships in general, interaction can lead to trust and changing of harmful expectations (Triandis, 1994).

In the context of cross-cultural leadership relationships in particular, Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque, and House (2006) advocated specific interaction techniques to improve culturally dissimilar relationships. Javidan and associates proposed specific types of interaction, namely, sharing information and educating employees on differences of culturally-bound leadership behaviors. These authors recommend that a sojourning leader inform employees of a host culture about his or her home culture and the similarities and differences between the two in attempt to dispel stereotyping and false expectations. Subsequent discussions of how specific leadership attributes are manifested in the different cultures can help build understanding and trust. Javidan and colleagues also advise involving the manager and all employees in a process of agreeing on what behaviors can be modified and what behaviors can remain. Thus, authors seem to suggest
that interaction and communication is important, especially for cross-cultural relationships.

Of course, more interaction can lead to negative consequences as well, depending on the situation. For these reasons, understanding the antecedents of interaction, such as personal and job demands, can be useful. Other specific potential factors contributing to interaction, such as superordinate goals and joint activities should also be examined for their effects on leadership relationships.

Initial findings from this study suggested that work contexts that require higher interaction may have contributed to higher relationship quality. Examples were given of dyads with high job demands for interaction, in which a poor relationship improved and a good relationship continued to be successful. An example was also given of a job with a low demand for interaction in which a poor relationship was unable to improve. The further substantiation of this finding has important practical implications for organizational structure and efforts to improve intercultural relations through interaction.

It should not be assumed, though, that all individuals will prefer or benefit from higher interaction. Other cultures may value interaction differently. Thus, the findings here may be extended further to discover how variations in preferences for interaction affect relationship quality and even how individuals with certain preferences may structure the organization to influence the interaction that occurs. Some future research questions related to demands for interaction are offered.

*How do similarities or differences in individual needs for interaction affect leadership dyads?*
Do jobs that require more interaction have different outcomes than jobs that require less interaction?

How can interaction be guided to overcome cultural differences?

Past Experience

As another precursor to relationship development, past experience was found to play a considerable role in how superiors and subordinates perceive and approach their current relationships. More specifically, two kinds of past experiences were shown to be relevant: prior dyadic experience and prior cultural experience. Participants often referred back to previous relationships with their superior or subordinate when asked about their current perceptions. Also, they related how their previous experiences with diverse coworkers assisted them in dealing with the diversity of their current workplace.

Interestingly, no mention of the influence of past leadership relationships was made in the LMX literature. Considering that some participants immediately made a comparison with their past experience with a dyadic counterpart when asked about their present experiences, it is possible that prior dyadic experience may have a substantial effect on how they rated their current relationship. In other words, an average relationship may be rated highly if the employee had bad experiences with their previous manager. Such an incident would yield questionable research results if using only the standard LMX-7 measure. Accordingly, this research reveals that it is necessary to consider an individual’s prior dyadic experience when interpreting their current relationship quality.

The finding of the positive effects of prior cultural experiences also has important implications. In multicultural dyads, an individual will be much better equipped to deal with cultural differences if he or she possesses prior experience with that culture.
Consequently, the relationship quality is more likely to be enhanced. Participants in this study believed that through prior cultural experience, one learns a great deal and broadens his or her perspective. In addition, it is also possible to build strength of character and better communication skills to handle cultural divergences.

Other research has also shown that cross-cultural experiences can have a profound effect on the leader’s worldview. In a qualitative study by Cassiday (2005), successful expatriate leaders were open to learning about a different culture, able to balance different worldviews, and became more aware of their own perspectives, thus enabling them to consider issues from a higher level of abstraction.

To better expand on the preliminary model of multicultural leadership relationships, more specific questions could be addressed that build off of the findings presented. The following offers possible future directions related to the aspect of past experiences.

*How do positive prior dyadic experiences affect current perceptions of the dyadic relationship?*

*How do negative prior dyadic experiences affect current perceptions of the dyadic relationship?*

*What aspects of prior cultural experiences are most helpful for cultural dissimilarity in leadership relationships?*

Relationship Building, Incremental and Reciprocal Influence, and In-groups and Out-groups

In support of Leader-Member Exchange Theory is the finding that the LMX framework appears to describe leadership processes well for this multicultural sample in...
addition to the homogeneous samples typically used in LMX research. This investigation has found that many of the basic processes that comprise leader-member exchange relationships in traditional samples were also at work in the current sample. These diverse participants described the following aspects in their dyadic relationships: 1) relationship-building, 2) incremental and reciprocal influence, and 3) in-groups and out-groups. These will be discussed together since they are integral processes and comparisons can be more easily made between the present findings and the LMX model.

The main premise of LMX Theory that differentiates it from other leadership theories is that leadership is a dyadic relationship-building process. Successful leadership occurs from the development of a high quality relationship between a leader and member. It is not obvious from the theory whether it is necessary for dyad members to be aware of this process as it progresses, but many superiors in this research were clearly cognizant of their attempts to build relationships with their subordinates, and many thought it was an important aspect of their job. The emphasis on relationship-building among these participants offers support for LMX as a useful model of leadership across cultures.

Cassiday (2005) found that successful expatriate leaders were highly cognizant of the importance of relationship development with their subordinates and its association with task completion. Developing successful relationships for these leaders involved keen communication skills of listening deeply, paying attention to non-verbal cues, and fostering a collaborative environment based on respect and trust.

Providing more support for the models applicability is the discovery of other aspects of relationship building as prescribed by LMX Theory, incremental and reciprocal influence. According to the LMX Model, the development of mature
relationships is initiated when mutual investments are made between leaders and high potential members (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994). In a low quality relationship, especially at the beginning of the relationship, both leader and member contribute “base contributions” to teamwork effectiveness. This is characterized by interaction based on the formal work contract. As the leader or follower further attempts to influence the other, the one being influenced considers the request in terms of past experiences with the one doing the influencing. It has been described as a psychological account to which the leader and follower give investments and take withdrawals (Graen & Scandura, 1987) and interpret the investments and withdrawals according to the accounts history. If there are more joint investments, this “incremental influence” (Katz & Kahn, 1978) leads to a mature relationship.

This similar process of incremental influence was found in this sample of multicultural dyads. Dyad members reported making positive investments into the relationship such as offering opportunities and helping with tasks. Over time, these contributions incrementally built trust between dyad members and strengthened their relationships.

The LMX model further proposes that when both the leader and follower are willing to step outside their formal job contracts they will then be able to capitalize on the hidden opportunities and resources of the other which may contribute to more team effectiveness. This mature relationship is characterized by extra-contractual behavior and by members outgrowing their jobs by expanding their interests from an individual focus to a team focus (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994). At this stage, leaders and members are
able to utilize their individual resources to influence the behaviors of each other, rather than just the leader influencing the member. The multicultural dyads in this research also mentioned ways in which they influenced each other reciprocally. Described as a “two-way street,” subordinates of high quality relationships explained how they could make suggestions or provide their input into the work and have them accepted by their superior. This reciprocal influence process was also seen as important for the relationship’s development.

Another characteristic of leader-member exchange is the presence of in-groups and out-groups. With the demands placed on leadership, leaders often devote their time to developing only a few select individuals, often called their in-group or “trusted cadre” in LMX Theory. These few individuals become the high LMX members while the others typically rate lower on LMX.

Likewise, participants in this study described differences in the superiors’ relationships with each of their members. Usually, certain individuals were portrayed more highly and LMX scores also were rated more highly than others. Sometimes leaders would spend leisure time with certain members and not others. It was, therefore, evident that differentiation of members into in-groups and out-groups was also occurring for this multicultural sample.

There is some evidence that in-group-out-group differentiation occurs in Japanese workplaces as well. Wakabayashi, Graen, and Uhl-Bien (1990) found that Japanese managers experience similar processes in that only a selected cadre is identified early in their careers and prepared for advancement in the organization. These selected “in-group”
members also reported high quality relationships with their supervisors, similar to Western samples.

These findings suggest that the existing model of LMX may be applicable for individuals of diverse backgrounds, an important first step for developing the model beyond its current limits. Present in these dyads were similar processes as described by the LMX model of leadership. Leaders and members recounted instances of relationship building activities, incremental and reciprocal influence, and in-groups and out-groups.

With more cross-cultural support and modification of the LMX model, including the results of this investigation, successive research can build from its basic structure. More cross-cultural and multicultural studies on leadership can contribute to enhancing the generalizability of the model. Possible questions for further research include the following.

How do perceptions of relationship-building differ across cultures?

How do time spans for relationship-building differ across cultures?

How does the incremental influence process differ across cultures?

How does the reciprocal influence process differ across cultures?

How does the formation of in-groups and out-groups differ across cultures?

Other Cultural Implications for Relationship Development

Ethnocultural Differences and Local vs Non-local Cultural Differences

It was evident that participants learned a great deal through their experiences with diverse cultures in their workplace. Ironically, this may be the reason that they did not attribute a great deal of importance to ethnic differences between superiors and subordinates. It is possible that many of them could have already gained sensitivity to
many cultures, so that those issues were not as salient for them. Evidence of this could be
drawn from Fern’s perception that racial or ethnic differences can be an issue, especially
in the beginning, but one changes from those experiences and learns to deal with
differences.

Drawing from the cultural literature, the lower perceived impact of ethnocultural
differences may be attributed to what has been termed “unconscious competence”
(Howell, 1982). According to Howell, there are four stages of competence in
communication. The first stage is termed *unconscious incompetence*, where one is
unaware of the misinterpretations he or she makes about another person’s behavior. The
second stage is *conscious incompetence*, where one is aware of the misinterpretations, but
does not know how to deal with it. The third stage is *conscious competence*, where one is
aware of the communication differences of a person from another culture and changes
behavior accordingly. The fourth stage is *unconscious competence*, where culturally
appropriate behavior changes have become so habitual that one is no longer aware about
using them. It is possible that some of the participants in this study have been exposed to
different cultures for so long that differences are less recognizable.

Multiculturalism has been present in Hawaii for well over a century, with a wide
diversity of nationalities, ethnicities, and cultures. Its central location in the Pacific draws
a broad variety of people from the Americas and Asia, which are widely represented in
the population. Therefore, its people have dealt with issues of cultural divergence for
most of their lives and through generations. Because individuals may be more competent
among different cultures, this may have been the reason why they did not perceive a
significant impact of ethnic differences.
It is likely that populations with a more recent influx of diverse people will perceive greater ethnocultural differences. Research on newly multicultural populations and workforces may provide different results than those found in this study. These issues should be explored in future investigations as well.

While ethnocultural differences were an issue for some, participants’ perceived source of cultural difference more often stemmed from disparities between local and non-local individuals, particularly those from the U.S. mainland. The fact that the people of Hawaii have experienced historical conflict with the U.S. mainland that lingers until today should not be rejected as a source of their sensitivity to those differences. However, what were mentioned by participants were primarily the cultures, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that were different between locals and non-locals.

In Hawaii, the term “local” may be used differently by each individual; however, some common dimensions were found to be used for deciding whether a person is “local” or not. Leong (1997) found that people attribute varying degrees of being “local” to a person using four major criteria: 1) whether they were born and raised in Hawaii, 2) their race/ethnicity, 3) their position in the lower economic strata, and 4) their attitudes. An individual’s attitude was found to be the most salient criteria and includes “values, beliefs, and behaviors.” Thus, the attitudinal distinction between locals and non-locals is a distinction supported by other research.

However, culture exists on many levels. The two levels that were expounded by these participants were the ethnic and local. It may be that societies that have had long-term exposure to multiculturalism have developed a “third culture” that exists along with the ethnic cultures which individuals bring to that society. It seems logical that over time,
the “third culture” will tend to become more predominant as individuals attempt to get along with each other and develop shared meanings, values, and beliefs. The study of these aspects of multicultural societies is relevant to cross-cultural relationships in the workplace and is another valuable area to pursue.

*How do ethnic perceptions compare between new multicultural populations and established multicultural populations?*

*Are local vs. non-local cultural differences an issue in other multicultural populations?*

**Exploratory Survey Results**

Findings from correlational analyses among the value and LMX scales point to the need for further research in this area. Because of the small sample size and use of stringent tests, none of the relationships between variables were found to be statistically significant (Appendix H). However, actual correlation statistics (R’s) were found to be relatively high. Of correlations between values and LMX quality, the highest R values shown were -0.504 for superiors and -0.551 for subordinates. The highest R values for correlations between value difference scores and LMX ratings were 0.545 for superiors and 0.552 for subordinates, and for the correlation between value difference scores and LMX difference scores it was -.788. With a larger sample size, these relationships can be examined more rigorously.

Considering the associations found between LMX and work values by other investigators such as Steiner (1988), Gessner (1992), and Dose (1999), is it plausible to expect general cultural values to be related to superior-subordinate relationship quality as well. Especially in examinations of cultural difference, it should be useful to understand how similarities or differences in values contribute to the quality of relationships between...
these dyads. Furthermore, while these initial exploratory analyses did not reveal substantial results, the high correlation values suggest that further investigation of these relationships may be fruitful.

**Implications for LMX Theory**

Along with raising the questions presented throughout this discussion, the findings of this study inform Leader-Member Exchange Theory of its limitations and possible future directions for it to be useful as a multicultural or cross-cultural theory of leadership. As shown in these multicultural dyads, similar processes of leader-member relationship development exist as they do in more homogeneous samples used in previous LMX research. Therefore, the theory holds promise for its application across cultures. However, a variety of issues must be addressed to reach this goal. A few of these are reviewed here.

First, the quality of relationship has previously been measured primarily with the LMX-7 measure, which is likely to be a limited indicator of relationship quality for many cultures. As it was shown in this study, some participants reported high LMX ratings, while at the same reporting that they did not know their leader or did not interact with them frequently. One of these participants reported working with their leader for only a few months, leading one to question the validity of the LMX measure, since high quality relationships are typically built over a lengthier period. Measurement issues such as whether constructs have equivalent meanings for different cultures, social desirability, and many others (Triandis, 1994) play an important role in applying research methods to other cultures. It is likely that more culturally sensitive measures will need to be constructed to measure relationship quality between superiors and subordinates.
Second, the nature of leadership is likely to differ across cultures. High power distance cultures (Hofstede, 1980) are more comfortable with maintaining authority, which may inhibit the process of reciprocal influence between these individuals. Since this process is related to the ability of leaders and members to capitalize on individuals' unique contributions for teamwork effectiveness, its absence may compromise the current LMX model. It will need to be determined how this issue plays out in different cultures. A new multicultural LMX model will need to take this into consideration.

Third, this study outlined the ways that interaction can be demanded of dyad members. However, the question alluded to earlier regarding differences in need for interaction also applies here. Certain cultural values lead individuals to use communication sparingly, which may pose a problem for the model, which depicts relationship building as involving ample interaction that goes beyond the formal job contract. How these values affect the LMX model, as it is currently understood, is another area worth pursuing.

Fourth, related to past experiences, it is possible that certain cultures with histories of conflict with each other will have unique issues when brought together in the work setting, or more specifically, in the leadership relationship. It was discussed how previous interaction with other cultures may facilitate subsequent interaction with those cultures. However, previous contact, when conflict-ridden, may present another issue worth examining.

For these reasons, increasing the applicability of LMX Theory to other cultures requires much greater use of qualitative methods to discover perceptions of leadership relationships for different cultures. In other words, research must start “from the ground
up.” The possibility of a single cross-cultural LMX model is still questionable, however. It may be necessary to be satisfied with many “emic” models of leadership relationships, rather than seek the “etic.”
Chapter 6. Limitations of Findings

One limitation of this study was its inability to incorporate a greater proportion of dyads that could be considered low quality or even dysfunctional. Such a broader diversity in the quality of relationships would likely have enriched the findings generated. Although probably more difficult to recruit and more risky in terms of legal implications, a qualitative investigation of these relationships would be an important contribution.

Second, a majority of ethnic categorizations used in this study may not entirely reflect the strength of cultural values, beliefs, perceptions, and behaviors that may be present in the actual country of origin. “Hyphenated” Americans, such as Japanese-Americans or Portuguese-Americans may not possess the same pattern of cultural attributes as, say, Japanese or Portuguese nationals. However, this is a study of multicultural workplaces, in which some cultural assimilation is assumed. Other studies can make a valuable contribution by focusing more on leadership relationships between individuals who have been newly introduced to new cultures and have had more recent ties to their home culture.

A third limitation that precluded a more rigorous analysis of associations between individual values and relationship quality was the small sample size. A greater number of participants would have strengthened conclusions about these relationships and contributed further to the understanding of how culture may affect leadership relationships through similarities or differences in values. The high correlation values that resulted from this small sample, although not significant, suggest that more research is necessary.
Chapter 7. Conclusion

The preliminary model of multicultural leadership relationships and related themes constructed from supervisor and subordinate perceptions provides an understanding of areas that are largely absent in leadership dialogues. Previous leadership research has been conducted primarily in culturally homogeneous samples and reflects a positivist perspective. Consequently, the findings it has generated are limited. In contrast, this investigation builds on a small but growing literature that attempts to inform on the more complex meanings that diverse supervisors and subordinates ascribe to their relationship. Such understanding allows the discipline to better respond to the changing global work context.
Appendix A. Employee Instrument

Semi-Structured Interview Format

Interview Introduction

“I am interested in what goes on at work and what happens between people at work. I would like to hear your stories or incidents that capture the uniqueness of your workplace and your work relationships with others. But at the same time, I have no interest in judging or critiquing specific practices that occur. I would just like to learn the diversity of things that happen in the workplace.”

Interview Questions – Employee

1) Tell me a little bit about the work that you do.
   a. What lead you to do this type of work? and at this place of employment?
   b. How long have you been working there?
   c. Tell me about a typical day at work. What about a typical week?

2) Tell me about your experiences with your coworkers
   a. How would you describe the people you work with?
   b. How closely do you work with them?
   c. Do you have activities with your coworkers where you work on things together?
   d. How much do you like your coworkers?
   e. How well do you know your coworkers on a personal level?
   f. Do you get together with your coworkers outside of work?
   g. What are the relationships like between your coworkers and the manager/supervisor?
3) Tell me about your experiences with your supervisor

   a. How much contact do you have with your supervisor (frequency and
      length of time)?

   b. What are the different means of communication that you use with your
      supervisor (in person, email, phone)?

   c. Do you know your supervisor on a personal level?
      i. Do you know about his/her family or friends?
      ii. Have you spent time with his/her family or friends?

   d. What are some positive things about your relationship with your
      supervisor?

   e. What are some negative things about your relationship with your
      supervisor?

   f. How, in your recollection, did your relationship develop with your
      supervisor?
      i. How long have you worked with this supervisor?
      ii. What was your first meeting (interview) like?
      iii. What was your first assignment like?
      iv. What are some stories about your supervisor that you can’t forget?

   g. What do feel are the reasons for the [positive or negative aspects] of your
      relationship?

   h. How does your relationship with your supervisor compare with other
      people’s relationship with him/her?
      i. What are some things your supervisor does with everyone?
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ii. What are some things your supervisor only does with certain people?

iii. Does your supervisor act differently toward different people? In what way?

4) What are the qualities of your ideal supervisor?

5) What are the qualities of a “not so ideal” supervisor?

6) Would those qualities be different than those you would desire in a friend?

Capstone questions:

7) What do you think are the basic foundations or requirements of good interpersonal relationships?

8) How do you view yourself and your supervisor ethnically?

9) What do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace (may need to define)?

10) Would you say you have a high quality relationship with your supervisor (for e.g., do you like your supervisor, get along well together, trust and respect each other, have similar interests, etc)?

11) On a scale from the stranger stage to a mature relationship stage, where would you say your relationship would fall (will need to describe)?

12) Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive at work?

13) Do you feel like gender issues are sensitive?

14) How long do you think it takes to know someone well?

15) What kind of personal knowledge is needed to feel like you know them well?
16) What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?

17) Can you have a good relationship without personal knowledge?
1. Do you know where you stand with your leader…do you usually know how satisfied your leader is with what you do?
   Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Fairly Often  Very Often

2. How well does your leader understand your job problems and needs?
   Not a Bit  A Little  A Fair Amount  Quite a Bit  A Great Deal

3. How well does your leader recognize your potential?
   Not at All  A Little  Moderately  Mostly  Fully

4. Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that your leader would use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work?
   None  Small  Moderate  High  Very High

5. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your leader has, what are the chances that he/she would “bail you out,” at his/her expense?
   None  Small  Moderate  High  Very High

6. I have enough confidence in my leader that I would defend and justify his/her decision if he/she were not present to do so?
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Agree

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?
   Extremely  Worse Than  Average  Better Than  Extremely
   Ineffective  Average  Average  Effective

160
In this questionnaire you are to ask yourself: "What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?" There are two lists of values on the following pages. These values come from different cultures. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for you as a guiding principle in your life. Use the rating scale below:

0—means the value is not at all important, it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you.

3—means the value is important.

6—means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life.

-1 is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you.

7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life;

ordinarily there are no more than two such values.
In the space before each value, write the number (-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7) that indicates the importance of that value for you, personally. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.

**AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed</th>
<th>not</th>
<th>very</th>
<th>supreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to my values</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin, read the values in List I, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List I.

**VALUES LIST I**

1. ______EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
2. ______INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
3. ______SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
4. ______PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
5 FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
6 A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)
7 SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
8 SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
9 AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)
10 MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)
11 POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
12 WEALTH (material possessions, money)
13 NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
14 SELF RESPECT (belief in one’s own worth)
15 RECIPROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness)
16 CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)
17 A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
18 RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs)
19 MATURE LOVE (deep emotional & spiritual intimacy)
20 SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)
21 PRIVACY (the right to have a private sphere)
22 FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)
23 SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)
24 UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)
25 A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change)
26 WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
27 AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
28 TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)
29 A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
30 SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)
VALUES LIST II

Now rate how important each of the following values is for you as a guiding principle in YOUR life. These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for you. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

Before you begin, read the values in List II, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values, or—if there is no such value—choose the value least important to you, and rate it -1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>to my values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>not important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>very important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>supreme importance</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
32. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling & action)
33. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)
34. AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
35. BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)
36. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)
37. DARING (seeking adventure, risk)
38. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)
39. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)
40. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)
41. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)
42. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)
43. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)
44. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)
45. HONEST (genuine, sincere)
46. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my "face")
47. OBEIDENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)
48. INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)
49. HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
50. ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)
51. DEVOUT (holding to religious faith & belief)
52. RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
53. CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)
54. FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
55. SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)
56. CLEAN (neat, tidy)
57. SELF-INDULGENT (doing pleasant things)
BACKGROUND ITEMS

Your Sex (circle): 1. Male 2. Female

Your age: _______ Years

While you were growing up (birth to age 15), who were the people who lived in your home for at least two years? Write the number of people in each category. Write zero if no one in category.

_____ Parents  _____ Other Relatives

_____ Sisters & Brothers  _____ Persons who are not relatives

How many years of education has each person completed (since 1st grade)? (estimate if not certain)

_____ Yourself

_____ Your Father

_____ Your Mother

What is your current occupation or your occupation when last employed? (circle):

1. Teacher grades k-2
2. Teacher grades 3-8
3. Teacher grades 9-12
4. School principal
5. Other professional
6. Manager or business owner
7. Clerical or sales worker
8. Skilled worker
9. Other blue collar
10. Farm owner or farm worker
11. Secondary school student
12. University student: social sciences & education
13. University student: humanities, arts, & law
14. University student: natural sciences & medicine
15. Homemaker
16. Other not codable into 1-15

With regard to religion, with which religious group do you identify with the most?

How religious are you, if at all? (circle)

Not at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With regard to ethnicity, with which ethnicity do you identify with the most?

How strongly do you identify with this ethnicity? (circle)

Not at all                      Very strongly

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Which political party comes closest to representing your views?

How strongly do you identify with this political party? (circle)

Not at all                      Very strongly

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

In what kind of a place did you grow up? (circle):

1. large city (500,000+)
2. small city
3. rural area
4. farm
Appendix B. Supervisor Instrument

Semi-Structured Interview Format

**Interview Introduction**

"I am interested in what goes on at work and what happens between people at work. I would like to hear your stories or incidents that capture the uniqueness of your workplace and your work relationships with others. But at the same time, I have no interest in judging or criticizing specific practices that occur – I would just like to learn the range of things that happen in the workplace."

**Interview Questions – Supervisor**

1) Tell me a little bit about the work that you do
   a. What location do you normally work?
   b. What do you do?
   c. What kind of people do you work with?
   d. How do you do your work?
   e. When do you work (what time and how long)?
   f. What lead you to do this type of work? and at this place of employment?
   g. How long have you been working there?
   h. What does your workplace look like?
   i. Can you draw me an organizational chart showing the relationships among the people you work with (note who is female)?
   j. Tell me about a typical day at work. What about a typical week?
   k. When did you start working with [employee]?

2) Tell me about your experiences with [employee].
a. How much contact do you have with [employee] (frequency and duration)?

b. What are the different ways in which you communicate with [employee] (in person, email, phone)?

c. Are there activities you engage in with your employee(s) during work?
   Does the organization support these activities?

d. Do you have lunch with him/her; go out after work; do things on weekends/holidays?

e. Do you know [employee] on a personal level?
   i. Do you know about his/her family or friends?
   ii. Have you spent time with his/her family or friends?
   iii. If it’s alright with you, tell me a personal story about him/her.

f. What are some positive things about your relationship with [employee]?

g. What are some negative things about your relationship with [employee]?

h. How, in your recollection, did your relationship develop with [employee]?
   i. How long have you worked with [employee]?
   ii. What was your first meeting (interview?) like?
   iii. Was there an orientation for him/her? What was that like?
   iv. What was it like assigning work to [employee]?
   v. Would you be able to draw for me a timeline of significant events in the relationship?
   vi. What are some stories about [employee] that you can’t forget?
i. What do feel are the reasons for the [positive or negative aspects] of your relationship?

j. How does your relationship with [employee] compare with your relationships with other employees?
   i. What are some things you do with everyone?
   ii. What are some things you do with only certain people?
   iii. Do you feel like you need to act differently toward different people? In what way?
   iv. What are some stories that describe your relationships with other people?

k. How does the reward system work at your workplace (pay, bonuses, merit pay)?
   i. What is your role in this reward system?

l. Do you feel you provide enough materials and tools (such as computer and supplies) for [employee] to do his/her job? If not, why not?

m. If you don’t mind, tell me about [employee]’s last performance evaluation.
   i. Were the expectations clear?
   ii. Were you outcome oriented?
   iii. Did you offer necessary support? In what way?
   iv. Did you give recognition for good work? How?
   v. Did you provide information to improve work? How?
   vi. Over the years, how has this been done?

3) How would you describe [employee]’s personal performance at work?
4) What are the qualities of your ideal employee?

5) What are the qualities of a “not so ideal” employee?

6) Would those qualities be different than those you would desire in a friend?

Capstone questions:

7) What do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

8) How do you view yourself and your employee ethnically?

9) What do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace
   (may need to define)?

10) Would you say you have a high quality relationship with [employee] (for e.g., do
   you like [employee], get along well together, trust and respect each other, have
   similar interests, etc)?

11) On a scale from the stranger stage to a mature relationship stage, where would
    you say your relationship would fall (will need to describe)?

12) Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive? [If applicable – Is that why
    you didn’t talk about it?]

13) Do you feel like gender issues are sensitive? [If applicable – Is that why you
    didn’t talk about it?]

14) How long do you think it takes to know someone well?

15) What kind of personal knowledge is needed to feel like you know them well?

16) What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work
    relationship?

17) Can you have a good relationship without personal knowledge?
18) From your observations, what process do people go through to move up in the company/organization?
1. Does your member usually know where they stand with you...does he/she usually know how satisfied you are with what he/she does?

Rarely Occasionally Sometimes Fairly Often Very Often

2. How well do you understand your members job problems and needs?

Not a Bit A Little A Fair Amount Quite a Bit A Great Deal

3. How well do you recognize your member’s potential?

Not at All A Little Moderately Mostly Fully

4. Regardless of how much formal authority you have built into your position, what are the chances that you would use your power to help your member solve problems in his/her work?

None Small Moderate High Very High

5. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority you have, what are the chances that you would “bail him/her out,” at your expense?

None Small Moderate High Very High

6. Your member has enough confidence in you that he/she would defend and justify your decision if you were not present to do so?

Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your member?

Extremely Worse Than Better Than Extremely

Ineffective Average Average Effective
In this questionnaire you are to ask yourself: "What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?" There are two lists of values on the following pages. These values come from different cultures. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for you as a guiding principle in your life. Use the rating scale below:

0—means the value is not at all important, it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you.
3—means the value is important.
6—means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life.

-1 is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you.
7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life; ordinary there are no more than two such values.
In the space before each value, write the number (-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7) that indicates the importance of that value for you, personally. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supreme importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin, read the values in List I, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List I.

VALUES LIST I

1 ___EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
2 ___INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
3 ___SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
4 ___PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
5 ___FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
6. A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)
7. SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
8. SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
9. AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)
10. MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)
11. POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
12. WEALTH (material possessions, money)
13. NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
14. SELF RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)
15. RECIPROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness)
16. CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)
17. A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
18. RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs)
19. MATURE LOVE (deep emotional & spiritual intimacy)
20. SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)
21. PRIVACY (the right to have a private sphere)
22. FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)
23. SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)
24. UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)
25. A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change)
26. WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
27. AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
28. TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)
29. A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
30. SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)

* * * * * *
VALUES LIST II

Now rate how important each of the following values is for you as a guiding principle in YOUR life. These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for you. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

Before you begin, read the values in List II, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values, or—if there is no such value—choose the value least important to you, and rate it -1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>of supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
32. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling & action)
33. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)
34. AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
35. BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)
36. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)
37. DARING (seeking adventure, risk)
38. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)
39. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)
40. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)
41. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)
42. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)
43. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)
44. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)
45. HONEST (genuine, sincere)
46. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my "face")
47. OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)
48. INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)
49. HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
50. ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)
51. DEVOUT (holding to religious faith & belief)
52. RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
53. CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)
54. FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
55. SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)
56. CLEAN (neat, tidy)
57. SELF-INDULGENT (doing pleasant things)
Your Sex (circle):  1. Male  2. Female

Your age: _______ Years

While you were growing up (birth to age 15), who were the people who lived in your home for at least two years? Write the number of people in each category. Write zero if no one in category.

_______ Parents  _______ Other Relatives

_______ Sisters & Brothers  _______ Persons who are not relatives

How many years of education has each person completed (since 1st grade)? (estimate if not certain)

_______ Yourself

_______ Your Father

_______ Your Mother

What is your current occupation or your occupation when last employed? (circle):

1. Teacher grades k-2
2. Teacher grades 3-8
3. Teacher grades 9-12
4. School principal
5. Other professional
6. Manager or business owner
7. Clerical or sales worker
8. Skilled worker
9. Other blue collar
10. Farm owner or farm worker
11. Secondary school student
12. University student: social sciences & education
13. University student: humanities, arts, & law
14. University student: natural sciences & medicine
15. Homemaker
16. Other not codable into 1-15

With regard to religion, with which religious group do you identify with the most?

How religious are you, if at all? (circle)

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very religious
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With regard to ethnicity, with which ethnicity do you identify with the most?

How strongly do you identify with this ethnicity? (circle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which political party comes closest to representing your views?

How strongly do you identify with this political party? (circle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what kind of a place did you grow up? (circle):

1. large city (500,000+)
2. small city
3. rural area
4. farm
Appendix C. Consent Form

Agreement to Participate in Work Relationship Study

By signing the form, I am agreeing voluntarily to participate in this research. The purpose of this study is to investigate perceptions of work and relationships at work. Benefits of the study include identifying what aspects of the job contribute to better working environments. To the extent possible, both supervisors and employees will be asked to participate for a fuller understanding of the job setting.

If I agree to be involved, I will be asked to participate in one or more interviews which will last about 50 minutes each, and will be asked to fill out a short questionnaire. I may be asked to voluntarily participate in follow-up interviews as well, for purposes of finishing or clarifying a previous interview. I will be asked questions about my work experience and performance and about my relationships with my supervisor and coworkers, or employees if I am a supervisor. Questions may include positive or negative aspects of our professional, personal, and/or family experiences, performance evaluations, or other areas that may be related to the work environment. Interviews will be recorded for the purpose of transcription. While real names must be used initially to match employee-supervisor responses and interview responses with questionnaires, pseudonyms will be substituted for real names and will be used on all transcripts and reports. Therefore, after initial meetings, there will be no way to identify individuals, and employees or employers will not have access to the responses of others. Every effort will be made to ensure my protection and confidentiality.

There are no known risks, beyond those of everyday life, from participating in this study. All information will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Names on this
page and on the master roster will be separated from responses, and kept in separate
locked drawers. The only exception to absolute confidentiality would be in rare cases in
which the University of Hawaii Institutional Review Board/Committee on Human
Studies staff may access the data collected. Audio tapes will be destroyed immediately
following transcription. All other research records will be destroyed upon completion of
the project. This research is voluntary and I am free to discontinue participation at any
time.

I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given
satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters, and
that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue
participation in the project or activity at any time without prejudice. I will also be given a
copy of this form for my records.

If you have any questions about the research, you may contact the investigator listed
above.

If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or
complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies,
University of Hawaii, 2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822. Phone: (808) 956-
5007.

PARTICIPANT COPY
I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigator or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.

Print Name

Signature and Date

Thank you for your participation!
Interview with Lancer - Supervisor of Fern

June 1, 2006
1:30 – 2:30 pm

D: Okay, um, my first question is, ‘Tell me about your work.’

L: Okay, so, I currently oversee our research and, um, clinical services department, as well as health educators and special projects. So I oversee about a staff of…10?…10 to 12…yeah, so, 10 to 12 staff members.

D: Oh, okay.

L: Yeah, and then in addition to that, then, I also look for research or grant opportunities and create proposals and project plans.

D: Okay. What would you say, um…what kind of people do you work with?

L: Haha…well I work with a very dynamic group of people. They’re very…each person has their unique qualities about them. And one of the challenges that I face daily is how do you best approach certain people. So I have about three new staff members that I’ve never worked with before, and I’ve had to take some time to learn more about them and how to interact with them. And then I’ve had others who I’ve worked with on different projects in the past but I’ve brought them on board under me for specific projects. And so it’s easier to work with them because we kind of already have that relationship built. But with the newcomers it’s a little…you know…it’s time to get to know you, get to know one another and build that relationship.

D: Okay.
Yeah. And then, you know, every person's different, and some people are more
difficult to work with than others.

Yeah.

D: Um... how do you do your work?

L: Um... what do you mean by that?

D: Like, what kinds of activities do you do for your work? I'm just trying to get an
overall picture first of just your job in general, so...

L: Okay, so, um, most of my time is spent in office... um... usually on the computer and
looking up things, so, researching various opportunities, or just statistics in general so
that I know, and I'm better aware of how our health trends are looking for the Native
Hawaiian population. And then, um, another percent of my time is focused on, um,
meeting with community partners on my special project grants. So, once a month I have
community meetings with Department of Native Hawaiian Health, Papa Ola Lokahi, um,
as well as other grass roots community people. So I work closely with them on making
sure that whatever their community needs are, we're addressing it as an agency.

D: Okay.

L: Yeah.

D: So what time do you usually work? And for how long?

L: ahh. So I usually start at seven in the morning and my day can end... I sometimes leave
the office as early as two in the afternoon to do afternoon errands and then I work again
at home at like eight to ten at night, so, a lot of the time that I spend in office is dealing
more with staff issues and community issues, and then the time I work at home is usually
concentrated time so I get more, like, the writing done...um, things that require more
thought and reflection get done at home versus in the office.

D: Okay. What would you say led you to do this type of work?

L: Well, my background is in nursing, so um, I used to work for Stanford Hospital and
Clinics at their bone marrow transplant unit and being there after...I worked there for
about a year and I realized that bedside nursing wasn’t what I wanted to do and I really
enjoyed community health nursing. So, I knew that community was what I wanted to do
and I always had a passion to work with Native Hawaiian peoples so I thought what
better compliment than to bring my nursing background into...into this community based
organization. So that’s what led me back here. Um, I had actually worked for [this
organization] for about six months in 1998 and then left to work in California because I
realized when I first came here I didn’t have enough experience to work with the
community. I needed to build my bedside skills in order to be able to help the people
properly. So that’s what I did, I moved back to California, lived there for another 2 ½ to 3
years and then moved back home.

D: Oh.

L: Yeah.

D: Um, can you draw me, like, an organization chart...

L: Sure.

D: Showing the relationships of people you work with...

L: Sure, just my section of the org chart or the entire org chart?

D: Uh, just your section.
L: Okay, [drawing] so my boss is the Executive Director, and then I work under her. So I oversee...and then under me, I oversee clinic...well, what we’re calling clinical services now, uh, which includes the nurse, the dietician, social work, and case managers. And then there’s a health education section which is um, like a case manager and coordinator. This person actually oversees all of our special projects, or helps with all of our special projects. And then the final piece that I oversee is research. And I have um, two research assistants here.

D: So you mainly oversee this part?

L: Actually I oversee all three of this area. Uh, because, so these are all people I oversee. But I have to work closely with, uh, our operations administrator, who oversees, um, fitness, as well as outreach. And then we’re just adding on a third person, or another person that does direct services, and she um, is the medical director, hopefully, she’ll come on board. We’re still in negotiations with her.

D: Oh, okay.

L: But, she would then oversee dental and um, primary care, so physician services. So I’m just primarily responsible for these people, but there has to be a...because the people that I oversee like...just the clinical people have to work closely with the fitness and outreach as well as the medical team, the physician and the dentist, because this relationship is constant...its always happening. We complement what the fitness trainers do by providing nutrition and um, nursing case management, as well as the outreach, we provide nutrition and nursing case management and social work, um, behavioral health issue stuff. Then we have to work with the doc, because the nurse needs to follow-up on whatever complicated cases she may have as well as the dietitian for clients who are
diabetic, or have cardiovascular disease. And then, you know, with chronic diseases come
behavioral health issues and uh, lifestyle changes and stuff, the social worker has to work
closely. So the teams that I oversee have to work consistently and continuously with the
rest of the agency’s teams.

D: Wow. I had no idea it was so big.

L: It has gotten very...in fact, we just went over this in our staff meeting today. So, I had
to last week, put it into a concept. You know, our Executive Director, she told me in
words, but she didn’t draw it out. And, I’ve always been tasked with drawing them out on
powerpoint for them, because they don’t know how to manipulate the program as well,
but this is what she told me, and I was like, OK, well, it makes sense now. So that
eventually, um, I think eventually what will happen is clinical services will drop down
into the medical directors responsibility, and then I will just have to focus on health ed
and research and evaluation eventually, so down the line what’ll get added on to research
is evaluation.

D: Oh, okay.

L: Yeah.

D: And, but there’s actually more too?

L: There is more, cause then we still have, like, our information technology person, our
fiscal person, and administration person that oversees the running of all of our offices and
stuff, so...

D: Oh...

L: Yeah, and then of course, we’re a non-profit so there’s a board of directors that hires
the executive director and oversees the entire agency, or is responsible for the agency.
D: Mmhmm.
L: Yeah.
D: Okay, thank you very much [taking org chart].
L: Yeah, absolutely.
D: Okay, now I want you to think about one person that you supervise.
L: Okay.
D: So it could be, you know, any good relationship, bad relationship...
L: Okay.
D: ...everyone has both.
L: Right.
D: So, just give me, like, a pseudonym...a fake name for that person, and then you can use that name.
L: Okay, I’ll try to think...[pause]...We’ll call her Fern.
D: Fem?
L: Yeah.
D: Okay. How often do you see Fern?
L: Uh, on a daily basis.
D: Okay.
L: She’s...her base is here at admin, so...
D: Okay, and how long...when you see her, how long are the meetings?
L: Um, it depends, because sometimes she’ll come in for a debriefing session, which could be up to 30 minutes, or it could just be a quick check in which is about 5 minutes.
And sometimes it's periodically for 5 minutes throughout the day. Just depends on what her needs are and my availability.

D: Okay. What are the types of ways that you communicate with Fern?

L: Um, I'm very open to her. I tell her exactly how it is. And, like, if I'm frustrated with her for being persistent about coming in and out of my office, I just tell her, ‘You know what? Can’t do it now. Just gotta wait. Can we schedule something so that I set aside the time that’s necessary to meet with you? Maybe in the afternoon, or tomorrow?’ So I’m very…our communication is very open and that’s what we both expect from one another, to be open.

D: Okay. Is it usually face-to-face…

L: Mmhmm, yeah. She...she does more...we...because she’s here its easier to just either call her on the phone, intercom her, or go to her cube and talk with her, or she just comes to my office, and then, its just usually follow-up emails about, like, key points that we discuss that’s sent back to her.

D: You folks communicate through emails?

L: Yeah, so that follow-up email

D: Okay.

L: Yeah.

D: Okay, um...are there activities that you engage in with your employees during work...

L: Like...

D: besides, like, meetings, or just brief communications? Like, some kind of activities where you would be working on something together, um, for kind of like a longer time period?
L: Um, like planning?

D: Yeah.

L: Yeah. So like we...one of the projects she has to work on is a diabetes awareness project. So we meet to discuss how the game plan will be for an event, and that usually is how we work.

D: Okay.

L: And then, like, most of the time, or sometimes, our staff is really good about, um, having lunches together. So we’ll have lunch in the back in the kitchen together, or have our breaks together. So, you know, I try to...I try to make the time to do that with every staff member at least once a month to, just you know, take that outside of work time, but still getting paid for it yeah? Lunches, and uh, breaks and stuff.

D: Okay. Do you do things with them, like, outside of work time?

L: Not particularly with Fem. Some of my other staff members I do, but not...not with her.

D: Okay, um, would you say you know Fem pretty well on a personal level?

L: Um, well it’s kind of a dynamic where it’s a...I don’t think well, I know enough about her to know when there’s a problem or if there’s a problem at home. I know enough about her to know when she’s not doing well health-wise.

D: Mmm.

L: Yeah, not, you know...I don’t need to know everything about my staff, but I know enough about them to know what the key points are, or what’s going on with them in their life and if they’re having a bad day.

D: Okay
L: Mmmm.

D: Do you know their family and friends?

L: Yeah, so I’ve met, I’ve been able to meet, like, her spouse and her... some of her
children, grandchildren...

D: Okay.

L: Yeah.

D: Have you ever spent time with them, any of them, at all?

L: No... no.

D: Um, if it’s okay, could you tell me any type of story about Fern?

L: Okay... um [laughs]... let’s see... what kind of story though?

D: Any kind of personal story... um...

L: Oh, okay... so um, Fern has, uh, she has dogs, and a couple of months ago one of her
dogs got very sick. And so she had called me early that morning to let me know that her
and her husband had to make a decision about what to do with the dog, and... and uh, they
needed to do it when the grandson was out of the house, ‘cause the grandson was
very, uh, close to the dog.

D: Oh.

L: And I told her, ‘Well, you know, Fern, whatever you need to do, go ahead and do it,
and that’s fine, and we’ll just... we’ll just work something out. We’ll figure out your
schedule later. You, you know, you have health fairs coming up that could count towards
your time, and we’ll just figure it out later.’ So Fern said that was fine, and so she,
um... she went ahead and sent the grandson off to school and prepared the dog and took
the dog to, um... I believe it was UH. Um, she took the dog to UH to euthanize the dog.
And then, um, and then I told her, you know, don’t come back to work, ‘cause it’s not…you know, you’re going to have to process, and go through some type of grieving, so just ahead and go home and we’ll talk more later. So she was really good. She kept me posted. She said, ‘Okay, we just dropped our grandson off. We’re going home to pick up the dog,’ and then, ‘We’re going to be on our way. It’ll take us about an hour to get to the university to drop the dog off,’ and stuff. So she did all those things, and she just kept me informed all the way through, which, you know, on a not so good day, its not good to persistently call me, but other than that its fine! But, you know…and I’m just very appreciative that she thought enough to keep me informed about what was going on and that she didn’t leave me out of the loop, um, so that was, I think that was very considerate of her to do.

D: Yeah.

L: Yeah.

D: Okay. What are some positive things about your relationship with her?

L: Um, I think one of the most positive things is that open communication, that I can yell at her and she won’t take it personally and she can yell at me and I know not to take it personally, and our relationship, if someone were to look in from the outside, they would think, ‘Oh my god, your, like, harassing your employee!’ And we really aren’t. You know, we know when to draw the line and when to take things seriously. We have a good enough relationship to know when we’re playing. And I think that’s one of the good things about both of us is that we know each other well enough to distinguish those things, where other people wouldn’t know that at all. Yeah.
D: I wish I could do that, like, even with my family! [both laugh] Not take things personally.

L: Yeah, so we agree and a lot of my other staff, too. They’re...we know when to take it...we know not to take anything personally, because it’s not...we’re not saying it to you to hurt you, we’re saying it to get it off of us. You know, and that’s all it is. And so I think that’s one of the best things about the staff that I currently oversee, is that we can be like this, and that we can work well with one another, and we can tell you how it is straightforward and not have to, you know, butter it up, or whatever, you know.

D: Yeah, that’s good.

L: Yeah.

D: Um...what are some negative things about your relationship with her?

L: Um, I think just her persistence...um, can be...for me it can be very...a negative thing, because especially when it’s grant writing season, and our timeline to get a grant in goes from a whole, a full month down to, like, three weeks. And then it gets cut even further because one whole week is spent, um, up at the level of the executive director’s trying to figure out everything that’s in the plan or the proposal, and then it comes down to me and by the time it comes down to me, it cuts my time down even shorter, so she needed to realize that, you know, I just can’t be bothered at the specific time at the year when it’s grant writing season, so...yeah.

D: Okay, um, how in your recollection did your relationship progress with Fern?

L: You know, it’s interesting, cause I had actually wanted to hire her a while back, and she had…wasn’t able to come on board to [removed agency name] so we just, we just kind of tucked her away and said if an opportunity ever arose in the future, we would call
her up, and there was a time where we were down outreach workers and we could hire
her, and it was a perfect time for her. And so we were able to pick her up. And I think just
being able to um, meet with her, and...in the past, and then meet with her now, and then
bring her on board, that helped with building our relationship, because I already knew
what her background was in. And, in fact there was another staff member, um, that we
did the same thing, and the relationship, and their commitment to us is stronger. Um,
they’re committed to staying with us, they’re committed to working with us, and they
don’t take anything personally. And they just...they work really well.

D: Were you already friends before...

L: No...it was just...she had actually responded to, uh, an ad that we had placed in the
newspaper, but she just couldn’t come in at all at the time, cause she was, um, working
for another agency at the time trying to do eligibility stuff, so she...it was difficult for her
to come to the appointment. And I thought, ‘oh my god, this girl...this lady doesn’t ever
want to work for me!’ So I thought, ‘oh, well.’ But she was really good about following
up with us and telling us, you know, ‘I’m really busy today, but I’m still very interested
in your agency, um, you know, but I don’t think I could take the job at this time. Could
you call be if you have a future opening?’ And sure enough, there was a future opening
that happened, and she was able to come on board. So she’s been with us for about a year
now.

D: Oh, okay.

L: Yeah. Yeah, so it took us about nine months to get her on board.

D: Wow.

L: Yeah, so I think it was both ends, persistence on her end and on our end to get her.
D: Okay, um, how are we doing on time?
L: Oh, we’re fine.
D: Okay…So was there an orientation for her?
L: Yeah, um, most of our staff who are…have about a month orientation, and the
orientation is divided up to ten days of, like, in-services and then ten days of fieldwork.
So that’s another time when I’m able to build relationships with staff, especially new
staff, because most of those ten days of in-services are spent with me going over program
structure, agency structure, the history of the agency, as well as all of our policies that
pertain to program stuff, so…yeah.
D: Okay…um…are there any stories about Fern that you would just never forget?
L: Hmm. You know, nothing comes to my mind right now. She’s never done, like,
anything out of the ordinary. Yeah…well…she just told me she that she went to the Big
Island this past weekend and she lost her ID…her drivers license…and they just finally
sent it back I guess. I guess she lost it at the airport and Hawaiian Airlines had sent it
back over to Honolulu’s ticket counter, so that was kind of funny. It’s like, ‘What did you
do?’ She’s like, ‘Yeah, I don’t have my driver’s license!’ We’re like, ‘Oh my God, please
don’t tell me you’re driving, cause that’s just not a good thing.’
D: [laughs] Um…let’s see…I’m going to try and skip through some of these cause
there’s a lot of questions. How would you say your relationship with Fern compares to
other relationships, with your other staff?
L: I think with Fern, because we can be open and honest, and we know not to take
anything personal, that’s a good thing. But with some of the other staff, because they’re
newer, I can’t…I don’t have that type of relationship with them. Um…there’s one of
my...well actually, the newest staff member...she’s quite quirky, and I still haven’t figured out how she thinks, how she reacts to things, and...and, I just don’t know her well enough to play around. You know, like, to be very casual, in conversations with her. So its very...that the relationship there is different, and its building, so it’s going to take some time to build. And as outgoing as she is, it’s just hard to understand how she works.

And, um, she did an inservice for us last month, and you kind of got to see some of her personality, but it was like, oh my God, I wonder if she’s going to be like this with to our community. You know, very, like, “No, sit down! You got the wrong answer...sit down!” She’s just very blunt. And it’s like, oh, I don’t know if that’s going to work. You know, it’ll work for us, because we know we’re playing, but I don’t know if it’ll work for our community, so I have to observe her and see how she interacts with community versus how she interacts with staff.

D: Um...what are some things that you do with all of your staff?

L: Hmm...other than eat...we eat well together...[laughs]...we do do that at least once a month. Um...as a whole we do that. Yeah.

D: What are some things you only do with certain people?

L: Um, some people, like will come over for, um, weekend get-togethers, or I’ll go out with some staff on the weekend, but not with everybody.

D: Okay.

L: Yeah.

D: Do you feel like you need to act differently towards every person?

L: No, I don’t think I have to...uh...I think it’s, uh, I think I react or interact with people the way who I am as a person, and I don’t think it, uh, that it needs to be different with
each person. Um, although when you’re building a relationship, you just need to kind of
tfigure the person out, but still stay within your boundaries. So like, if we interact on the
weekends, we know the weekend stuff is weekend stuff, it’s personal time. Personal time
is not company time. But, when you’re coming to work, we know that, you know, even
though we just spent the weekend together, we know that there’s a line, and yeah we can
talk about it, but don’t, you know, whatever was discussed over the weekend doesn’t
really get discussed in the office...at least openly in the office. It might be discussed
behind closed doors and stuff, but yeah...

D: Okay. Um...what does the reward system look like here for the employees?
L: Hmm...you know, we don’t...we...that’s something that had come up in our strategic
plan. And we did the strategic plan about a year ago now. And, um, we don’t really have
a reward system here. Um, some of the thoughts, when we were brainstorming for the
plan, was to do...um...like, uh...gift certificates, or...um...reward staff on a quarterly
basis for attainment of goals, but we really don’t have any of that. And, and, you know,
partly is that it helps, it really helps build staff morale.

D: Mmhmm.
L: It, it shows the staff that we appreciate what they do. But, you have to be able to sell
that to the entire administration team. Even thought the board loves it, it’s, it’s more the
administration team that has to allot money for it, decide what it is, decide the structure,
and since that doesn’t really fall within, it doesn’t fall directly in my purview, it falls
under the operations manager’s purview, because she is not only a supervisor, but she’s
also human resource.

D: Oh.
L: Yeah.

D: Okay...Do you feel like you're able to provide enough resources for everybody to do their jobs?

L: Um, I think within the past year, we have been. We’ve been able to make sure that all staff members have access to, uh, a computer, whether it be a laptop or a PC. We also determine the need. Like, if the client...if a person is mobile, then maybe the need is that they have a portable versus a PC. So...yeah. I think the other important thing is to make sure that staff have the right tools. So...um...making sure that their space is...has...adequate desktop space, because I have a person that processes all of our data sets, and so he needs to make sure that he has enough space. And then I have a research assistants, who, one, will see clients here, so he needs to have privacy taken care of. The other one won’t so she doesn’t really need a bigger space, she just needs a space to do her work, and stuff, so...yeah.

D: Okay, um...if you don’t mind, could you tell me if there was a performance evaluation for Fem?

L: Um, yes.

D: There was?

L: There was. Mmhhmm. Um, we do our, um, performance appraisals, um, yearly. So we’ll be doing another set in July. We usually try to match it to our grant system, and then when a person is hired, we do one at three and six months.

D: Um...do you think the expectations for her were clear?

L: Yes. We...that’s one of the things that we cover in our orientation, is...this is...everybody functions...most people here function underneath our primary source of
funding, which is the Bureau of Primary Health Care. And within that grant we have, um, they call it care planning, but it’s not. It’s an action plan. And it tells the staff exactly what the goals are for the grant year, how many clients that a whole agency is responsible for obtaining, and then they get down to the individual level. So, everybody’s provided a copy of that upon orientation. And then yearly, um, in August or September.

D: Okay, okay. Um...how would you describe Fern’s personal performance at work?

L: I think she has areas of improvement. Um...especially when it comes to, um, employee interaction. A lot of the employees, um, take offense to her, because she’s very blunt, and she’s a very stern person when you look at her. So your not...you know, you don’t know if she’s playing or if she’s being very serious or not. But, and then her tone can be, um, mistaken. Um, but, when she works with clients, she is...the tone is different. And it’s very interesting to see her interact at the client level, and then see her interact with staff. So...

D: Oh.

L: Yeah.

D: Okay. Uh, just overall, in general, what do you think are the qualities of an ideal employee.

L: Hmm...I think an ideal employee, um, is flexible, because in an agency such as this non-profit, you have to be flexible. You have to be able to, uh, go with the flow. Um, you also have to be open-minded, and willing to...willing to take that next step...willing to learn as much as you can, and then the only way you truly learn something is to then teach somebody else. And I think that that’s what would make up a good employee.

D: What are the qualities of a not so ideal employee?
L: Hmm...I think a person who comes to this agency and has...uh...is not well informed of what our purpose is. Um...we’ve hired people in the past, who thought all their job was...they were hired under one job title, but their only job was to, uh, dictate to other people what to do. And, and to me, that’s not...that’s not a good thing. Not to take the title as it is, but it’s just a title and that’s all it is, and within that title you have all these responsibilities and you work well with other people.

D: Okay...what are the qualities of an effective employee?

L: Mmm...I think somebody who knows how to prioritize, who has good time management skills, who is organized...uh...and can think on their feet.

D: Okay, how about an ineffective employee.

L: Those who are not organized...

D: [laughs]

L: [laughs]...don’t have time management, and who can’t think on their feet. Yeah.

D: Okay. Okay. What are the qualities of an employee that you could easily get along with?

L: Hmm. I think...I don’t really...haven’t...I haven’t had that issue come up before. I’m trying to think back on my past job experience...I think someone that’s just open, that’s willing to work with other people, that doesn’t come off as being nosy, but just comes off as wanting to learn. I work well with those types of people. Um...yeah.

D: Okay, what about...what types of people do you not get along with?

L: The nosy type.

D: The nosy type.

L: Yeah, and those who think that they’re...that...who don’t know their place. Yeah.
D: Okay. Okay. How has your work environment contributed, or not contributed to your development?

L: Not contributed? ... you know, this job... unfortunately, everything about this job has contributed to personal growth. So like, when I first came to [agency], they knew that my background in grad school was similar public health, or a master’s in public health, but, and I had a lot of course work on proposal writing and stuff like that, so when I came, they sent me still to more proposal writing courses, but it was a benefit, because it was different types of proposal writing, and in… and in college we didn’t cover the various types. We only covered one style, which was foundation writing, but when I went to these different workshops I got to learn about federal grants, research grants, uh, foundation grants specific to Hawaii only, not to the broader mainland spectrum. So they, they encouraged me to go to these classes. They encouraged me to go to this non-profit business certificate course at KCC, but it doesn’t... it never complimented, uh, my schedule, so I couldn’t do that.

D: Oh, interesting.

L: Yeah.

D: I don’t even have... I don’t have no familiarity with, like foundational...

L: Really?

D: writing, yeah...

L: Yeah, it’s different. It’s a different style of writing.

D: Really?

L: Yeah, yeah.

D: Now, what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?
L: Can you define interpersonal relationships for me?

D: Um... just relationships with other people... like personal...

L: So like colleagues?

D: Yeah, or personal relationships... like, what are the characteristics of that relationship...

L: Okay.

D: ... that, you know, provides a foundation for it?

L: I think communication is important, and um, always being honest with the person, and if you have a problem to just tell them that, what it is, be very straightforward.

D: Okay. How do you view yourself ethnically?

L: How do I define myself, ethnically?

D: Yeah.

L: Um, I define myself as a Hawaiian-Chinese... uh, German, Irish, Scottish, and English person. So I’m a person of many ethnicities. Um... my family always told me when I was younger, ‘You are primarily Hawaiian, but yet you are Chinese, and, and you are also all these other things, because our families intermarried when... you know, back in the day.’ And I said, ‘Oh, okay.’ But... and... and growing up, we were, even in grade school, we, um, in grade school we always identified ourselves as what are we ethnically, so... yeah.

D: What would you... view Ferns ethnicity as?

L: Um, Portuguese.

D: Okay. Um... what do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?
L: I think it, um, broadens our view. Um, I think one of the most interesting things that I learned when I lived in California for many years was that, as diverse as San Francisco was, everybody was compartmentalized. So all the Russians lived in this neighborhood, all the Chinese lived in this neighborhood, all the French lived in this neighborhood. And you could see that evidence left behind years and generations later, where there’s a French hospital, there’s the Russian, um, churches, and you know exactly where all these communities were...lived. But in Hawaii, you...you live next door to somebody that’s totally different...different from you ethnically. You know, and you...and you interact with them, and you work with them, and you...you share with them, and I think that’s one of the unique things about living in Hawaii, is that we’re very ethnically diverse, and we share...we love to share our culture, we love to share our heritage, and I think that’s what makes working here unique, is that, even though this is a Hawaiian agency, we...we don’t only employ Hawaiians. We employ people of many ethnic backgrounds, and...and we share with each other. Every year around Chinese New Year, we celebrate Chinese New Year with eating gau and jai, and you know, traditional foods, and we have potluck, and we get to know each other on that level – what’s...what’s your...what’s your sign, and is it going to be a good year or a bad year for you. And then, you know, we share all those things, and we try to watch out for one another throughout the year. So, yeah, I think that’s one of the...one of the things I always look forward to every year, is Chinese New Year’s here.

D: Okay. Would you say you have a good quality relationship with Fern?

L: Yes, I do.
D: Okay. On a scale from, let’s say, you’re strangers, to like a really good mature relationship…maybe from 1 to 10.

L: It’s like about a 9.

D: Okay. Mmm…do you feel like racial or gender issues are sensitive?

L: For here?

D: Yeah.

L: Um, I think when we had the [name] project, there was…there was a sensitivity issue, about how do you…a lot of things that I got when that team of workers weren’t here was how do we refer to them? Are they a ‘she’, are they a ‘he?’ How do we address them? And I…and the best advice I could give anybody is, you address them however they want to be addressed. So if they introduce themselves as ‘so and so,’ then that’s how you address them. And even if they’re in transition, and they still introduce themselves as such, you have to…you have to respect that, and call them by that name.

D: Mmm.

L: So, that was one of the issues that was always something within our agency.

D: Mmm, okay.

[moved on to questionnaire]
D: Okay, my first question is, “Tell me about your work.”

F: I have some really exciting projects here at [removed agency name].

D: Okay.

F: Um...what I do is I offer health care...to individuals.

D: Okay.

F: Um...and beyond health care, it depends on the individual, and each person has a different need, um...that I become in contact with. I do two different programs completely different from each other.

D: Okay.

F: And, um...one is for illness...specifically for specific illness, and one is for...a kind of people...based on nationality.

D: Oh, okay.

F: The projects are exciting, because you do...you assess need...it’s all about need. Could be anywhere from health care to a bus pass to...um, needing just, maybe social...um, maybe just social...evaluation from a social worker...

D: Mmhmm.

F: ...counseling, that sort of thing. The program is exciting. Um, I believe I have one of the most exciting programs. Um, I have a lot of help from outside with my employees. Um, we work together as a team...um, so I’m able to refer within the company if I need
to. I can refer to outside the company by using resources. Um...I’m sorry, what was the
general question?

D: So...um...[interrupted last statement]

F: Go ahead.

D: So you have employees under you too?

F: I do not...I pretty much work alone on my projects, but if I need help of other
departments, then I can request...um, for them to intervene, with um, servicing my client.

D: Oh, okay.

F: So then, um, it wouldn’t be employees under me, it would be as team work, which I’m
really big on. Um, and I think some people have a hard time swallowing that, because I
am team effort all the way.

D: Mmmhm, mmhmm. Yeah Lancer was telling me about, like, how the...it’s all
structured and it’s a really big organization you guys have yeah?

F: Mmmhm.

D: A lot of different departments, and...

F: And outer islands as well.

D: Oh.

F: So we can use outer islands to help us.

D: Oh.

F: Um, we have...I call it sister companies, on Maui, Kauai, and Big Island, and also on
Molokai. So if we have clients that came to Oahu for help...with health care, because we
have the best health care on Oahu...so if they came here for services, the outer islands
would use us.
F: Or if I had somebody who was living here but going move to an outer island, then I can use them.

D: Oh.

F: So we can keep it...the Native Hawaiians can always be serviced by our Native Hawaiian system.

D: Yeah, oh okay. Okay, um...what would be, like, a typical day in the office for you?

F: Um, a typical day never is the same. It’s always different. Um, you have to pretty much be prepared for...um...anything that can happen. You could be...your day could be planned to just do intakes, meaning um, one-on-one client intake, clients needs, assessing needs, and this could change by the Executive Director or higher ups needing um, for you to be at a meeting, that you totally did not plan for. Um, and so, um, you need to be versatile. And this could be anywhere from at, uh, the State Capitol to the Department of Health, and I think this keeps you on your toes, um, puts variety in your work, makes you want to come to work every day.

D: Oh.

F: Cause there’s always variety.

D: Yeah.

F: Um, and so this does happen, nah, I wouldn’t say daily, but it does happen, and you gotta be prepared for this, where you can just pick up and go, and be able to do your appointments as well.

D: Oh, okay. Yeah, that sounds like its...

F: Its fun.
D: ...it interesting, yeah?

F: Yeah.

D: Not the monotonous day-to-day kind of work, yeah?

F: Yeah, go to your desk, sit down, do the same thing every day.

D: That’s kind of what I do [laughs].

F: Yeah.

D: I need more variety in my work. Uh, so how long have you been working here?

F: I’ve been here for a year and two months.

D: A year and two months. Okay, and what would you say lead you to this type of work and with this employer?

F: Um...I’ll try and make my story really short.

D: Okay.

F: I have numerous years in health care, um, anywhere from doing medical insurance to dental insurance to, uh, patient advocate, which is pretty much what I do now. I’m a patient advocate, in a sense still...that never leaves you...case manager, and project coordinator, that’s my title.

D: Okay.

F: Um...what led me to do the work here at [removed agency name] was because I had a background in it. I did medical and dental previously. I probably have about, maybe 15 years of, um, experience in medical and dental.

D: Okay.

F: I like the one-on-one. I like to do, um, one-on-one services with people...face-to-face. Um, that’s what led me here is because I always did it, and I started from insurance,
which we would do on... which I basically did on the phone, and I worked for big companies like Hawaii Dental Service...

D: Oh.

F: ...and Aloha Care, um... and so doing Native Hawaiian health care was something I hadn’t done and is something I wanted to do.

D: Oh, okay.

F: Yes.

D: Okay, tell me about some of your experiences with your coworkers... like what do you think of them... you know, how do get along with them and stuff?

F: Mmm. Um, my coworkers... everybody is different here in every way – personality, nationality, background, uh, professionally, and work experience – we’re all different. So, it’s like having this big fruitbowl with numerous kinds of fruit in it, and everyone’s gotta fit into this bowl. And, I came in with a positive outlook to this company, knowing from the very beginning, I’m not Native Hawaiian, but I was willing to give it a try and to see what I could do for the Native Hawaiians. Um, I’ve been born and raised here. I think the most interesting thing is working with people with different nationalities, different professions, different backgrounds, and different outlooks, and being able to respect, understand and to learn from others. I... think ... I get along with everyone professionally quite well. But because we’re so different, we’ll always have differences.

D: Mmm.

F: But that’s part of...

D: Yeah.

F: ... that’s part of adults in a professional world.
D: Yeah.

F: Um, and I think that’s what makes the challenge everyday, is everybody being different, cause if we were all the same, then it would be boring.

D: Yeah.

F: Yeah.

D: Yeah...okay...can you draw me an organizational chart showing um, like your area, and the people you kind of work with?

F: Mhm. Sure.

D: I think that might be different from Lancer’s.

F: Yeah. [drawing]

D: That’s the Executive Director [indicating on drawing]?

F: Yeah. Executive Director, Administrator Director, Project...Director, I think.

D: Okay.

F: I would work under her.

D: ‘Kay.

F: [continues drawing]

D: Research team?

F: I missed a block.

D: Oh, that’s okay.

F: Clinical...

D: Okay.

F: Project Coordinator, research team...

D: Okay.
F: Oh, data entry...I don’t...I think maybe too many boxes.

D: Okay.

F: But that’s where it would be. And then, did you need me to fill in...?

D: Um, wherever if you, like, work with other people...

F: Yes.

D: ...maybe, like, the connections you have with other people.

F: ‘Kay, so under her would be, um...outreach...and fitness trainers...and, um, traditional healing.

D: Do you work with all of those different groups?

F: Yes.

D: Oh, okay.

F: And the reason I would work with all groups...and the reason is, is because project coordinating and case management would more than likely go under clinical, and project coordinating would go under, um, its kind of a confusion in this area about the project coordinating. Um, but it’s basically because of one of the programs I work with. But its to organize, um, community events...

D: Oh, okay.

F: ...and to give health education at these community events.

D: Uh huh.

F: And so therefore, I would need outreach...

D: Mmm.

F: My outreach workers are very important, and fitness trainers, because we...the fitness trainers make the community healthy, and traditional healing, because if we’re working
with Native Hawaiians, sometimes not into the everyday... you know, the regular physician...

D: Yeah.

F: They only want traditional healing, like um, La’aulapa’au, and um, lomilomi.

D: Yeah.

F: So it would come from our traditional healing.

D: Okay.

F: My projects, also...I...I need them a lot, is my clinical team, which is my social workers, dietician, my nurse, and our physician here.

D: Okay.

F: So that is where clinical...I...so...this, my position, I feel, works with everyone. So it’s really important to be a team.

D: Yeah.

F: But when everyone’s different, as I explained to you early on in our conversation, sometimes it becomes difficult, because we’re all so different, we all have different backgrounds, we all have different ideas of what may be an individual need, or what a project will need...

D: Yeah...

F: ...and so I think that I have a difficult job because I have to work...

D: Coordinate...

F: Right, different needs, different ideas. Everybody, um...It’s kind of a fun job, too, because you’re always involved with just about everybody...

D: Yeah.
F: ...and when you’re involved with everybody, sometimes you, um, sometimes it
difficult because you’ve got to meet everyone else’s schedules...

D: Yeah.

F: You gotta hope everyone can come together to pull off a certain event, uh, cause
everybody’s different, everybody’s got different schedules, times, events...um...

D: Wow.

F: So, I think that makes the project coordinating a little different because you
gotta...you gotta hope that everybody can be in one place at the same time. Yeah. It
doesn’t always work that way. You get some bickering and everyone has different ideas,
and you gotta be open to ideas. Um, I haven’t had...I think...when I first started at
[removed agency name], um, I was an outreach worker. I found that to be one of my
easiest positions because all I had to worry about was making sure my clients’
needs...clients’ needs were met.

D: Mmm.

F: Medically, financially, and resources-making sure that I help them. If I couldn’t help
them, I couldn’t help them, but...and if we couldn’t help them here at [removed agency
name] we would refer them out...

D: Mmm.

F: ...through other resources. But I think this job as a project coordinator and case
manager has been my most challenging because I have to...I don’t work by myself.
Technically, I need every team member to be a part of my accomplishments, and so it
makes it harder.
D: Okay. Um, okay...um...so when you have to get everyone involved in something, um, like, what is that like? Do you guys have mostly meetings to try and work things out, or...

F: Um, basically, um, the way we do it here is...an event is usually...um, how can I put it? It's um, an event is chosen within a community, and approved by the Executive Directors, the Administrative Director, and by Lancer.

D: Okay.

F: And therefore they will choose a team player to head that project. Um, we need to have approval from all three higher...um, higher management, and then they will designate the person to coordinate, or become the coordinator of that event. Um, I'm sorry I got off track...what was your...your question?

D: And, um, so when...say you have to coordinate something, like, how would you go about coordinating that?

F: Well first of all, most importantly, is you need approval to enter a community with a project.

D: Okay.

F: Um, once you have approval, and you’ve been deemed the coordinator of that event, then you would coordinate with your other departments. As I mentioned: outreach, fitness, clinical, my dietician, and all of them-whoever matches that event that we are going to go to. Sometimes we do health screening, and we do, um, health education. So that’s really important to have everyone.

D: Okay.

F: Um, that’s generally how you would do it. So, my job is very team effort.
D: Mmm. Do you guys, um, like, brainstorm, or...do you guys kind of...

F: Um, pretty much we bring our own styles. It would be nice to brainstorm before an event...

D: Uh huh.

F: ...but we don’t do that generally. Pretty much what we do is...which I really think that would be the ideal thing to do is to brainstorm before any event, because that makes team...team effort. That makes a non-failing project, when you have brainstorming before hand, because you get all your different ideas, yeah?

D: Yeah.

F: Technically, because everyone is from different sites, different positions, has different schedules, we never know where we’re going to be...um, each individual is pretty much off on their own schedule.

D: Mmhmm.

F: It’s hard for us to come together before an event as a team.

D: Oh, okay.

F: So we show up at our events, loaded with all the information we need, and let me tell you, we come with boxes and crates, and some people come with nothing at all and just depend on the other person to bring everything. We come with tables and chairs and bottles...water bottles, and....when people bring their stuff, they’re like, ‘Wow, they get plenty stuff.’ But that’s what makes an event happen is what each person brought to a project.

D: Okay.
F: It would be the ideal thing to meet beforehand. I wish we could do that, but unfortunately our schedules don’t allow us to, but I think that if we did, we would have less disagreements and more organization. We’d be, like, shining out there in the community if we could meet before. But I think in the end it becomes very positive because everybody brings what they have from their profession and who they are as individuals. We come together, we put our materials together usually in a booth or on tables, depending on where we are, cause we do it at parks, the Blaisdell, at hotels, wherever the events are, and I can honestly tell you that we do stand out, and we’re a very friendly team, so we have good outcomes.

D: Mmm, okay. So, like, leading up to an event, would you normally be just one-on-one with each person, since you can’t meet all together? Would it be kind of like, you just talk to each person individually?

F: Not always.

D: No?

F: Not always. Sometimes. It depends on what the moods are of each individual. Maybe somebody may not want to work with you at all, so they communicate with other people instead. And that’s fine. If you’re lucky maybe you can get information from one of the other people of what the other person is bringing.

D: Oh, okay.

F: So being a project coordinator it’s important...it is important...to get along with everyone, but that isn’t the true world.

D: Mmm.

F: Because everybody’s different.
D: Yeah.

F: I think you need to be tolerable. You have to tolerate.

D: Yeah.

F: And um, you can kind of learn information through others, through the grapevine, sort of thing. Yeah?

D: Mmm.

F: ‘Oh do you know what so-and-so is bringing so that we’re not duplicating?’ Or if you make a list of what everybody’s bringing, then you look at your list and you go, ‘Okay, this is what’s missing.’ And then fill in that space. Like, okay, someone forgot the cooler with the water bottles or, you know, somebody forgot to order lunch, or...that sort of thing. And then just silently behind the scenes fill in the spots.

D: Yeah. okay. Um, how would you say your relationships with each person you work with differ from each other?

F: It differs...a lot. Um...this has been the most challenging position that I’ve had, and I...it...I pretty much work alone. Um, since I’ve taken this position, I’m kind of an outsider. I’m still the same person, I have the same name, but my positions changed, but I’m addressed differently. Um...I don’t know why, I...but as I’ve been told that I’m not the only one who feels that way, and prior people before me felt the same way.

D: Oh, the nature of the...

F: Position.

D: ...position, yeah.

F: Yes. And people, um...yeah, it’s a very challenging position.

D: Mmm. So some people, would you say, you get along more with than other people?
F: I think I would get along more with outreach...

D: Okay.

F: ...than I do with clinical, cause clinical is really at the top of the heap, cause they’re the professionals. Um, I’m not saying that outreach isn’t, because everyone’s a professional in their field. Like, clinical cannot do what outreach does and outreach cannot do what clinical does.

D: Yeah.

F: But, I think the most difficult would be clinical, and the easiest people to work with is outreach because they constantly have people contact.

D: Yeah. Okay, um, how well do you know your co-workers on a personal level?

F: Um, I think I know my coworkers pretty well on a personal level, when we have one-on-one time, private time. Um, I think we share about our families and who we are as individuals. And as far as who we are as individuals, we’re very good about explaining that. If we have dislikes or likes, we’re sure to say so. [Removed agency name], because we’re all so mixed, um, we’re all so different, we verbally tell each other exactly what’s on our minds and how we feel.

D: Okay.

F: So you have to be open.

D: Do you get together with anyone outside of work?

F: Uh...

D: Of your coworkers?

F: No. I do not.

D: Okay.
F: On a personal basis you mean?
D: Yeah.
F: No, I do not. And I like to keep it that way.
D: Okay.
F: I do travel with coworkers. My job has, um, enabled me to travel far and near, so outer islands and, like, to the mainland. And um, other than being with them on that level, because it’s work related, I don’t…that’s the only time I ever go outside of work and spend days on end with them, like a week at a time.
D: Yeah, yeah.
F: But that’s the only time. And it’s not…it gets personal sometimes, but work is…it’s only work related.
D: Yeah.
F: Yeah.
D: Okay. Um…Tell me about some of your experiences with Lancer.
F: Um…
D: Anything you want to share.
F: Sure. Um…I respect her immensely because she has um, her background and her schooling is…her education is…is very admirable…all that she’s accomplished for her age. She’s very young. Um, it’s every person’s dream to do what Lancer has done. Well, anybody in medical, I think, in the clinical field. Um, she’s warm, she listens. She doesn’t always agree with me, I don’t always agree with her, but again that goes back to individuality.
D: Mmhmm.
F: Um, I think she’s fair. Um, and I’m the type of person that fairness is, as I told you early on in, that fairness is very important to me, and if you’re not fair, you’ll know. If I feel...and it’s never...I’m not self centered either...I’m not, I believe...I believe I’m not self centered, um, but if I feel like I’m being mistreated, or not treated fairly, I will come and I will tell you straight out. And I no need one meeting for tell you. I’ll knock on your door and tell you.

D: Yeah.

F: Because it has to be addressed. We work with people one-on-one, with the general public, so your mind and feelings, you must always be in balance, which is called pono, and that’s something that’s...that we all learn about here, because we’re Native Hawaiian health care. Being pono with ourselves and with everyone else is very important. If you cannot be pono then you cannot do your work. And I shared that in one of our meetings—um, sharing your light, because when your light is dim, then eventually down the line, it will get dark.

D: Yeah.

F: And, sure everybody not going be bright and sunny everyday, but you should be because you working with other people with health needs. You cannot go to somebody who’s all gloomy, hate their job, and gotta come in, ‘Huh! I gotta be here today!’ If so, you shouldn’t even come in. Call in sick, take a vacation, whatever. But, um, I believe that Lancer understands that about me, and I think she allows me to practice that to a limit, but she understands that about me.

D: Okay. How often do you see her?

F: Every day.
D: Okay, and how long do you get to spend with her when you see her?

F: Probably more than she wants to [laughs]. Um, I’m always addressing her everyday.

It’s important for me to let her know where I am with my work, how I feel about my feelings during the day. If somebody irritated me, I’ll be sure to tell her, whether it may be a coworker, or a client, or... or if I have a concern... um, am I treating my client properly, did I give them the utmost care, did I forget about something... I will always go to her. Um, I prefer to go straight to my superior than to my coworkers to ask for advice, because otherwise you got the blind leading the blind.

D: Mmm.

F: Yeah?

D: Yeah.

F: I mean, I’m not saying that I don’t trust my coworkers’ input, but Lancer has higher education, she’s my supervisor, and that’s why I go to her. That’s her position. She’s my guidance, so, um, I think that kind of explains how I feel about her.

D: Okay, um, is there different ways that you communicate with her? Like email, phone, interpersonal... is there...

F: Um, I’m trying to use email a little bit more.

D: Okay.

F: And I think she would prefer that as well.

D: Okay.

F: But I do like the one-on-one, because... in health care... and I’ve worked for big firms... um, I’ve worked for Queen’s Medical Center as well... you can do email, because
everybody’s so far apart, the campus, I mean, it’s huge, you know, you got people way over there, and you got people way across the other side...

D: Yeah.

F: ...um, some people are actually downtown Merchant Street that you actually is part of Queen’s, so you have to email.

D: Yeah.

F: But, I’m...and I don’t know if I’m old school, but I believe that if you’re in the same office, email is very impersonal.

D: Yeah.

F: Why can’t you meet with somebody, they’re too busy?

D: Yeah.

F: Or because they’re so way up there they cannot have a meeting with you?

D: Yeah.

F: So if someone was to tell me to send them an email, and we’re face to face now, I’d be offended by that.

D: Oh.

F: ...or if they say, you know what, call my phone and leave a message. For me, I would think that they’re telling me, ‘I don’t want to have to deal with you one-on-one, so just use the other alternatives.’

D: Yeah.

F: It has happened, and because we’re all so busy, we have different projects, and we’re coming and going, we have different schedules, it has happened, but it does bother me.

D: Mmm.
F: Um, and enough of that. I think it would turn me off not to want to be here. Because
we work with people, and in order to work with people, you better have a one-on-one
from all levels, from higher management, to the person who transports somebody.
D: Yeah.
F: You know. Um, maybe that’s just me, I don’t know.
D: Even my work... because our office is small... and sometimes I’ll... because I’m so
used to emailing other people, and I’ll start emailing my boss. I’m like, ‘He’s right there!
I should just go to his office!’
F: Yeah. Why wouldn’t you?
D: Uh, most times I do. But he’s, like, sometimes he’s busy and he’ll say, ‘Oh, you
know...’
F: ‘Just email me.’
D: Yeah, or ‘Come talk to me later,’ or something. But if there’s... usually we send
documents between each other, too... so if I’m already having to attach something and
send it to him, then I’ll just add a little note there, or something like, you know, ‘We can
talk about this later,’ or something, yeah?
F: Yes.
D: So yeah...email is a strange thing.
F: It can be very impersonal.
D: Yeah, especially when you don’t word things right, people misinterpret it in different
ways, yeah?
F: Yeah. When I do the email thing, I always do it in paper form. It goes in their mailbox,
and I’ll also email them.
D: Oh.
F: I...And it’s just who I am, and I’m old school. I’m, you know, [removed age] years old. If I could, I would do without the computer.
D: Mmm.
F: But we cannot. We need it.
D: Yeah.
F: I’d be lost with it or without it.
D: Yeah. I’d prefer not have computers too, but it’s like you gotta use ‘em, yeah?
F: Yeah.
D: Um...do you get together with Lancer, like, out of work at all?
F: No, not at all. All on a professional level.
D: Okay. Um, what types of...is there any activities that you do with her during work?
Like when you’re both working on something together?
F: Um, yes. There are some projects that, well...all of my projects include her. She always knows what I’m doing. I share my downs and my ups with her about my projects. She’s always included when I address other people about my projects or I need to go to meetings...she is there even if she is not there. I always let people I’m meeting new for the first time, or just old...um, I always let them know that she’s part of me physically being there. I never leave the company unnoticed. I don’t go in as who I am. You know, just as me, the individual. I always make sure that I’m representing the company.
D: Okay. Okay, how well do you know her on a personal level?
F: I do not. I don’t think in the time I’ve spent at [removed agency name] allows me to do that, since it’s only been, what, 14 months? I think, I think it takes longer than 14 months to get to know somebody on a personal level.

D: So, um…do you know anything, like, about her family, or her friends, or anything?

Spend time with any of them?

F: No

D: Okay.

F: I know that she has a sister and a mom. Um, I know her mom goes to my doctor, cause just by chance I saw her mom there and her there one morning.

D: Oh.

F: So I know me and her mom shares the same physician, and more than likely has the same illness, um, cause I’m a diabetic and more than…and I go to see an endocrinologist who specializes in diabetes, so I’m more than sure her mom has diabetes, too.

D: Oh.

F: Um, and I might be wrong but um, that’s the only thing in common that I can think of.

D: Yeah. Oh, okay. Um, if you can think of anything, could you tell me a personal story about Lancer? Any kind of…something you remember about her that you could just tell like a short story about?...It could be personal, it could be, like, work related…Um, maybe some event that happened at work or something.

F: Um, I remember once…um, she sent me out to the North Shore.

D: Okay.

F: Um, and…well I decided to go out to the North Shore, but it was a project that we were both working on, and I was all excited. My position was new, and I was really
excited about going out to the North Shore to...for the day. And I called...we...our normal practice is to call in to the office to say that we’re...okay, we’re on our way out to the designated area. So it’s checking in, yeah? So I called to check in, but I called to tell them that my truck wouldn’t start that morning cause I had...my battery was dead.

D: Oh.

F: But I was so excited and I was counting on doing this all week. And this...if I could get out to the North Shore would enable me to, um, make a successful project. This was the beginning of a project.

D: Oh.

F: And so, I went out, started up my truck, and it wouldn’t start. My battery was dead.

D: Oh no.

F: And I panicked, and I thought, “Aw, how am I going to get to do this?”

D: Yeah.

F: I mean, I’m gonna look like a failure. It’s my first day they do the project, the first day of the project, and already I cannot make it. So I call up my neighbor, and I said, ‘My battery’s...’...I called my husband and my husband works in town and I live in Wahiawa. I said, ‘Can you help me? My battery’s dead.’ And he’s like, ‘No, I’m all the way over here. How am I gonna help you?’ ‘Well can’t you come and pick me up?’ He goes, ‘And then what, you gotta use the car?’ I’m like, ‘Yeah! And maybe you can start the car for me.’ He was like, ‘No, no, I cannot help you.’ So then I called my daughter. She just woke up. It was like 7 o’clock in the morning. She’s like, ‘Mom, I really tired. I had to work late last night.’ She couldn’t help me. So then I called the office and I tell Lancer, ‘My battery’s dead and I don’t know what I’m gonna do, but I tell you what. I
haven't given up. I'll call you back later.' So throughout...anyway, to make a long story
short, my neighbor helps me and she lets me borrow this battery pack.

D: Oh yeah.

F: It’s about like this big. You can start your car by yourself, basically. You just plug it
on, make sure you get 'em positive in, you know, the right place...get back in the car,
crank it up, and it starts.

D: Oh.

F: So I call in to tell her first of all my battery’s dead. Then I call in to tell her, ‘Okay, I
got the battery pack.’ Then for every time I stop, I would call her and tell her, ‘Guess
what? I got it started. Guess what? I got it started.’ And she thought it was really funny.

And I think on the third call...on the third call, she said, ‘Okay, well you know what, you
can just turn around and go home already.’ [laughs]


F: Cause she’s probably like, ‘What? You gonna call me every time you get your car
started?’ But I thought it...to me it was funny. I really don’t know what it was here.

D: Yeah.

F: [???] ‘You know that Fern is driving me crazy!’ But I was all the way on the North
Shore...and you know I’m used to the North Shore cause that’s my home yeah?...um, but
I thought that was funny, did you think that was funny?

D: That’s pretty funny.

F: And...and I think I’m Lancer’s most trying and pesky employee.

D: Oh really?
F: Because I need that one-on-one attention from her. I need to know she’s there for me daily, because why am I doing what I’m doing? Partially... not only to please my clients, but to know that I’m being... I’m being efficient in what I’m doing. Who’s the best person to ask, but your supervisor?

D: Yeah.

F: If she cannot be there for you, to answer even the smallest questions, or for the smallest direction or guidance, in any day, may it be near or far... if I call her from D.C. and say, ‘You know what, I had a bad day here.’ My boss should be able to help me through that.

D: Mmm.

F: Or give me direction. That’s her job. That’s what she gets paid for.

D: Mmm

F: So maybe, yeah. I don’t know, did I go off course? [laughs]

D: So you never got to the North Shore that time?

F: I did, yeah. I got the battery pack. My neighbor, who’s another female... it was all females this day. There was no man involved at all... All the guys I called couldn’t help me, but my female, the female neighbor came... Japanese neighbor... she’s so cool. She’s like, ‘Here! I just bought this!’ I... brand new, still in the bag, and everything. I was like, ‘No I cannot borrow this. This is brand new.’ She goes, ‘Oh no, you take it with you.’ So I... I was like, ‘Wow!’ Got it started.

D: Wow.

F: I went all the way... all the way down North Shore, did all my visits. I had a really positive day...
D: Oh wow.

F: ...but I was real tired. By mid-day, 12 o’clock, I felt like it was 5 o’clock. Because, you know, the excitement, and...

D: So much going on...

F: Yeah, you know...but all in all, it was, you know...you know, I’m a doer.

D: Mmm...okay, I think we have...I’m trying to stick to maybe 45 minutes, so we have time for this...

F: Sure, not a problem.

D: ...so maybe we have like...maybe 7 more minutes left.

F: Okay.

D: So, I’m gonna try and...

F: Whip through?

D: Try and skip through...yeah. Um, what are some positive things about your relationship with Lancer?

F: I think one of the positive things about Lancer and our relationship is that she understands the way I feel about teamwork, and perfection, and being able to satisfy the human need, and that she understands that because of health care.

D: Mmm. Okay, what are some negative things about your relationship with her?

F: Um...openness. I think if she’s dissatisfied, she...she needs to know that she can tell me. I think that’s one of the negative things, is being open...and not afraid to evaluate.

D: Okay. Um, let’s see...I’ll jump to this here...what would you say are five attributes of people that are important to you?

F: I’m sorry, can you clarify that for me?
D: Like, what are five things, um, that are important to you about other people? Like, what stands out as the five main things that you see in someone...

F: Okay...dependability...and not necessarily in this order...dependability, honesty...fairness...I can’t think of anything else.

D: That’s okay. That’s good enough. Um, what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

F: Communication...communication...communication. [laughs]

D: Okay. Um, how do you view yourself and Lancer ethnically...or racially, or ethnically...

F: How we’re different you mean?

D: Yeah, or similar...or how do you see that aspect, like, in your relationship...is it a significant part of it? Is it not significant?

F: I don’t think it’s significant.

D: Okay.

F: We’re both local girls. I think we pretty much come from the same background too. Middle class, you know.

D: Kay. I know we kind of touched on this earlier. What do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

F: Respecting...people’s belief, religion, backgrounds...

D: Mmm. Okay, okay. Would you say you have a high quality relationship with Lancer?

F: I think it’s medium.

D: Okay. Say like on a scale of 1 to 10. Like, one, you’re a stranger, maybe 10 is like a really good relationship.
F: I’d say five.

D: Five, okay. Okay, do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

F: It can be. It can be. I think you need to just...um, as character, strengthen that, and put it behind you, or aside...you as an individual, how you view it...in the beginning, yes, it is an issue, but you learn how to deal with that. It’s you as an individual, how grounded you are.

D: Do you think gender issues are sensitive in the workplace?

F: Absolutely not.

D: Okay. Okay, good. That’s it for that part.
Interview with Ms. Aloha - Employee

June 13, 2006

1:30 – 2:30 pm

D: Okay. First, tell me about your work.

A: Okay. In this particular position, I’m a contract worker with the City and County of Honolulu. Um, I recently started on the end of March. So I’m in the job about 3 months...almost going on 3 months now, and it’s a community block development grant, which means that it’s funded through Housing and Urban Development, um, from the Federal government and then the money is given down to the County, in this case, the County of Honolulu.

D: Oh, okay.

A: And um, the purpose of the grant is to remove barriers for individuals that are experiencing homelessness. And the barriers would be, um, so that at some point in life they may want to be work ready

D: Okay.

A: Or an introduction into work readiness.

D: Okay. Um...so about three months?

A: Mmm.

D: Okay. Um...what would be a normal day for you...what kinds of activities would you do?

A: Okay, um, it’s pretty much broken into two parts. One, some days I’m in the office and then the other days I outreach, and they’re very...they’re very different. So the office
work is pretty much, um, you know, following up with people...you know, phone
calls...um, you know, doing the email thing, you know, the office thing, and at some
point going up into the front reception area and just, um, you know, observing. Because
I’m not a permanent worker, so I’m still learning all of the services that the overall
agency provides.
D: Okay.
A: Um, so maybe I spend 40 minutes up there kind of just observing, um, and if I can
help, help, or back up the staff.
D: Okay.
A: Um, then in my outreach, um, capacity, what I do is I actually go around to the parks,
like Ala Moana, Sand Island, Blaisdell, Mother Waldron (?), and look for individuals that
are experiencing homelessness. Um, I also have clients that I already worked with, I
mean, that I continue to work with and then I may follow up with them, primarily at Ala
Moana Beach Park or Ala Moana Shopping Center.
D: Mmm. Okay. Are they still there at Ala Moana Beach Park?
A: No, they’re...they’re staying that the shelter, but during the day the shelter closes.
D: Oh.
A: So they have to be...they have to be out of the shelter at 8:30.
D: I remember that in the news about all the Ala Moana...
A: Mmhmm. So I know pretty much where to find them and so I’ll do my follow-up, um,
you know, either, whatever, you know, [?] paper work. Um, as well as, you know, be
observing, you know, are there any new people that may need service or are interested in
the program. And then, um, in addition to that, it may be going to meetings involving
homelessness. Um, and I’m meeting with other providers, you know, on a case by case
basis.

D: Okay, okay. What would you say led you to work...to work here at this place?

A: Um, well basically after the...my last grant ended I needed employment, and um, my
neighbor actually works for the organization. So she mentioned that internally she saw
this position so she recommended me...

D: Okay.

A: ...um, to apply.

D: Okay, um, tell me about your coworkers.

A: Um, I...my experience here...they’re very friendly, um, very helpful, um, a lot more
friendlier than I expected for city government. I work in...worked in the state
government and some people weren’t always so nice...

D: Oh.

A: ...but they’re actually very friendly. Um, and I don’t know if it’s just this office
because you have more public contact...

D: Mmm.

A: ...um, or if that’s just the individuals in general.

D: Mmm. Okay. I was wondering if you could draw me, like, an organizational chart...

A: Okay.

D: ...of your area or department, or...

A: Okay. I’m under the Department of [removed]. [looking for materials]

D: It doesn’t have to be too detailed.

A: Yeah, but basically...[writing]...
D: Oh... [removed name]. I used to work under her at the [removed name] when she was there a long time ago.

A: What were you doing over there?

D: I was just a front line person...

A: Uh huh.

D: What do they call it... Duty Manager...

A: Oh, okay.

D: ...keeping all the residents in order and stuff.

A: How did you enjoy the experience?

D: It was a good experience [laughs].

A: How did you enjoy [removed name]?

D: I didn’t get to interact with her that much. She was like, the Executive Director, and I was just a little peon, so [laughs]... but I heard some interesting stories about her.

A: I bet. Did you remember [removed name] that worked over there?

D: [removed name]...

A: I forget her last name. Kind of an older lady with short salt... kind of salt and pepper hair.

D: No...

A: I think she was doing the um, what do you call that... um, the counseling, the substance abuse counseling.

D: I don’t know... That job was kind of fun though, actually. It’s stressful at times...

A: Yeah...

D: ... the kind of people that come into the shelter...
A: Oh yeah...

D: There's a lot of interesting people, and you have fun with a lot of them too.

A: Yeah [both laugh]. [continuing writing]. [removed name] is one of my bosses.

D: Are those the four bosses?

A: No, actually I have [removed four names]. So I got two on [removed name]'s side and I got two over here.

D: Wow. That must be...

A: [laughs]

D: ...kind of hard.

A: [laughs] Now the stories you've heard I'm sure were true! But this is kind of like an...you know, I don't know organizationally where it sits in the city, but basically this is what, um, and then of course I would be the job development...did I put that down? Oh yeah...I would be here...and then the special CDBG...

D: Community Development...

A: Yeah. Community Development Block Grant. Yeah.

D: Oh, okay. So these are just different branches off of...

A: No, it’s within...there all...this is the branch...so all of these come under...

D: Oh. Under here?

A: Yeah.

D: So it goes this way? [gesturing to drawing]

A: Yeah, I...yeah, I don’t...I mean they’re all, you know, basically, you know, under the same...they’re under [removed name].

D: Oh, okay. Oh it’s really, like, spread out.
A: Yeah.

D: Oh, okay.

A: Yeah. But then, you know, I don’t know what it looks like. I’ve never seen their organizational chart so I… I don’t know how it looks within the bigger picture.

D: Okay, interesting. Okay, thanks.

A: Uh huh.

D: Um… let’s see… how closely do you work with your coworkers?

A: Um… I don’t actually work that close with them, I mean, on a daily basis, because I’m… I’m on a special grant. Um, so in some ways it’s… it’s actually nice, because I’m still the new kid, you know, so… so people, um, don’t really know what to do with me, so they’re still nice to me [laughing]. So that’s kind of a good… you know, it’s a good thing, I think, in that way.

D: Yeah.

A: But, I mean, I haven’t had any barriers with that. I mean, they’ve been very helpful, and, um, supportive, and friendly, um… I haven’t felt excluded. Um, probably misunderstood because other people don’t understand the population.

D: Mhm. Do you folks get to work on things together?

A: Not usually, unless we share a client. Like, I… it’s possible that I can share some clients with them.

D: Okay.

A: You know, people that are registered here but are homeless.
D: Okay. So far, um, what you’ve experienced with your coworkers, how do you like them, or what do you think about them?

A: Um, I... I enjoy them. I mean, they’ve been doing what they’ve been doing for a while.

D: Mhmm.

A: Um, they pretty much have their jobs down. I think for me, I would get bored. Um, you know, cause it’s pretty much a routine.

D: Mhmm.

A: Whereas I have the, you know, the dramas, the exciting parts.

D: Um, is there any differences in your relationship with your coworkers... like, between each person...

A: You mean, like... what do you mean, like, differences? Like...

D: Like, would you say...

A: Conflicts or disputes or something?

D: Yeah, or do you get along better with some of your coworkers than others?

A: Umm... no not really. In... in this office, it’s like a division... like back here is a separate... there’s the support services. Then in the front is more of the people I belong to. But for logistical purposes, or whatever, this was an office that was available.

D: Oh, okay.

A: So, um, so in some ways, I luck out cause I get the best of both worlds. I get to... you know, to actually have these... this group as my, you know, office kind of thingy...

D: Mhmm.

A: ... and then um... I try... I make it a point, you know, like, to maybe like, once a week eat lunch with the regular staff just to kind of, you know, show face, and...
D: Yeah.

A: You know, just so they still remember that I work here [laughs].

D: Yeah [laughs].

A: But, no, not... I mean, I don’t know how they interact, cause I’m not here that much.

D: Oh, okay.

A: You know, but for me personally, I feel like I have the best of both worlds.

D: Yeah, okay. Do you know them on a personal level at all?

A: Um... maybe one or two.

D: Okay. Um... what is a story that you could tell me about one of your coworkers?

A: Um... one of the ladies that, um, is the employment counselor, her house is across the street from where I massage in, um, Waimanalo, and her cousin sells laulau on um, Saturdays, and I think it’s his daughter or somebody else, sells it at a different location, but in Waimanalo, like, farther away. And, I didn’t know that that was her house. So when we have a break we usually go over and buy laulau. And we always ask him for rice, and they... you know, he doesn’t have rice, he just has the laulau. So, when I was telling her this story, she said, ‘Oh, that’s my house.’ And she was laughing, cause the cousin kept telling her to make rice [laughs], because, to make one plate, you know, to... you know, cause other people have asked for rice too, and, but she... she feels like her salad... her... cause she was talking about making a plate lunch. You know, you could just make salad and... and uh, and rice. But she didn’t feel that her salad was an award winning salad, so she doesn’t want to make it [laughs].

D: Oh.
A: So you know, we have...you know, we always tell...when I see her I tell her, ‘Oh, I going Waimanalo. Go make the rice.’ You know [laughing].

D: Oh, so you gotta bring your own rice then.

A: Yeah, yeah.

D: Okay, um...I know you said you had four different bosses...

A: Mmhmm.

D: Um, maybe choose one that you could think about and talk about. Um, could be a, you know, a good relationship or not so good relationship.

A: Mmhmm. Well...

D: Um...

A: I don’t know, they’re all different [laughs].

D: Right, right...

A: I mean, I can go through, you know, through each one of them without...I mean, like, my...my immediate supervisor is, um, an individual that worked at Oahu. I mean, that worked at um, [removed agency name], and when I had a surgery...this was back in the 80’s...um, I wasn’t able to work or go to school, so I entered a work training program, and she didn’t want me to enter because I already had a bachelor’s degree. They said they normally don’t take...so I said, ‘But one of the things that I don’t have is clerical.’ So she allowed me to go, and that was back in the 80’s and she’s my same boss now.

D: Oh.

A: So, you know there’s a connection there.

D: Yeah.

A: And I tend to get along with her, you know, very well.
D: Okay.

A: And then the one above her...um, she’s a very forceful individual. So when I first came here, a lot of people said, ‘Oh, you know, don’t let this person bother you,’ or, you know...you know, like make rude comments. Basically, I think she probably is forceful, but I enjoy that because she tells it like it is.

D: Mmhmm.

A: I mean, I don’t think she’s vicious or um...it’s just her...she’s just rough. You know, and I guess for some people, they take it personally, or they’re intimidated by it.

D: She very blunt?

A: Yeah, very blunt. And, you know, she’s not one to be giving you kudos, or you know, so you have to be kind of be tough skinned to...

D: Yeah.

A: ...you know, to deal with that. But I...I like it. I think I like her as a person, and, you know, I like working with her, so I’d say, you know, pretty much my loyalty are to those two ladies, you know, here.

D: Okay.

A: Then the next lady is above her. She works directly under [removed name], and um, you know, I actually like her. I mean, she’s very task oriented. Um, she I think has more managerial experience and can somehow think outside the box some of the time, or is open to thinking outside the box some of the time. Um, I think her hands are tied, you know, being in city government, um, but I, you know, I enjoy my time with her. And then of course, the...you know, the big one is [removed name], and um, you know, I knew her from [removed agency name], you know, just, you know, as another provider, on a
personal level. And, um, she's more of a visionary. Um, but sometimes her visions aren't ready to be....um...

D: Accepted?

A: Yeah, accepted, or followed through, um, in practical reality or in the way that, you know, other agencies or individuals work. So the challenge is to not take that personally, and just recognize that that is a vision. Um, if it can't happen today, it might be able to happen next week or the following week or something.

D: Mhmm.

A: Um, and so I...I'm very...you know, honestly just speak what I have to speak, and you know, pretty much that's my approach to the situation.

D: Okay. Um, who would you say you could talk more about, your immediate supervisor, or the one above her?

A: I'd say, probably my immediate.

D: Okay.

A: Yeah.

D: Let's think of a name for her...a pseudonym, so you could....

A: Um...Miss Philippines [laughs]

D: Okay...okay...how often do you see her?

A: Um, when I'm in the office. So, you know, it could be daily, it could be, you know, when I...when I come in.

D: Okay. And how...how long of a time do you have with her when you see her?

A: Um...it's usually just passing.

D: Okay.
A: Unless we have to meet. Um, it’s pretty much just passing.

D: And what are the types of ways that you usually communicate with her?...like email...

A: Um, in person, verbally...

D: In person?

A: Yeah, for the most part, I mean...

D: Um...is there any activities you do together with her?

A: Um...I think probably just planning.

D: Okay, and how often does that occur?

A: Mmm...maybe on a monthly basis.

D: Do you get to go out to lunch with her and stuff too, or...

A: No, not really. We’re...we’re kind of on a different schedule, like they...they come in at 7:45, and then they have a certain routine. So we don’t always get to eat lunch, but, you know, she’ll call me, or if I need to, you know, to find her or whatever, I mean, she’s available, you know, or I’ll make myself available to her.

D: Okay. How well do you know her on a personal level?

A: Umm...you know, fairly casual. I mean, you know, like I know a little bit about her family and her trip to the Philippines, and you know, how long she’s been working here, what is she...you know, things like that.

D: Okay.

A: Her concerns, I guess, her personal concerns. She takes care of her mom, an elderly mom...

D: Have you met her family before?

A: No. No, I haven’t met her family yet, uh uh.
D: Um, if it’s alright with you, could you tell me a personal story about her?

A: Um, well, she recently took a 3 week vacation to the Philippines with her husband and her brother, I believe it is, and it was her husband’s class reunion. So they, um, you know, got to go and meet with old friends, and they were in the province, and uh, and she got to go to, um, do a facial and a massage, and…

D: Wow…

A: …excuse me…different things like that, you know, in addition to whatever family parties there was, you know, in the Philippines…

D: Wow…

A: Um, let me see…

D: Sounds like fun.

A: Yeah, I mean, she just…you know, she shares things like, you know, how long it takes to drive home, where she lives, uh, you know…she was playing tennis for a while…I mean just, you know, small little things…

D: Yeah.

A: We have a fairly…I don’t know, casual, friendly rapport.

D: Okay. Okay. What would you say are some positive things about your relationship with her?

A: Um…she’s open and honest.

D: Okay, what are some negative things about your relationship with her?

A: Right now, I don’t have. I don’t have anything really negative.

D: Kay. And you said you knew her from the 80’s.

A: Yeah, not personally, she was just my counselor.
D: Just an acquaintance. Okay, how would you say your relationship has or hasn’t developed through that whole...

A: Well, um, it was one of...I guess for the fact that she, whatever she saw in me to allow me to go to that training, you know, I have a sense of respect for her. Um, and I think that continues. So there’s respect and loyalty. You know, kind of like, well you helped me, you know, so I want to make sure that I’m, you know, looking good for you, kind of a thing. You know, local kine stuff, yeah?

D: Yeah...’kay.

A: I mean in a good...you know, in an ethnical way, of course.

D: Yeah...yeah. Okay. How did you first meet her again?

A: It was through the [removed program name] program. Yeah.

D: That’s the one...

A: She was a job training counselor, or whatever.

D: Um, what was your first duties, or assignments, like here at this workplace?

A: Uh, pretty much just getting oriented, cause it’s a...you know, they’ve been running for I don’t know how many years, and they’re pretty, um, you know, formatted in their way.

D: Was there like a formal orientation?

A: No. It was just watch and learn. Ask questions.

D: Kay. Could you draw for me, maybe on the same paper, like a timeline, of...you could put it on the bottom [indicating]...of like, significant events in your relationship with Miss Philippines?
A: Hmm...significant events...okay, the first one would be, she sat in my interview.
[drawing]. Um, I think the second one...let’s see...I’d say she’s always available...
D: Is that from the first meeting until now?
A: Yeah. I mean, if I need her I can just track her down, and...
D: Oh.
A: ...say I need to talk to you, or make time for me, or you know, so that...that’s a good thing, and then, I think the, um...the third one is when she went to the Philippines [laughs], for 3 weeks. Cause I was only on the job for what?...she left in the beginning of May...so I was only on the job like about a month, so...
D: Oh.
A: [writing]...and then I’d say, um...I’d say she’s supportive...constant changes...mmm...I don’t know, I guess I feel like she’s protective...by her communication.
D: Um, what would you say are some of the reasons for, like, the positive aspects of your relationship with her?
A: Mmm...
D: I know you mentioned, like, honesty and openness, before, too.
A: Mmhmm. I’d say that’s probably the, you know, the undercurrent...I mean, it’s like a mutual respect. Um...mmm...I feel trust, you know, probably...is probably there...um...
D: How would you say that that respect and trust developed?
A: Mmm...oh, that’s a hard one. I’m not sure...you know, it just kind of...you know, we just clicked...yeah, we just clicked, I guess. Well, and I think the fact that, you know, I was successful in...you know, I accomplished, I finished that program. So, I mean, even
though that was a long time ago, but I mean, it was still the success...um, from...from a statistical standpoint.

D: Yeah. So that would be kind of like, like she would trust you because she knows that you’re capable and stuff...

A: Mhm...mmhmm.

D: Um, how would you say your relationship with her compares to other people’s relationship with her?

A: Mmm...well, I think some people here aren’t always as honest. Um, or respectful.

You know, she’s not one...she’s real different than the big manager, where you know, that person is very aggressive and she’s more of a soft...soft-sell type of person.

D: What are some things that she does with everyone, like, equally...would you say?

A: I think she treats them with dignity, and fairness, from what I can see.

D: Okay, and are there any things that she does only with certain people?

A: I don’t know. I don’t have enough observation on that.

D: Okay...what are some stories that you could say that describe her relationship with other people?

A: Mmm...hmm...

D: Was there any that you can think of?

A: Yeah, I mean, other than her just, you know, like, talking to the other Filipino ladies in the back about shopping, or...I mean a lot of times they’re talking in Filipino so I don’t know the whole conversation, but, you know, basically just friendly, um, you know, friendliness...um...

D: Haven’t seen too much...
A: Yeah...yeah...cause I’m not really here. If I am here, it’s like, I’m on the computer
doing stuff. I don’t have that time to interact as much.

D: Yeah, okay. Um...what is the reward system like here at this workplace, if there is
any?

A: None! [laughs]...your paycheck! [laughs]

D: Does Miss Philippines...does she have any, um, say in that?

A: No. It’s not, um...this is definitely an ‘in the box’ workplace. It’s not a...think ‘out of
the box.’ It’s almost like they’re not allowed to think outside the box.

D: Okay. Is she responsible for, like, providing you with the tools that you need for your
job? Like computers...

A: Um, I can go through her, but some it is predetermined.

D: Oh, okay.

A: You know, it’s not like, okay I can go and say, ‘Oh, I’d like a laptop,’ or you know,
um...I mean if I wanted particular office supplies, I could go through her and it probably
wouldn’t be a problem, but they’re pretty much whatever is already in the organization,
that’s what you get.

D: Mm, okay. Does she do performance evaluations for you?

A: Not at this point. I don’t even have a job description, D! [laughs] It changes constantly
[laughs]. So that one should be interesting.

D: Okay, um...how much time do we have left?

A: Oh, shucks.

D: Do you have an appointment?

A: Um, no I just gotta finish a report.
D: Oh, okay.

A: Let’s see...I think we’re good. We could probably go another 15 minutes.

D: [checking recorder] About half an hour. Okay. Um, what would be the qualities of your ideal supervisor?

A: Um...to be a partner in...in supporting the mission of whatever, you know, we were doing. Um, to be honest. Um...supportive...creative, be able to think outside the box.

D: What would be the qualities of a not-so-ideal supervisor?

A: Um, I think people that are closed...closed minded...um, don’t know how to communicate effectively...have hidden agendas...and just aren’t nice people. I mean you know, personality, I guess.

D: Yeah. I want to try and differentiate between an effective supervisor...what would you say would be the qualities of someone who’s effective?

A: I’d say someone who had boundaries, that understood the...you know, the job, or whatever it was...the job, the mission, whatever that may be...um, was able to provide leadership, knowledge, um...networking...you know, if they didn’t have the information to be able...know how to go and get it. Um...you know, to think outside that box, you know...well that’s creativity I guess.

D: What are the qualities of an ineffective supervisor?

A: Mmm...Isn’t that what I just answered?

D: An effective?...so someone who is...

A: Oh, oh, oh...okay, okay, okay. Um, I think, you know, someone who is unclear...um, gives out mixed messages...um, has hidden agendas...controlling...micromanagement.
D: Okay, um, I’m going to jump to some of these questions to get through this quickly.

Mmm...what are...oh I think you kind of answered that a little bit...what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

A: I’d say definitely communication is the...the ground...groundbreaker, cornerstone...um, listening, active listening...respect...openness...and honesty.

D: Okay. How do you view yourself and your supervisor ethnically?

A: Um, I’d say we have...um, what do I want to call it?...a connectiveness...because I have Filipino in-laws. So, you know, I understand the culture, the food...um, I don’t speak the language, but I’m...I’m comfortable around, you know, people that might be speaking or whatever.

D: Yeah. What do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

A: Um, I think you tend to learn more. You know, definitely you learn to appreciate other peoples’ culture, belief systems. I think it can help you, you know, in all aspects, but primarily on the job if you have to deal with someone in that culture and you’re not that familiar with it.

D: Do you think racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

A: I think so...

D: How about gender issues?

A: Mmm. It doesn’t seem to be, but I...I’m not sure how comfortable, you know, people would be. I mean, for example, I think if someone has a sex change, and it wasn’t necessarily known, you know, they’d get hired, but I think that if they came in here and they were ‘flaming’...

D: Mhm. 253
A: I don't think that they would get hired.

D: Oh.

A: Maybe because I think that they would be afraid of how the public would respond.

D: Yeah.

A: So, you know, it's like half and half.

D: Um, say on a scale from maybe 1 to 10, where would you say your relationship with your supervisor lies...from, like, a stranger to, you know, a really mature relationship?

A: I'd say about 8.

D: Okay, I think that should do it for my part here.
Interview with James – Supervisor of Dexter and Al

October 12, 2006
9:30 – 10:15 pm

(There was a lot of background noise during these interviews, which made it difficult to transcribe accurately)

D: So first of all, I just want to get, like, an overall picture of what you do here.

J: We just clean the cooling system...they call it the heat exchangers...the condensers.

D: The heat exchangers?

J: Anything that does cooling, we clean.

D: Okay. Um...what would you say led you to work here at this place?

J: Uh, the condensers?

D: Yeah, and at [removed company name]...for this company.

J: Uh, the pay and the benefits. But as for working with the condensers, I just ended up here by chance.

D: Yeah the pay is good. I have a coworker that just left us to work for [removed company name].

J: Aw.

D: The secretary. She’s getting paid more, so just had to take it. How long have you been working here?

J: Fourteen years.

D: Fourteen years?
D: Um, so you’re the supervisor of these guys [sitting outside]?

J: Yeah

D: Could you draw me a chart of the organization?

J: I’m gonna give you the [unintelligible] version.

D: Okay.

J: [Drawing] This guy is the crew leader. Okay, then they…usually it’s split into two groups. This is the [removed site name] and this is the [removed site name] Then they have what they call OC. OC is, uh, they call it over classified.

D: Over classified.

J: Yeah. They’re just temporary. Their official thing is just [unintelligible] the senior guys.

D: Is that your position [indicating on drawing]?

J: Yeah, that’s me. I’m [removed site name]. And then, when we’re all together, we only have one crew leader, and they come together. But, since we’re split, in actuality, he’s OC, too. That’s when we’re split crew.

D: Oh, okay.

J: That’s only when split. And there’s always three guys. We only get two right now, but we’re gonna hire one more. So there’s [unintelligible].

D: So you oversee three guys?

J: Yeah, yeah. So when we’re all together, sometimes we’re all at one powerplant, we all come together as a team.

D: Do you ever supervise the other guys, or is it just the same...
J: Yeah, normally the same. Sometimes...we supposed to switch [sites] but since where people live, the traffic, so we try to keep everybody closer.

D: Um, so what is like a typical day at work for you...what kind of stuff do you guys do?

J: Um...typically...uh...just wait for the units to come down, because the unit has to be able to come down...we [unintelligible] be able to get half the condensers or all the unit down. We have to wait for it. Then load the brushes, and the tubes. There’s like thousands of tubes in the unit. We just stick the brushes in and shoot it out. And that’s the whole shift. And then we have to give it back at a certain time, too, because you know when people go to sleep, it all goes down right? When people start waking up, take shower, [unintelligible] we need to load back so we can get it back as soon as possible.

So we usually do maintenance [unintelligible].

D: So, I know [removed name], so you don’t have to talk about him. The other two guys, how long have you been working with them?

J: Uh, I’ve been working with Dexter for about one year almost. I just got back from Iraq.

D: Oh yeah?

J: Yeah. I just started one year ago. I came back in January, so I’ve been working with him 9 months. And then Al, I’ve been working with...4 years?...4 years.

D: Oh, so when you went to Iraq, you had to quit here, and then...

J: No, by law they gotta hold my job.

D: Oh.

J: My seniority and my position.

D: Oh. Um, so, hopefully there’s enough time, but I wanted to hear about your relationships with Dexter and Al. Um...
J: It’s a good working relationship.

D: With both of them?

J: Yeah, all three of them. When things need to be done, uh… I got no problems with none of them. I mean, they no ask why, they just know it needs to be done, cause I would never ask them to do anything I wouldn’t do or [unintelligible] I guess. Um…

D: So you guys must spend a lot of time together, yeah? On each shift?

J: Oh yeah. We’re with each other the whole shift, every day. We even have breakfast after work.

D: Everybody?

J: Yeah, everybody except Dexter. [unintelligible] Yeah, we went surfing together after work.

D: So everybody surfs?

J: Except Dexter.

D: Why, he has family or something?

J: Huh?

D: He has family or something? He gotta go home?

J: I don’t know. He’s just a homebody I guess.

D: Um, so you folks don’t use, like, email or phone or… like when you communicate with each other, its all interpersonal, yeah?

J: Yeah.

D: You folks are around each other the whole time?

J: Yeah.

D: Um, do you ever get to do stuff, like on weekends or holidays with these guys?
J: Uh...we always plan to, but we never get around to it. We always plan to go fishing.

We plan on getting a...some beach houses from the military. Yeah, but we haven’t really
done it.

D: Would you say you know these guys on a personal level?...

J: Yeah...

D: Their families and...

J: Uh, I only met [removed name]’s wife and his kids. I never met (the rest).

D: Um, let sec...let’s try focus on one guy, Dexter. What is one story that you could tell
about him that...something that you just can’t forget kind of story.

J: That he’s deaf.

D: Oh yeah?

J: Yeah, sometimes, uh, you kind of misinterpret...either he’s not listening or ignoring
you, but in actuality he’s not.

D: Was that on the job? Or...

J: Yeah.

D: During this job?

J: (Yeah). And it’s loud inside. You know when you go to the [site], so more so.

D: You guys wear ear plugs?

J: Yeah.

D: What would you say are some positive things about your relationship with Dexter?

J: Positive things are that he’s a good worker. Like, when things need to be done.

D: What would you say are some negative things about your relationship?

J: Negative...Only that, uh, something physical that he can’t help, that he’s deaf.
D: So he cannot hear us then? [laughs]

J: Nah, he cannot hear us.

D: How would you say your relationship with him developed from when you first met him until now?

J: Um, his, uh, work habits weren’t up to my speed. I don’t like things done half-ass. He was taking short cuts. I expressed my standards, and then eventually [unintelligible] he’s been improving. It’s not a constant thing, it’s only like one time.

D: Did you interview these guys, when they applied?

J: Nah, they were already here when I came. Except, the only person I worked with was Al, before I left.

D: Oh, okay. Was there an orientation for these guys?

J: Yeah, everybody has to go through it. You know, company policy...

D: Uh...what do you feel are the reasons for the positive aspects of you relationship with Dexter?...What do you think are, sort of, the foundations of what makes a good relationship?

J: The foundations?

D: Yeah.

J: I guess the understanding of each other. You gotta know each others ‘trip point.’ You know, how much they can handle in criticism. How much knowledge they can absorb at one time. When you’re teaching, how much they can handle. You gotta be understanding, some people catch on slower.

D: How would you say your relationships differ between these guys?

J: My relationships?
D: Yeah. Are there differences?

J: My personal, or...

D: Yeah.

J: Uh...you know, like [removed name] them, he’s a real, kind of family guy...has a lot of patience. I don’t have that kind of patience. That’s why I’m divorced.

D: Oh...How about the other guys?

J: Yeah, they got good marriages, except Dexter [got divorced?]

D: Is there some things that you do with everybody equally?

J: Yeah, I actually...there’s only so much room in that condenser, but when you got room then I do hands on work. Or one person take vacation, we don’t actually bring in another guy, we just run the crew one short.

D: Oh, okay.

J: So [unintelligible].

D: Are there certain things you do with only some of the guys and not others?

J: Uh...not really.

D: No?...Uh...what is the reward system like here, if there is a reward system?

J: There isn’t one. No bonuses. The only reward system they give us is safety. We don’t get hurt...we get a safety award. We don’t call in sick, [unintelligible] all the time, take vacation.

D: Nothing for like performance?

J: Performance, no.

D: Do you have to do evaluations for these guys?

J: Uh, no I don’t.
D: What would you say are some positive things about your relationship with AI?

J: Oh, AI catches on to things. He doesn’t question a lot. AI knows the (job). When I’m not here, he’s OC. So he pretty much knows the job requirements.

D: What would you say are some negative things about your relationship with AI?

J: Uh...I don’t know...

D: Everybody has good and bad...

J: Ah, sometimes he’s too quiet, when everybody’s conversing with each other.

D: Um, how would you say your relationship developed from when you first knew him...

J: It’s always been good. Never had no problems, never had any arguments.

D: Um...is there any story about AI that you can’t forget?

J: Oh yeah, when he broke his finger.

D: Oh. On the job too?

J: Yeah. He came, uh, walking up to me and he said he thinks he broke his finger. And his finger was like this [demonstrating]. I said, “You definitely broke it.”

D: Oooh.

J: We rushed him to...I rushed him to Pali Momi.

D: Oh. Some hazards, yeah, on this job?

J: [unintelligible] the company used to lay parts in the walkway, and we gotta maneuver our carts, the cart is all metal and its heavy, so when we...sometimes we maneuver it around, its so heavy, when you bump into, you know, a valve or something, it’s metal too, and when your cart goes this way, your finger don’t have a chance.
D: Yeah. I guess that’s why they stress the safety, yeah? Okay, what would you say...I
know you said you had a good relationship with him...what do you think are the reasons
for that positive relationship?

J: I guess the reason why is because he knows the job so well. I don’t have to overlook
him. I don’t have to look over his shoulder. I just gotta let him know what gotta be done,
and I don’t even have to check on him.

D: What do you think are the qualities of your ideal employee?

J: Qualities?

D: Yeah, or characteristics?

J: The most important thing is that they try. No matter if they do the job slow or fast,
[unintelligible] learning or not, as long as they try, make an effort. That’s good enough
for me. Some guys, you know, they don’t know, they think its hard or whatever, they
won’t even put the effort in. I’m kind of a stickler about that. See, we used to have a
contract with this company, before all these guys were here. Used to be only me and Al,
and these contractors.

D: So their not employees.

J: Yeah, they’re just contractors. They used to send us some winners [sarcastically]. And
then I used to send them home. It’s like in the middle of the job, I used to send them
home. Sometimes before they even start work I used to send them home.

D: Oh. Where did they get them from?

J: Labor service. So you talking about real drug addicts...

D: Oh.
J: And then you get guys that does well, and you ask for them back and they get a bigger pay with another job [unintelligible]

D: What do you think are the qualities of a ‘not-so-ideal’ employee?

J: The worst one is question “why?” Every order, every task, always ask “why?” I’ve been in the military 25 years now. I’m kind of done with that attitude. Don’t ask me why, just [unintelligible].

D: Kay, what are the characteristics of an employee that you could easily get along with?

J: Easily get along with?

D: Yeah.

J: Someone that doesn’t uh, loose their temper. Luckily nobody I work with now is like that.

D: Pretty mellow guys?

J: Yeah.

D: What would you say, in general…people in general…what would be 5 attributes of people that are important to you?

J: Important to me?

D: Yeah

J: Uh...

D: No need be 5, just whatever you can think of.

J: Gees, that’s hard…uh…can do attitude, their attitude is important…their listening…and learning. Cause some guys aren’t willing to learn.
D: Yeah, that’s good enough. I kind of asked you this already, but what would you say, just for interpersonal relationships in general, relationships with people, what do you think are the basic foundations to make a good relationship?

J: Patience. Everybody has different personalities, different views, different ideas. Without patience, your just gonna argue all the time.

D: How would you view yourself and the other guys ethnically?

J: Ethnically?

D: Yeah. How would you describe your ethnicity?

J: I don’t know, that’s kind of hard.

D: Are you all the same?


D: Is there one that you identify with more?

J: Uh... well, [unintelligible] grandmother was Japanese, but its hard to say because we do a lot of Hawaiian. I guess the attitude (would be Japanese), because its mentioned in my family “its not the Japanese way.”

D: How would you describe the other guys, just Dexter and Al?

J: I think we’re pretty much the same level. Now if they were from the mainland that would be different.

D: Yeah. What do you think is special about different cultures in the workplace?...Having people of different cultures, backgrounds, ethnicities?

J: Uh... I think culturally, we have different values. Whereas, you know, to me, Haoles... Haoles, they just want to, they’re willing to, I don’t know, I hate to say this, but they’re willing to B.S. their way to the top. And uh, whereas, to me, locals... locals, they
know their limits. They got a few exceptions. But most locals, they only willing to proceed to their limit, and they won’t go past it. I don’t know if I’m making sense.

D: Yeah, no, I understand. They have a different mindset, yeah? A different way of thinking.

J: Yeah.

D: Um, okay, on a scale of, say, 1 to 10, say like, 1 is a stranger and 10 is a really good relationship, where would you say your relationship with Dexter lies?

J: Oh, everybody’s a 10. They come to work. The kind of jobs that [unintelligible]. I used to be in [removed site name] before this one.

D: Over here is better?

J: Yeah.

D: Um, do you feel like racial issues are sensitive in the workplace? Just in general?

J: Well, we tease about each others race, but I have...each and everyone of them I have the same race. Like, Al has Chinese, I have Chinese, and Dexter has Filipino and I have Filipino, so easy for me to put down, I put down every race.

D: Do think that gender issues can be sensitive in the workplace?

J: Well we never had...when I was here, we never had any women.

D: Okay, I better stop there.
Interview with Dexter – Employee of James

October 12, 2006

11:00 – 11:30 pm

(The recording was lost or did not record – transcripts are based on notes during interview)

DJ: Tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

D: We take care of the condensors. They’re like a radiator for the [removed name].

DJ: What lead you to do this type of work?

D: I was looking for steady employment.

DJ: How long have you been working here?

D: Almost 1 year.

DJ: What is a typical day for you like at this job?

D: It’s easy. It’s the easiest job I had. Unstressful.

DJ: How would you describe the people you work with?

D: They’re cool. I knew AI for a long time. We used to work at [removed company name] together

DJ: How do your relationships with your coworker differ?

D: Our relationships are all the same. I treat everyone the same.

DJ: How well do you know your coworkers on a personal level?

D: Not really that great. Workwise it’s okay, (I know them based on) how they present themselves, how they work.
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DJ: Do you get together with your coworkers outside of work?

D: We do hang around, but we mostly spend time with the kids, because it’s a hard schedule.

DJ: Do you know James on a personal level?

D: Yeah, I’m a pretty good judge of character.

DJ: Do you ever do things with him outside of work time?

D: No.

DJ: Have you ever spent time with his or her family or friends?

D: No.

DJ: What is a personal story that you could share about James?

D: It’s mostly just normal conversation. He’s shared some of his Iraq experiences.

DJ: What are some positive things about your relationship with James?

D: The way we get along. We have almost the same interests, same sense of humor, good judge of character.

DJ: What are some negative things about your relationship with James?

D: Nothing actually.

DJ: How long have you worked with James?

D: Almost 1 year.

DJ: What was it like in the beginning when you were working with him?

D: It was natural. The job was actually a step down for me. I had different skills before.

DJ: What do you think are the reasons for the positive aspects of your relationship?

D: I always look for the positive side of people. I try to take a positive outlook.
DJ: How does your relationship with James differ from the other guys’ relationship with him?
D: It’s the same. He has the same respect with everyone.
DJ: Are there certain things that he does equally with everyone?
D: He treats everybody with respect. There’s no favoritism.
DJ: What are the qualities of your ideal supervisor?
D: What I have now is real good. I’ve had far worse, where I’d become violent toward him. James has the “buck stops here” attitude, (in other words) if anyone died today it would be me.
DJ: What are the qualities of a not-so-ideal supervisor?
D: I had one supervisor who asked me to “rat out” everyone else. He was always on your back. He wanted me to steal from our own customers.
DJ: What are the qualities of a supervisor that you could easily get along with?
D: What everyone here has. You like being around these guys. You’re informed of what’s going on, they put everything on the table.
DJ: What are the qualities of a supervisor that you would not be able to get along with?
D: Someone who’s arrogant, has too much pride.
DJ: What are five attributes of people that are important to you?
D: Honesty, reliability, humor, attentiveness, don’t want anyone to get killed.
DJ: How has your work environment contributed to your personal development?
D: You feed off of other people’s good sides.
DJ: What do you think are the basic foundations of a good relationship.
D: Honesty, reliability, humor, attentiveness.
OJ: How do you view yourself and your supervisor ethnically?

D: I'm Filipino, more specifically, Visayan. James is like my kid, a mutt. He's mixed.

OJ: Do you think there's anything special about different cultures in the workplace?

D: No, not really. This is Hawaii.

OJ: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being a complete stranger and 10 being a really great relationship, how would you rate your relationship with James?

D: About a 7.

OJ: Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace.

D: Absolutely. I've seen it in my other job. Especially among the Whites and Blacks. They don't want to room together. It's mostly the guys from the mainland. They used to bring in huge crews from the mainland, and they always had some people where you could feel the heat from them. Here we mesh well. On the mainland, they don't like it when they have to work together, but they have to tolerate it.

OJ: Do you feel like gender issues are sensitive?

D: Yeah, absolutely. Especially this company. Even at [removed company name-former employer], there was the gender thing. I supervised men and women, and there is the issue of harassment, which could be anything. A lot of it has to do with the Filipino culture, because Filipinos touch each other a lot.

OJ: Okay. [Interview needed to be concluded due to time constraint]
(There was a lot of background noise during these interviews, which made it difficult to transcribe accurately)

D: So how long have you been working here?
A: Almost 14 years with [removed company name].
D: And how much with just this department?
A: Um...about 3 years.
D: I think I already got kind of an idea of what a typical day is here. I’m going to kind of skip through some of these questions...How would you describe the people you work with?
A: Um...how would I describe them? A lot of different personalities, but, uh, as a crew, uh, we work well together.
D: Um...I kind of see that you guys work pretty closely together. You’re kind of around each other the whole shift yeah?
A: Yeah.
D: What would you say about...how much do you like your coworkers?
A: How much?
D: Yeah.
A: What kind of grading scale is this?
A: I like them a lot.

A: Um...I guess you could...you’re gonna, of course, gravitate to someone who has the same interests so...yeah...the person may be a lot older, a lot younger, but, if he has the same interest as you, then you kind of want to more gravitate towards that person.

A: Um...I guess...um...not that well because of, you know, I guess we talk amongst ourselves but we kind of get a feeling of what their background is like, or how many kids they have, but as for actually meeting them and interacting, uh, its more of a juggling thing where I gotta pick up my kids, or I gotta take them to practice, or...and its through interacting together [indistinguishable]...we come to work and discuss what happened during the week, we kind of feel like we kind of know them, but out of work, everybody has their own kids and don’t have time to interact.

A: Uh...like for [removed name] and I, we went fishing a couple of times, [indistinguishable] but other than that, everybody has their own thing that they gotta do...picking up their kids, or some of them do some kind of function with their families. I think it’s more of a time thing [indistinguishable] the shift that we work with...it doesn’t bode well...and the amount of overtime that we work, too. Usually we’ll have just one day off, and people doing things with their friends instead of...or coworkers, instead of spending time with your families...that’s...doesn’t really work to well.

D: You guys don’t get together outside of work at all?

D: Yeah, can be really hard on the rest of the family.
A: Yeah, because it’s the way our shift works, where you work from one day overnight to the next day. Like, we’re gonna be working Friday overtime, so Friday goes into Saturday morning, and Saturday morning you go home and sleep, whatever, get up, the next day you gotta go, Sunday night, you go back work. So it’s not really like a full day off, yeah.

D: Yeah.

A: So it’s the way the shift is set up, the amount of overtime we work, most of the time it’s like, trying to make time to spend time with their families [indistinguishable].

D: Um...do you get to, um, spend time with James at all, outside of work?

A: Uh...oh, actually yeah, one time, um, one time we went surfing. That’s another thing that [removed name] and I do, is surfing too. So I guess besides fishing, surfing, um, sometimes we’ll go out and eat and stuff. But with James, um, a couple of times we went surfing...that’s...surfing and breakfast afterward. But, other than that, its try to get home and get your rest before you gotta go pick up the kids and do homework and take ‘em football practice. So, if we were to do something like that, then you’re cutting into your sleep time or doing all your family responsibilities.

D: Would you say you know James on a personal level?

A: Yeah.

D: Do you know his family and friends?

A: Uh, from what...family from what he has told us. Yeah.

D: So you never met them?

A: [No.]
D: What is a story that you could tell about James...the first thing that comes to your mind...something that you could never forget.

A: Uh...I guess his stories of when he was, uh, deployed. [unintelligible] Whether it be Panama, or Iran.

D: Was it you that went to Iraq too?

A: No.

D: That was Dexter, was it? I know he mentioned somebody went to Iraq.

A: Not from us. Maybe somebody else...somebody else who works here.

D: Oh.

A: Another, uh, he works in operations.

D: Oh.

A: He went to Iraq also.

D: What would you say are some positive things about your relationship with James?

A: Uh...positive...I think, for us, we just kind of...we work well together, so... we’ve both been in this company for about the same time, so we kind of know how the system works, so we kind of respect each other being that we have been in here that long. We kind of know how the system works, I guess.

D: What would you say are some negative things about your relationship with James?

A: Um...I don’t know if I...yeah, I don’t know if I have any. Uh, since I’ve been here, I don’t think I’ve...I don’t think I’ve had a disagreement with him. I guess there are times where we’d do something and then I thought, “Oh maybe what if we did it this way?” Then if it works better than [indistinguishable]...um, [indistinguishable] “No, no, no, we gotta do it this way.” “All right.” So I don’t think we’ve had any type of disagreements.
D: Did you guys know each other for 14 years?

A: No, uh, we’ve been, uh…only since I’ve been working here in this department. And then, for say, a year before he was deployed. So, so, maybe out of that three years, maybe two years I’ve known him.

D: Oh. Um, how would you say your relationship with him developed over the last two years? How was it like in the beginning, how did it change?

A: Um, I guess in the beginning, it’s always going to be like a ‘feeling out’ process – see how he works, and how he wants the job to be done. And then just, uh…maybe…cause I was a new guy, he’s telling us how jobs was supposed to be done, do it that way, and then, through the process, if I see something, that maybe if we did it this way, and he was open to it, so some things that we did before, we’re doing it differently now, but its better. And if I was doing something, and he thought, “Oh, you know what? Maybe you should do it this way,” and then I tried it, and then, oh yeah, it’s actually easier for me.

So, we always kind of watch how each other works, and he has a few pointers and I have a few pointers, and we just kind of bring it up, and both of us are open to change, in the end it works out all right.

D: What would you say are some of the reasons for the positive aspects of your relationship?

A: Uh, I think just willing to work together…keeping an open mind.

D: How would you say, from your perception, your relationship with James compares with the other guys’ relationship with him?

A: Um…well just amongst our crew here…with James, I’ll give him more respect because he has been here (for a long time). With the other guys, I’ve been working here
longer, so I’m like more of a… not… I wouldn’t say like a James kind of thing, but I’ll be
like, more like how James is to me, I’ll be to them, where I’ll be explaining how to do
things. So it’s kind of like, um, with James, it’s like I’ll be listening to what he says, and
these guys I hope they’ll be listening to what I say.

D: Are there things that you noticed that he does only with certain people, or some things
he does with all people?

A: Yeah, I think, um, because he and I have, uh, the same amount of seniority, sometimes
he’ll be harder on less senior guys. [indistinguishable] He’ll just be a little bit
[indistinguishable] It’s not a personal thing. It can be taken badly, it just that he wants to
see them perform better or work safer, or...

D: He was mentioning about the reward system [indistinguishable] as far as
performance…

A: There isn’t any.

D: Do you guys have performance evaluations?

A: We’re supposed to. I’ve never… I’ve never gotten that yet, in the 3 or 4 years I’ve been
here. Other people have mentioned, on a yearly basis they get that [indistinguishable].
I’ve never gotten one yet.

D: Do you know what they’re supposed to be evaluated on?

A: Um, job performance, um, attendance, how well you work with others, safety, work
safety, and then your, if you put in any type of extra volunteer or overtime, take the
initiative…

D: What would you say are the qualities of an ideal supervisor?
A: Um, someone who’s fair, open-minded to change. That’s...that’s the workers, uh...let them work and without looking over their shoulder. Training them and then trusting yourself that you trained them correctly and getting them [indistinguishable]. If anything arises where you could help them, they’ll ask for it. Not looking over you.

D: Like micromanaging?

A: Yeah, yeah. As long as it’s fair.

D: Um...what are the qualities of a not-so-ideal supervisor?

A: Exactly the opposite of what I just said. Someone who micromanages, favoritism, and set in his ways, or set in the ways of how a job is supposed to be done.

D: What would you say in general are five attributes of people that are important to you?

A: Um...five?

D: No need be five...as many as you can think of.

A: Um...first, honesty...um...honesty...hard worker...honest...hardworker...dependable...prompt...and someone who works safe.

D: Um...how would you say that your work environment has contributed to your personal development?

A: Uh...[unintelligible]...personal development...I guess I appreciate jobs where you stay clean.

D: What do you think are the basic foundations of relationships...interpersonal relationships?

A: Trust...um...

D: any kind of relationships...coworkers...friends...

A: Trust...honesty...respect...
D: Okay. How do you view yourself ethnically?

A: What is... What is my ethnicity? [unintelligible]... I’m three-quarters Asian and one-quarter Caucasian.

D: If I had a kid, that’s what they would be.

A: Oh yeah?

D: Yeah. I have half Caucasian and my wife is Asian, and I don’t look it too.

A: My kids, my wife is Asian, so my kids are one-eighth... one-eighth Haole, but they pull all... their real fair, their [unintelligible]... yeah, you can tell their Hapa, but...[unintelligible] seven-eighths Asian...

D: How do you view James’ ethnicity?

A: Filipino I guess... last name...

D: Do you think there is anything special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

A: Uh, well I can see... you can see the other side. Um, they... value... the values of the culture and so uh, I guess it makes you more open to understanding how people are raised differently or how they act.

D: Okay... say on a scale of, like, 1 to 10, 1 is a complete stranger and 10 is a really good, best friends, relationship... what would you say, with James, where would your relationship be?

A: Um... I’d say like a... 7.

D: Um... Do you feel that racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace at all?

A: Um... within our crew?

D: Uh, just in general.
A: Yeah, cause I think you have, with this big of a company, you’ll have a lot of personalities...[unintelligible]...you’ll see the extremes. Just because of the amount of people you have...so you’ll come across a lot...a whole lot of personalities.

D: Do you feel like gender issues are sensitive in the workplace?

A: Uh....

D: In general?

A: Yeah...

D: Okay...[ending conversation]
D: Okay, so tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

W: I’m a physician, and I, um, work at night in the intensive care unit.

D: Okay.

W: And I, um teach residents and students, um, like, clinically.

D: Okay.

W: I also do surgery...but I also supervise residents.

D: Okay and you said you normally work at [removed name] right?

W: Yep.

D: Um, how would you describe the people that you work with?

W: They are very smart, intelligent, um...very interested...most of them, I mean there are always exceptions, but they are...they are motivated to learn, so that’s a big plus. Some of them have a harder time in the intensive care unit than others, but in general, everyone is interested in learning and that’s what I like.

D: Mmm.

W: They come from all kinds of backgrounds, but because the medical school here in Hawaii is very, um, transcultural, so [indistinguishable].

D: Okay, so you usually work pretty long hours?

W: Mmhmm.

D: Is it 12 hour shifts?

W: 12 hour shifts, but you stay until things are done. On the surgery side I do 24 hours.

D: Wow, 24 hours shifts?

W: Mmmmm. They call it ‘calls,’ yeah?
D: Oh.

W: You’re on call.

D: On call.

W: But you’re in the house. I mean, so, if you’re busy, you’re up the whole time, up and running, and if you’re not busy then you get to sit down and read or whatever.

D: Oh okay. Do you get to sleep?

W: At night, if you’re really lucky...sometimes. But not very commonly.

D: How would you say that affects your work, having those kinds of hours?

W: I think you’re trained from the get-go, yeah? So if you go into this, you know already that’s what you’ve got to be ready for.

D: Mmm. Okay. What would you say led you to do the work that you do?

W: Uh...

D: You always wanted to be a surgeon?

W: I think I pretty much knew from...I think like the late teens.

D: Wow.

W: I actually didn’t know that I wanted to be a surgeon. I...the first clinical internships and rotations I did in medicine just because I didn’t trust myself. I wanted to be sure that it’s really surgery that...that I wanted to do. So I wanted to look into the medicine side of things first to make sure.

D: Oh.

W: And it ended up being surgery for me.

D: Oh. Okay, and how long have you been doing this...surgery?

W: Uh...since graduating from medical school. Uh...1993...
D: 1993...

W: End of '93...so I started in '94.

D: 12 years?

W: Yeah.

D: Okay. So you said you supervise some people...

W: Mmhmm.

D: Um... is there, like, a complicated organizational chart that you have? Or is it pretty flat... how you would just have a certain number of people...

W: It's... um... it's a little bit like by seniority a little bit. So the students are the most... the youngest and most inexperienced ones, and then come the first year and the second year and the third year residents.

D: Oh.

W: The third year residents are close to graduating, so they are the most competent.

D: Oh, okay.

W: And in surgery, when I work with the surgical residents, then, uh, it's five years.

D: Okay. Uh, maybe could you draw a chart of, maybe, you're area where you work, like if someone supervises you, and then, like, where you are in that, and how... other people that are under you, maybe?

W: Mmhmm. I would say there is the boss of the ICU [drawing], and then there are all the ICU positions, um, and then there are the residents... uh, there is 3, 2, and first year, and then there are the students. And these, and I'm one of them, yeah? This is my boss.

D: Okay.

W: But he also takes, um, shifts, so he takes call like all of us.
D: Oh, okay.

W: And he’s not...from the...from the standpoint of decision making, we are equal, where each one when he’s on call makes his own decisions. So autonomous, yeah?

D: Oh, okay.

W: But then, because we work together, and after one person is off call, the next person takes over, you kind of work as peers.

D: Oh, okay.

W: So you rely on each other and one has to continue what the first one started, or change it, revise it, you know, [indistinguishable] anything. So each of us, um, like this is me, um, teaches the residents which are different levels, and teaches the students, and then also the nurses, who take orders, but are also independently doing their nursing job without me supervising, so they are supervised by their own nursing supervisor for their jobs. Just for the medical orders that they take from us, from the physicians, in that respect, I am their superior.

D: Okay. So do the other physicians also supervise the same residents?

W: Yeah.

D: They all share...

W: Yeah...

D: supervisory...

W: Yeah. I’m not good at charts, sorry.

D: No, that looks fine! Um...let’s see...so think of one of your supervisees...did you think of someone already?

W: Yeah.
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Okay. Give me a, like a pseudonym for that person, so I can call her or him...

D: Aran.

W: Aran?

D: Aran?

W: Yeah.

D: Okay. Okay, so how often do you see Aran?

W: Um, everyday.

D: Everyday?

W: I mean everyday that I’m on call, which is usually, 5 to 6 days...in that...in that area.

D: Oh, 5 to 6 days a week?

W: Mhmhm.

D: Okay, um, when you meet with Aran, or you have encounters, how long of a period do you get to spend with her?

W: During the whole call, because I work nights and so then when he’s on call with me, then we are the whole night working together.

D: Oh, ‘he?’

W: Yeah.

D: Okay.

W: But he’s on call every three or every four nights with me, so it may overlap or it may not.

D: Oh, okay.

W: Otherwise I see him in the morning and in the evening before they leave if they are not on call, or if he is not on call.

D: So you spend a lot of time with him, then, on the shift?
W: Mmhmm. So I make rounds with him and go over everything that happened during the day.

D: Okay.

W: And then we do some teaching based on clinical cases, and then, um, we do procedures as needed, and um, we check on new patients or patients whose status changed. Um, we follow up on any studies that are done, and discuss the result and how that changes the management.

D: Um, so is it mostly in-person that you’re interacting with him? Do you folks do email kind of thing?

W: In person.

D: In person.

W: By phone.

D: Oh, okay.

W: I mean, you know, because he might not be ready when something occurs, and I have to run ahead, or the other way around. Sometimes we have to divide and conquer.

D: Oh, okay.

W: So, he’s doing, um, you know, some of the things he’s doing autonomously, and he just asks me about things when he has questions, and some things we have to do together.

D: Mmm. Okay. Um, do you every have... do you have breakfast [laughs] since it’s so early in the morning? Do you eat with him?

W: At night. Sometimes at night we eat something. You know, whatever is in the lounge, or if he didn’t have dinner then we eat something.

D: Do you ever get to spend time with him outside of work?
W: Not with this one, no.

D: Other students?

W: Rarely, yeah, but sometimes, yeah. Only like once or twice a year.

D: Oh, okay.

W: But it’s because it’s usually me who doesn’t want to go out.

D: Oh.

W: Not that they don’t go out together with the others?

D: Yeah.

W: I think they go out more with the others than when I…with me being present.

D: Oh, okay. So would you say you know Aran on a personal level?

W: Yeah, sometimes we talk about personal things, like what’s his background, and what he has for plans, and um, when he has especially stressful situation, you know, personal things, and personality comes into things.

D: Okay. Do you feel like you know his family and friends?

W: No I don’t know his family, but I do know his friends.

D: Oh, okay. Uh, have you spent time with his friends?

W: When, yeah, most of his friends are also residents, and some of them are nurses, so...

D: Can you think of a personal story that you could tell about him?...Something that’s maybe funny…or could be something sad…or any kind of story.

W: He was telling me about, um…that he used to do kickboxing a lot, um, at home…he’s from…what do you call…[removed place]…sorry.

D: Oh, wow. He must be really good.

W: Kind of. It goes together with him very well, if you know him.
D: Oh yeah?

W: I think he has a personality of a, you know, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder person.

D: Yeah?

W: Incredibly easily distracted.

D: Oh.

W: And so the first time I met him, he was, um, standing in the middle of the intensive care unit and talking with his friend, also a resident, and trying all these moves, and they were talking about some event he had in his past, and then he was kicking around, and then there were the nurses coming in, and she didn’t see, yeah, so he kicked her on the elbow.

D: Oh no!

W: Nothing happened, but it’s kind of...I thought it was extremely funny. You know, just that picture, it’s hard to describe.

D: Ahh...Okay.

W: And it just fits very well with him.

D: Yeah? He looks like a kickboxer?

W: He’s like a very thin, like wirey kind of guy, but he’s in very good physical condition, and he’s just like all over the place.

D: Oh, wow. Seems like that might be good for your type of work, yeah? Cause you’re always...

W: He needs to focus better and put more attention on detail. That’s what I was trying to train him in. The first time he rotated through, um, the ICU it was a lot worse. It was very
horrible. Because he just got distracted and then he forgot about things and then until the next morning, you know, when you notice, ‘oh, this and that hasn’t been done,’ and so on.

D: Oh.

W: And so he got, um, a pretty bad, um, report...um...

D: Evaluation?

W: Evaluation, yeah. And this time that he came back, um, he’s making a real effort and he’s much more focused, and you can really see what a difference it makes.

D: Oh.

W: He’s also a lot more humble than he was before.

D: Oh...maybe somebody, uh, beat ‘em up or something. [both laughing] Uh, what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with Alan?

W: He’s very, um, funny. He, um, he sees the...the irony in things oftentimes and um, its easy to...to smile and, you know, when we talk things over, he understands things very quickly, and then he gets to work on it. And he’s eager to do procedures, so he likes to do certain things better than others, and that’s fine. That can be accommodated. And, you know, I really see the improvement and that’s very motivating for me also.

D: Mmm. Okay.

W: So he really worked on himself.

D: Mmm.

W: And the first time he was there, I really didn’t like him, because I thought, ‘He’s very superficial, and, um, doesn’t pay attention. He really doesn’t care.’ Yeah? But now, he seems to me that really cares because he sees how it affects the patients. It’s not just that I
drill him and he needs to obey orders. It’s because it’s a patient he cares for and that’s why it needs to be paid attention to and needs to be done in the right way. So I think his perspective changed and he has the right priorities now.

D: Okay. Okay. What are some negative things about your relationship with Aran?

W: I still don’t trust him very much, so I always double check things, um, more so than I do with others. But, you know, if he proves himself, then I’ll probably slowly do that less and less.

D: Mmm.

W: And he’s also, um, he is so restless, so um, so much energy, um, that it sometimes, um...you know how people can make you kind of...restless, because they are so...

D: They kind of make you feel like that too...

W: Yeah. Yeah.

D: Yeah.

W: So that...I mean, if I notice it and get conscious...I mean am conscious about it, then it doesn’t rile me up so much, yeah?

D: Uh, huh.

W: But I have to realize, okay, just calm down...then it works.

D: You have to make yourself calm down with him?

W: Yeah.

D: Wow....Um, I know you kind of explained this, but could you elaborate more on how your relationship developed? Like, how do you see were some of the...or what do you see were some of the factors in how you saw improvement in your relationship with him?
W: I, um, when he came... I mean, when they come through where I work with him the first time, yeah? The whole... the whole setting is that they go to different areas and learn in different special... specialties. So when they come to me the first time, they’re all overwhelmed. Everyone. I’ve not seen a single one who wasn’t overwhelmed. And so people compensate in different ways, and his way was, you know, kind of to blow over it, and pretend it doesn’t really affect him. And, um, so he made the impression that he doesn’t care, and then he also didn’t really know, yeah? I think ignorance was a big part of the problem, and he just didn’t realize, you know, what is important and what is not important. And then he got distracted easily, you know, being... that just being his personality. And then, um, and it just kind of perpetuated itself, yeah?

D: Mmm.

W: Um, but now, the second time when he came back, um, he started on a different level, yeah? And so, I think he started on a better footing, and so everyone trusted him more, and um, because he seemed to have... more, more calm, and he had more of a systematic approach, had better priorities, and what’s, you know, what’s needed, and what’s important and what’s not important. He also was more efficient already. And so, that kind of also gave people more the willingness to be patient with him and let him do, also let him do more.

D: What do you think was...

W: Me... me especially, yeah? I didn’t want to let him do a lot, because he was just not diligent to me, and it’s dangerous to let people do some things if they don’t pay attention to what I’m saying, yeah? And they just think they know it already, and... and they do it, you know, because it’s interventions on patients, yeah? And now that he listens more,
and I...I feel that he learned, then I...I can trust that he listens to me also while he does something where I'm supervising him, and so I let him do more.

D: Mmm.

W: And he got better with that, too.

D: Umm...what do think was a major reason for why he changed so much?

W: I think he saw that he couldn’t go on that way. He wasn’t going to get through the program if he didn’t, you know, straighten out sort of, yeah? I think he...he had it, in a way, he had it easy because he’s so smart, he didn’t really have to sit down and learn and really stay with things, yeah? And so he had it too easy for a long time, and he realized...now, I think he realized he has...this was different, so he changed the way he...he approached things. Sometimes the case with the really smart people.

D: Mmm. Yeah.

W: Maybe he’s also...maybe just generally more interested now. Before it seemed like most of the things were really just a game for him, yeah?

D: Yeah. Okay, um...hmm...how would you say your relationship with Aran compares to your relationship with the other students?

W: It’s different yeah? That’s why I thought of him when you asked me who to think of.

D: That one stuck out for you.

W: Yes [laughs]. Because I...I can see his potential, yeah? And that’s always what really interests me, when...when people have this great potential but they have a lot of trouble to...to realize it.

D: Mmm.
W: That’s when I...I get more personally involved for some reason, and I don’t know why. I think he can be really good. Yeah. Be a really good physician if he sticks with it. I also think he still has to find out what he really wants, and I’m just trying to help him there, yeah, by showing him the aspects that I can show him, so that he can make a...you know, what do you call it...informed decision.

D: Yeah. Okay. Do you feel like you have to act differently towards him than any of the other students?

W: I have to calm down more. [laughs] I have to um...I have to tell myself, ‘Yeah, okay, wait...just.’

D: Um...

W: And I have to also, I have to uh...um, really do more criticism. I mean, constructive criticism, but sometimes in the beginning, though, I really scolded him, and I thought...I told him, ‘You know, I really didn’t think that I need to say that. You know, you are at this level now, and this is the kind of things that are very basic.’ You know, go over things with him like that. But, I mean, I also tell him, you know, how it feels for me when...when he does something that I really think is an oversight or is really bad. Um, I tell him that I feel disappointed, because I didn’t expect that from him. So, I mean, I think it’s important that...that one shows it’s a personal thing always, too, yeah? It’s not just a role-type thing between a teacher and student.

D: Yeah.

W: And some people, it’s not...it doesn’t really disappoint me, because I know they’re not interested, and they...they won’t deal with that anymore after they’re out of this rotation, yeah? They’re never going to be in this situation. And then it doesn’t disappoint
me, or it doesn’t make me sad, yeah? Because I know that’s what…they’re not interested.

They’re gonna do something completely different, so they just need to get through this.

That’s all right, yeah?

D: Yeah.

W: But in him, I expect more, so I’m disappointed more…if…if he doesn’t do what I expect.

D: So for some people, um, you don’t invest as much into them because…

W: Because they make it very clear that they just really want to get through the basics, and be able to handle things, and…and not really, um, you know, be…be extensively involved in details…management person…or also on, you know, the questions of what we know…uh, science –wise, yeah? What’s the evidence? What’s…what’s just assumption?

D: Mmm.

W: So with…with, uh, some people, I really discuss the matter in detail, and with others I don’t, because they are really not interested.

D: Mmm.

W: It usually becomes clear up…right up front. So, uh, or I ask them and then, you know, we find a level of where everyone is comfortable, because, you know, I mean, there is no point in wasting time.

D: Yeah.

W: And sometimes there is no time to do that, but other times there are.

D: Sometimes there’s no time…
W: To teach. You know, then you just have to go and get the work done, yeah? But that’s also teaching in a way, because that’s reality, yeah? That’s how it’s going to be for them, too, when they’re out in residency and doing their attending job.

D: Yeah. Okay. Hmm…is there some kind of reward system for the students?

W: I think they can get awards for best resident of the year, or things like that. And then they can get a very good evaluation. For the students, they can get honors.

D: Okay.

W: I haven’t given honors to a student in a long time.

D: Oh.

W: In the surgical side, yeah?

D: So you folks get to bestow…

W: Yeah, evaluate.

D: Okay. Do you feel like, um, Aran has enough resources to do his job?

W: Yeah.

D: How many performance evaluations does he get? Like a yearly thing, or…

W: One every month.

D: Oh, wow.

W: Yeah.

D: Okay, so, I guess like you said in the beginning his evaluations weren’t that good and then they improved later on.

W: Just the clinical evaluations and then they do the written…their own written exams that are…are nationwide.

D: Mmm. How long would you say it took for his evaluations to get better?
W: Um...it was...uh...8 months.

D: Eight months?

W: Eight months ago, he came the first time. Yeah. See they only have 3 years to be
finished yeah. So they gotta learn quick.

D: Gotta...gotta be quick, huh? Mmm. What would you say are the qualities of your most
ideal, uh, student?

W: Um...from the standpoint of learning, you need to be motivated. I think motivation is
really what counts. If you’re motivated, you can learn anything you want.

D: Yeah.

W: But in the setting of medicine, he needs to care about his patients, because it’s all
about the patient. It’s not about, you know, being great, or looking good, or something
like that.

D: Mmm.

W: And it helps if someone is efficient and, you know, quick in the uptake...um, you
know, and deals with the paper work side of things well, because that’s all just the
burden, yeah? So it needs to be handled efficiently and quickly, so that you can really
spend time with the patient care itself, yeah? Um, find out what’s going on, investigate,
then evaluate, um, change the management and re-evaluate. You need to be flexible, so
that he is open-minded and sees that things can change and they can change quickly, and
that will also change the management very quickly.

D: What are some qualities of your not-so-ideal student?

W: Just not interested.

D: Okay.
W: Taking forever with doing things, or actually, just not doing things. I tell him something and things don’t get done. Or even worse, he says something is done and it wasn’t done.

D: Oh.

W: Um, being overconfident. Um, and thereby, you know, overestimating his capabilities and then making mistakes. Being, um, very bad in communication or, you know, in interpersonal relationships with the patients. Yeah. Need to be able to talk with your patients...um, you know, get a relationship, um, because there is trust involved. And so, on an interpersonal level that needs to work. Otherwise you can’t ever find out what’s really going on with your patient. And same, you know, for communicating with the families, especially in the ICU, because most patients can’t talk. They are [indistinguishable] so need to be able to communicate with the families and make them understand what’s going on. Earn their trust and help them to make decisions. So, if someone can’t do that they are worthless. From the standpoint of working together, yeah? They are...as a member of the team, they are a non-entity at that point.

D: Mmm.

W: It’s never one person alone, yeah? It’s always a team. There...the whole ICU works based on the team. Yeah. The physicians, residents, students, nurses, pharmacists, um, everything, yeah?

D: You need to have good communication with everyone.

W: Yeah. And the residents and students have a very key role, yeah? Because the nurses call them first, and then they call me. If they don’t get a good answer, or they’re not satisfied, or things are not working.
D: Mmm

W: And so, if... also if the residents can't talk with the nurses, or is offensive, or arrogant, then it's not working either.

D: Mmm. Um, on a more interpersonal level, what would you say are the qualities of a student that you could get along with easily?

W: The qualities of a student?

D: That you could get along with easily?

W: Uh, I really like it when someone is openminded, yeah? So that, um, he's not only seeing one aspect of things, or, you know, one organ system, or one problem in a setting, but he needs to see the whole picture at the same time. You know, being, um, being diligent. On a... on a really personal level you mean?

D: Yeah, someone that, you know, you feel you'd really like, and...

W: They have compassion with people. Even with the people that is difficult to get along with.

D: Mmhm.

W: If they still can have compassion and patience, you know, and see that they are suffering or they are so under stress, and they can handle that and, you know, have a distance and don't take it personally, then I really can work with them.

D: Mmm.

W: Because it helps me and it helps them also.

D: What kinds of qualities would you not like in someone?... on a personal level.

W: On a personal level, if they are cocky, and arrogant, and pretend... and think they know everything. If they do, uh, you know, if they think, you know, 'I am so good. I
don't even need all this evidence. I know already what’s going on, so I do not need to do that study or put in that catheter monitor, or...,' that kind of thing, yeah? Cause then I’m thinking...someone I don’t trust.

D: Mm. Yeah.

W: Cause none of us know that. Otherwise, you know, we would all be heros and no one would die.

D: Yeah.

W: It’s narrowmindedness. That’s the same thing in a way. Also, careless, yeah? Makes them blind to see what else could be going on. And therefore it endangers patients and patient care. And it also makes them bad teachers, because, uh, they don’t see the whole spectrum of things, and don’t evaluate the alternatives and the differential diagnoses, and...and that makes them bad teachers in my mind.

D: Um, can you name five attributes of people that are important to you? Like just five words...uh, doesn’t have to be single words [laughs].

W: Compassionate, openminded, intelligent, patient, altruistic.

D: Okay. Um, how would you say your work environment has contributed to your own personal development?

W: Um, I think that I am very blessed in the fact that I have excellent colleagues from whom I learn. And I also learn from my patients, because they are so varied and so amazing in the way they present and what they have, and each one, each time you treat someone it’s a learning experience, too, yeah? So every time goes into, you know, into the future so that we can improve things, hopefully, the next time we have a similar problem. And I learn from my students and my residents because of the questions they
ask. You know, um, it motivates my need to read things and to look up things and learn. And it just, in general it just keeps me interested in doing it. And the environment the...that allows that, that’s a very good environment. There are not that many places that allow you to...and the resources are excellent.

D: Mmm.

W: The electronic resources as well as the human ones, yeah? So you can ask other specialists for their opinion or how they would approach that, or would they interpret that. Or on a very simple level, you can get an interpreter for any language [indistinguishable].

D: Oh. Wow.

W: I’m sure at every single night there is someone who speaks Cantonese, or Thai, or Vietnamese or French, German, English, whatever.

D: Wow.

W: Japanese are busy [indistinguishable]...numerous Korean... D: Like as part of the staff, or do they have...?

W: Staff, nurses, housekeepers, X-ray techs, anyone, yeah?

D: Oh. So not just special interpreters, that...

W: Yeah, there’s a phone line for that too, but you know, just the...the hospital staff itself...all the...entire hospital, I mean, you usually get someone on who can translate, so that alone is fascinating for me...something that wouldn’t be the case in, like, let’s say, in Germany, or even on the East Coast. Not necessarily.

D: Yeah.

W: Usually you have Spanish and English.
D: Yeah... Hmm... Now, what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

W: At work or in general?

D: In general.

W: Basic foundations...

D: Yeah... what are the factors that help to build interpersonal relationships.

W: A genuine interest in doing that. Obviously, if you’re not interested to get to know someone, then it’s not going to happen. And communication. And, uh, trust, eventually. But now what really generates that trust that’s the big question for me, yeah?

D: Mmm. That’s what I was going to ask you about. [both laugh] That’s the million dollar question.

W: Yeah. The one that I still can’t answer. I guess that’s why I’m not married.

D: Well, me and my wife are still working on that... How do you view yourself and the other students ethnically?... Like, how would you describe... how would you describe yourself, first?

W: I’m Caucasian.

D: Caucasian, okay. And what type of...

W: I mean, ethnically I’m Caucasian, yeah? Simple. Um...

D: What kind of, um, ethnicities do your employees have? Well, not employees, but you’re your students.

W: Um, anything. Filipino, Japanese, Chinese, um, Vietnamese, Thai, Laotian, Caucasian... Russian... German?

D: Wow.
W: And I met a French one in recent times. That’s about it.

D: French?

W: That was a year ago.

D: Oh, and you said Aran was Thai, right?

W: Yeah.

D: Um… what do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

W: Um… it’s special because it really enriches it. Um, in… in… I worked in Germany for a while also, and in Germany it’s much, much more homogenous. Um, you really have 80, 90 percent Germans that you work with… in the hospital setting, at least, where I was, yeah?

D: Mmhmm.

W: And, um, so the topics of conversation and of communication are focused on completely different issues, yeah? But here, with different cultures and religions you have different holidays, and you speak about different things and different perceptions on things. And it also helps very much, because where it affects the patient care, for example, death and dying patients and how the families deal with that… so much culture goes into that… culture and religion, and if you can understand that better, then you can help them better, communicate better. So, if I have a Filipino patient and… and Filipino nurses can explain to me what’s going on, you know? Or what… how usually Filipino families deal with, you know, a dying [indistinguishable] situation, it’s a lot different than if I don’t know anything about it.

D: Mmm.
W: Or Hawaiian families…50 of them in the room, yeah, when someone dies. That’s something that would never happen in Germany.

D: Mmm.

W: Um, and that’s why, it’s totally important for them to have them all there. It’s not something that is important in Germany or in other, whatever other…some other religions, or cultures, I mean. So for them, it’s more important to make…break the hospital rules, or bend them, and let 50 people into the room, so that they can all be than…um, than any other thing, yeah?

D: Yeah.

W: For some Catholic person, uh, the most important thing is to get the priest ready, yeah? And it’s so different. And it’s really important, I think, not only for the patient, but also for the families, and for us all, to try to…try and give the best care, that we know that, you know? You know what…what’s the important thing right now, for this situation. Or amputations, yeah? In some cultures, an amputation is…is…is very bad.

D: [indistinguishable]

W: Yeah, because it…it would mean, I think, I don’t know which religion it is, but I heard about it, that you cannot…that you…you have an incomplete body when you go to heaven.

D: Yeah, I think I heard about that. So what do they…

W: They would rather die than have an amputation.

D: Wow…um…would you say you have a high quality relationship with Aran?

W: I think so, yeah.

D: Um…
W: One from which we both learn. That's a high quality for me.

D: Yeah. On a scale of 1 to 10 where would you rate your relationship with him?

W: 8...7 or 8.

D: Okay.

W: Cause it...it's interesting, so I like that, yeah? I'm not bored. Um, 10 I would give to my lover, but not to anyone else, yeah?

D: Ah...Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

W: Yeah.

D: Yeah? How so?

W: You can offend people if you don't know what's important culturally for them.

D: Mmm.

W: And it also can impede communication a lot, yeah? The perception of time in Hawaiian families is completely different than our Western perception of things. So if I try to explain to them, 'You know, he can die, and he can die any minute now,' they still tell me, 'Oh, the uncle is coming in from Samoa next Friday.' And I said, 'Yeah, that's not gonna work. He's gonna be dead before then.' It's a...it's something that continues to amaze me, because it's a completely different perception of time. As if time bends to their rules, of their own perception, yeah?

D: Mmm...Okay...do you feel like gender issues are sensitive in the workplace?

W: Um...It's hard to say...

D: In your workplace, would you say?

W: I don't have a...I don't have a feeling for that being a problem or being something that needs to be improved, or...or...it's kind of off my radar.
What about, like, in general?

D: In general here, in the United States, or here in the physician setting, or in...

W: Mmm, just in workplaces in general...any type of workplace...

D: Oh.

W: It’s, yeah, I think it depends on, uh, the culture where you’re in. In Europe, it’s much more an issue than here in the United States, at least in the setting that I’m used to.

D: Oh.

W: I’m sure there are workplace situations where it’s even more of an issue. For example, I think auto mechanics are still mostly male, yeah?

D: Yeah.

W: Whereas here in the hospital, um, there are just, I mean, nearly as many male as female nurses, and they are also just the same.

D: Oh.

W: And physicians, same. Male and female physicians. There are more...more male cardiac surgeons. So there are some professions that are male dominated still, and there are some that are, you would say they are female dominated. I guess there are overall more female nurses than male nurses, but, from the perception of, you know, quality of it, I think they are equal.
Interview with J.T. – Supervisor

May 13, 2007
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 pm

Note: Participant recently entered a new position, but was interviewed about her previous position as a supervisor.

D: So what was your position called?
J: Business Office Team Lead.
D: Business Office Team Lead. And that was like accounting stuff that you were doing?
J: It’s more, um, handling what the, um, operators bring in per day-and balancing what they do. That’s like the main part of the work-making sure it balances and stuff.
D: Okay.
J: And there’s, you know, little bit more to the job.
D: Okay. Uh...how would you describe the people that you work with?
J: Mmm...In that department?
D: Yeah.
J: Um...they just wanna be workers and be lazy.
D: Okay.
J: They just wanna do what they know, but its like, there’s no eagerness to learn more, except for one of my others...associates.
D: So there’s only one person that was kind of more motivated?
J: Yeah, because I think that she, overall, was just about, like, making people happy. So she always works hard for her supervisor, or...overall for anybody, like, she just wants to help people out.

D: Okay.

J: She’ll be a good longstanding worker at [removed company name], I think.

D: How long were you working in that position again?

J: Um...

D: One year?

J: I think so. Yeah, about a year, year-and-a-half.

D: Tell me about a typical day at work. What kind of stuff would you do?

J: At that department?

D: Yeah.

J: Um...If I work in the morning, a typical day would be...whatever, um, money, checks, credit card slips, um, was turned in by each cashier from the night before, we’re counting down those bags, and plugging it into our computer system, called the [removed name] system. And once we’re done with that, then we have to match what we plugged into our [removed name] system compared to what they rang on the cash register.

D: Oh.

J: So the system had already kept track of all their ring ups, and we have to balance out mainly the cash and the checks to see if they’re over or short. Once we figure all that stuff out, and everything is okay, there’s nothing to be researched, then we can finalize that business day...that yesterday’s business day. Once we finalized and all that...um, things get finalized with our home office, I guess. And throughout the day, it’s just
basically putting the deposit together, putting away all our paperwork that was printed from the night before. Basically it’s all our sales and stuff...what the store did for the day.

D: Okay. Um...since you were a supervisor, I wanted to kind of, uh, get to know your relationship with one of your people that you were supervising. So think of one person, and we’re gonna use fake names, so we gotta think of a fake name for you first...

J: Um...I’ll be J.T.

D: J.T. Okay what about, uh...can you think of a person...one person that you could talk about...

J: She’ll be Cameron. [laughs] Justin Timberlake and Cameron Diaz.

D: How much contact do you have with Cameron...on a typical day?

J: Um...with this particular associate that I had problems supervising, I would purposely, um, make the schedule so that I’m only working with her for like two hours in a day. Cause I couldn’t stand her work habits.

D: And for those several hours, would you work kind of closely together?

J: Yeah. We all just work in one single office, so there’s not, like, space between us. It’s not separated by cubicles...nothing.

D: Mmm. Do you guys...you and Cameron, get to work on stuff together...like you both have to work on something together at the same time?

J: Mmm...that’s...I don’t think that’s ever really the case, unless, um, two people are trying to work on a deposit together. So they’re, like, say, if they’re doing a pull for the day, they went downstairs to pull money from the cashiers, one might be plugging the
cash, and the other might be plugging the checks. But for the most part, there’s a lot to do in that office, so two people shouldn’t be working on the same things together.

D: Oh...everyone kind of concentrates on their own part?

J: Yeah.

D: You ever take breaks together with her, or have lunch with her, or...

J: Um, sometimes I do, but for the most part, um, I think there should be somebody in that office as much as possible, at least one person.

D: Oh, you kind of gotta separate the breaks and stuff?

J: So, yeah, like, um, if downstairs calls and we have to collect from our customer that had a bounced check with us, its always nice to have at least one person in that office to be ready for anybody on the floor if they need help with something.

D: Okay.

J: I try to, um, alternate the breaks. That...that office is very independent. So, nobody really watches over you. So, they might be taking multiple breaks. So that’s [unintelligible].

D: You ever do stuff outside of work with Cameron?

J: Yeah, Cameron’s fun to party with.

D: Oh yeah?

J: She likes to drink.

D: But you don’t like to work with her?

J: Yeah, she’s lazy that’s why.

D: Would you say you know Cameron on a personal level?

J: Yeah.
D: Do you know her family and friends?

J: I know her husband, met some of her friends, um...but her family is in another country.

D: What's a story that you could tell me about Cameron? Something that...

J: At work kine?

D: Yeah, any kind of story.

J: Work type of thing? She's a...um...she'll just do work that she knows. It's not that she tries to learn anything outside of her box. I think it's just, like, not wanting to take on more responsibility.

D: Mmm.

J: And then, um...I think she had me trained in a sense, because I had problems with, um, having her do things or like delegating tasks...um, she's answered back to me once or twice before so that really, really got me irritated, and I was gonna have her coached or warned on that, but I didn't follow through on it. Um...and then she complains about her schedule...spending time with her husband, she wanted to work a certain shift, and, you know, I tried to explain to her, its like, you know, if you want a Monday through Friday job you shouldn't be working retail.

D: Mmm.

J: So yeah, she's just a little complainer. But I probably...she's probably had me trained in a way that I wouldn't bother her so much or try to, you know, boss her around in a way that I should've. And then my problem was making...becoming friends with her. I think that was a...I think it's hard not to make friends at work, you know?

D: Yeah.
J: But then my friend told me one thing before. He goes, cause he’s manager, right, at his job? He goes, “I’m your boss, I’m not your friend.” He’s just there to supervise. So he knows how to separate that, you know?

D: Mmm.

J: I think I’m too sensitive too, so...

D: What are some positive things about your relationship with Cameron?

J: Positive things?

D: Yeah.

J: Mmm...I think she’s a caring person. I mean, that’s a good quality in a friendship. Um...good caring, loving, heart I guess. And she’s uh...her attitude towards life is just kinda...happy-go-lucky, and you live in the moment. So, I think that’s a good attitude.

D: What are some negative things about your relationship with her?

J: Mmm...work...work-wise, uh, like I said she probably had me trained in a way to not put on extra tasks on her, and when you try to...when I try to direct her in a direction I wanted her to go, then she’d be, like, very argumentative about it.

D: Oh, okay.

J: A little bull-headed.

D: How would you say your relationship kind of developed with her, from when she...when you first started working together until the end?

J: Mmm...my approach with her was just being friendly, and jokey, and teasing her and stuff. I didn’t honestly know how she was going to be to work with, because she’s um...she’s from Mexico. Can I say that?

D: Yeah.
J: Not American. So I was concerned about, like, I guess I was prejudging her cause her English wasn’t very well, so I didn’t know if she’d be up to par to come into our office, and honestly if you gave me the choice on who I would’ve hired, and I was the supervisor back then, I wouldn’t have got her in. Just because I would’ve prejudged her before having [unintelligible]...you know?

D: Yeah. So who started first over there, you or her?

J: Me

D: And then she came after?

J: Mmm...

D: You were...so you were there for a year and then she’s...less than a year...

J: Eight...eight months maybe? Eight, nine months.

D: Can you draw me...uh...like a timeline of, uh, like, key events? Like, in thinking about your relationship with her, like a time line of significant events in that relationship.

J: Of work?...

D: Yeah, or anything. Like, anything that kind of stands out to you, as, “Oh, this was maybe a time I got to know her well,” or maybe after that, “This point, maybe, our relationship got bad,” she did something, I don’t know...some kind of significant event...

J: Timeline?

D: Yeah.

J: On a line?

D: Yeah, whatever’s easiest...or an outline...
J: What is last year?...06....Question mark is gonna be “about” okay?

D: Kay.

J: [drawing] How do I write...that...I mean that, as far as getting to know her...I get to know her while I’m working with her, so...you know like, you’re just working, and you just talk about things, whatevers? So, that’s like on a day to day basis.

D: Yeah, you can just put that...ongoing...

J: So I put, like, she started around June, her learning is a little too slow, so I figured she needed to pick up the pace, so around August, she had an eval. So me and another supervisor talked to her about how she was doing so far in her position and what...what she needed improvement on.

D: Yeah, that’s good. How she progressed and stuff. Is she still there?

J: Yup...I didn’t write everything, everything.

D: Thank you. What do you think are the reasons for the positive and negative, um, aspects of your relationship?

J: What are the what?

D: The reasons...behind it?

J: Oh. Um, from the time she started...from the time she started, um, I wasn’t satisfied with her work performance from the beginning, because she kept repeatedly asking things, and she should’ve been writing things down and knowing what to do already.

D: Oh.

J: And by a couple months later, I had a sit-down eval with her about how can we...what can we do to develop you better, so we had suggested to her, “You need to write down
notes, so that you don’t repeatedly ask the same questions over and over and over. You should’ve had this stuck in your memory already.”

D: Yeah.

J: Um…then by August, my other coworker came in to my office, and she ended up being my prize-winning associate, because whatever I taught her, she just held it in memory without writing anything down. Then she was the only one that I could depend on as far as extra responsibilities.

D: Oh.

J: Then I started expressing to that person…let’s just call her, um, Gertrude…so I expressed to Gertrude, I said, um, “So I’m getting frustrated with Cameron.” I said, “So what am I gonna do?” I realized it was my fault, as far as how I was supervising her and letting her run over me. You know, Gertrude was like, “Okay, you know, you know it’s partly your fault, whatever, but give me the responsibility and I will train Cameron into the associate you want her to be.” And Cameron never comes around to being the associate I want her to be. By around early this year, I was like, “Oh, fuck it already. I don’t really care about this position. I don’t want to be at [removed company name] no more.” Then I went on my vacation. I started going into like “I don’t give a shit” mode about my position, or my associates, or whatever. Like, I was just kind of going through the motions. So then I went on my vacation. And when I came back, you know, I was like, okay, you know, I need to find a job, whatever, you know, but then optical came up, and I thought of it as a good opportunity. And that’s why I moved to optical. Which at this point, I don’t know if it was the wisest decision on my part, but I think it’s a lot better than being in that…in this office.
D: Oh...sounds more fun...

J: So that’s my drama. I like not being a supervisor, because I see how my new manager gets frustrated over her staff, and what her responsibilities are, and I don’t see it worth it. No more at least for me.

D: Mmm. Um...so when you were in that position, how did your relationship with Cameron compare with your relationship with other staff?

J: Mmm...so Gertrude was my favorite associate, and then, uh, the rest of the three including Cameron, are just, like, lazy. They just wanna know what they know, and they don’t wanna learn more and they just come in and do what they know, and that’s it, which isn’t very helpful to me, cause then the workload for me started piling up.

D: Mmm. What are some things you used to do with all your staff?

J: What are some things?

D: Yeah. Could be anything, go out, certain activities...

J: Oh, well...my other, uh, associate, uh, call ‘em Shaun. Shaun doesn’t get along with Cameron from the start. He, like, judged her way before she even came in. He’s like, “Why the hell she coming in here. She don’t know shit about accounting. She said she graduated in accounting and she’s useless, and she don’t understand what we’re talking about.” And he was like totally negative about her. And then they had a beef: so then they just, like, didn’t like each other. They don’t like working with each other. So...what was the question again?

D: So how does your relationship with Cameron compare with your relationship with the other folks?
J: Mmm... I get along with everybody fine, but I just have my little, um, reasons why I get irritated with each and every one of them.

D: Mmm. Do you do stuff with certain people that you don’t do with others?

J: At work?

D: Yeah.

J: Mmm... well, Gertrude is the one that I would teach everything, cause I know she would get things done, without giving me a hard time, or... so I had a favorite associate. But I... but I didn’t give her preferential treatment. I just gave her a lot of my work. [laughs] Like my own personal secretary. Cause the rest just weren’t willing to learn. So it was like almost at a point that I had to write out to do lists, for the rest of them, just to make sure that things would get done in that office.

D: Mmm. Okay. Uh, what are the qualities of your ideal employee?

J: What are the qualities?

D: Yeah.

J: Gertrude.

D: What is she like?

J: Um... She’s easy to teach. I don’t have to repeat anything. Like, once you teach her, she don’t even write it down. I’m not like that. In order for me to learn, I have to write things down, and I... I actually, I can be annoying like Gertrude because I will keep asking the same thing over and over and over and over again. So I know that it’s a good habit to write things down, so that you can try to keep things in memory, but yeah... with Gertrude, it’s like, you tell her once, you show her how to do something once, and she just gets it right then and there. I don’t have to show it to her a second time around. So it
was at...it was at a point that I don’t have to worry about certain things getting done, because she would do it. She’s always like...her mentality is, “I work because it’s paying me. I don’t goof off, because this is work. I have to work.” So, she had a good mentality for the job, at least.

D: Okay, what are the qualities of a not-so-ideal employee?

J: What are the qualities of a not-so-ideal?

D: Yeah.

J: Someone that, um, complains about their schedule all the time. Um, cause I think I’m flexible, but then you...you have to work with me, too. Like for me, like, my attitude is I don’t care if I have to work weekends. That’s just a given. You know what I mean? But, if a...a person can give you enough notice that they want changes...not like, you know, like, “Oh, I don’t want to work nights, cause I want to be with my husband.” It’s like, sorry, you know, this is retail. That’s the way it is. Um...and somebody that just doesn’t take direction very well, that’s gonna, um, kind of avoid doing it, or find a reason not to do it. Um...I don’t know what else.

D: Okay. Would those qualities that you would like to see in your ideal employee be different than what you would like to see in a friend?

J: Mmm...I think it...I think it should differ. Cause friendships are more like something that, um, you’re looking towards...I mean, what am I trying to say...cause we’re getting older right? So you’re looking for quality in friendships. You’re not looking for anybody...you don’t want new friendships with a person that’s needy, and is depressed all the time, right? I mean, there’s nothing to gain out of that.

D: Mmm.
J: So, quality...I think its two different qualities.

D: What do you think are the basic foundations of relationships?...Interpersonal relationships.

J: Basic foundations?

D: Yeah...stuff that, uh, helps the relationship develop...stuff that you need for a relationship...

J: Just relationships in general?

D: Yeah.

J: I don't know...basic foundations?

D: Yeah.

J: What is interpersonal?

D: Just like...mmm...you know...

J: One-on-one.

D: One-on-one relationships.

J: Could it be like when I'm getting to know somebody new?

D: Yeah.

J: Um...

D: Like what do you need...what do you think you need to have a good relationship?...what would the qualities of the person be, or...I don't know...

J: Well, when I...when I meet...when I meet people...when I meet new people at least, I want to make sure that...that I'm at least a good listener, cause that frickin annoys me when people, you be talking to them and they're just like...their minds are just...which I can get like that, but...a good listener...
D: Good listener.

J: Someone that respects, um...I guess someone that respects your beliefs, cause everybody has different beliefs and stuff, like, you know, I think respect is very important, but not somebody that’s gonna push their beliefs on you.

D: Mmmmm.

J: Not too, um...both people shouldn’t prejudge each other. I think people have a tendency to do that. And so, like, um, for me at least, I...I know my downfalls are that I’m easily intimidated by people. So like, I don’t like people in higher positions. I automatically, like, put myself down here, so that I don’t have a hard time talking to them, because I myself feel insecure, you know? Like, I’m all like, well, I’m not good enough to talk to them, or I’m gonna come across stupid. So I need to learn to put myself at the same level so that...cause those kind of people, they know when you’re intimidated, and some of those people are the ones that will know how to control you and get what they want out of you. So you gotta try and da kine right? That’s my, like, strongest downfall, I would have to say...strongest downfall...so...people with authority I guess...um, but on the...I mean, like, on the surface, like, I can just...I can get to know people...it’s pretty easy, you know, you find out where they come from, what their background is, where they grew up, what kind of work they do, what kind of hobbies they do. On the surface, that’s pretty easy, right?

D: Mmm.

J: But, I have to say, I’m pretty intimidated by a lot of people, actually. Not a very Leo type of trait I think. [laughs]

D: How would you view yourself and Cameron ethnically?...you said she’s Mexican?
J: I think ethnically, we’re like, um...I think we’re very different because she’s very, um...and I don’t know if this is very common in a lot of Mexican households, but she’s very united with her family, and is very concerned about her family, and, um, misses them a lot, that she made a sacrifice to come here because her husband wants to be in Hawaii. Which doesn’t mean that she doesn’t care about her family, but when she got married, you know, it’s gonna...she’s gonna lead a whole different life now, you know? Um...

D: Yeah. And how would you view yourself ethnically?

J: I think that I’m a pretty proud Okinawan. [laughs] But I think that if...um, if I had more time, which time always can be made, of course, I would like to learn about my peoples a little more. I would definitely like to learn the old language, because it’s dying...dying with our parent’s generation, and uh, learn the cooking from my mom. Not that I like Okinawan food, but I think it’s a good thing to carry on for future generations.

D: What do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

J: Intercultural? I think you can learn a lot from other people. Um, I especially love, like, other cultures’ foods and stuff, and I think that that’s a good way for other people to, uh, intermingle with just their food alone. But I love learning about other peoples’ cultures and stuff, cause it makes me, kind of like, feel like, oh, I’m traveling a little bit through them. When you talk...you know when you’re, like, talking to them and stuff?

D: Yeah, yeah.

J: But, I noticed, like at work...like, you know how Filipinos, they all just, like, [hand gestures a “coming together” gesture]. No matter, like, if they’re new workers, they always just fuse together with, like, with people that been there already before. But
they’re not like, they don’t seem prejudiced or anything like that. They’ll share their food with you.

D: Yeah.

J: You know? They’re just like…they always feed me.

D: They have their bond yeah?

J: Yeah, they always feed me and stuff. Some of them [unintelligible] Filipino, you know, but they always fuse together, Filipinos, wherever you work.

D: Mmm.

J: But it’s good to see, like, a tight bond like that, you know?

D: Mmm. Do you think that cultural part plays a role in your relationship with Cameron?

J: I think I prejudged her too soon, before I…because I…I…because her English wasn’t very good, I thought, well, she’s stupid, and that’s not…that’s not a good way to look at it. Just because she doesn’t speak English very well, doesn’t mean that she’s, you know, not up to par having a conversation with you. She just can’t explain things in the same way, you know? I think she’s a smart girl, but I think the English was the barrier. And the…and the sad part with her is, I had made a suggestion that there’s a adult school where you can take English classes…

D: Oh.

J: For really cheap, right? And she…her thing is she’s learning things in everyday life. That’s how she learns her English, and that’s how her husband thinks she should learn her English. But to me, like, if you go to a class, you’ll learn the proper structure of…you know?

D: Yeah.
J: Like, she'll say things the wrong way a lot of times, because she’s thinking about it in Spanish.

D: Oh.

J: So when she words it, you know, maybe the “what?” might be in the wrong placement rather than the beginning of the sentence.

D: Yeah, yeah.

J: So her...it’s...part of it is her husband not telling her, well...he’s kind of just like, “Yeah, just learn it in everyday life.” And I don’t think that’s the way to, you know...that’s probably why she just can’t formulate right sentence structure.

D: Would you say you have a good relationship with her?...Like, how would you rate your relationship on a scale of 1 to 10?

J: Um, friendship-wise, I think that she’s better...a better friend than she is a associate under me. So friendship-wise, I’d give her like maybe a 5 or a 6. And then as a associate under me...if I was just a associate...a common associate like her, I would probably give her a 5 or a 6, but then as an associate under me, I’d give her like a 3.

D: Um...okay, almost pau with this part. Do you think racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

J: Racial or ethnic issues? Sensitive in the workplace?

D: Yes.

J: Um...probably...racial, ethnic issues...um, in Hawaii, I think a lot of people just don’t like White people.

D: Mmm.
J: Um, sad to say, but a lot of our managers come from the mainland, so... I mean I don’t even have to explain it, you know what I mean? White people just act so, like, self-righteous, and that’s just annoying with Hawaii people, cause, they’re not, you know, they’re not used to that, cause we don’t, we’re not part of the mainland, so attitudes are different, yeah?

D: Mmm.

J: But I would say, probably, amongst the associates, yeah, just the White folks. And then they don’t like our Korean customers, cause you know, like, we’re right in K-town, right? Over there, all the “buy-me-drinkie” bars? Oh, they’re so demanding those Korean business owners, but not like work-wise.

D: How long do you think it takes to get to know somebody well?

J: To get to know them well?

D: Yeah.

J: Well? Like a year.

D: Okay. Um, what kind of personal knowledge do you think is needed to feel like you know them well?

J: What type of personal knowledge?

D: Yeah. Like what would you need to know about them to feel like, “Oh yeah, I really know this person good”?

J: Mmm... when you break down their walls and stuff and they admit their weaknesses to you.

D: What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?
J: Personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?

D: Yeah.

J: Personal knowledge of what?

D: Of the person. Like, do you feel like you need to have a lot of personal knowledge about that person to have a good work relationship?

J: Mmm... as a supervisor, I think that you should try to avoid getting to know people personally, [laughs] so that you’re not gonna, um, you shouldn’t treat them differently from people you don’t know. Um...but, I think... I think work-wise, to make work just work, maybe you shouldn’t really get to know people that well, but it’s hard not to though. Like some people, they’ll just go to work and they won’t socialize with anybody. They just come to work. And I don’t know if those are the type of people that make better associates versus people you’re getting to know on a personal basis while you’re working, because then you’ll notice that people end up sitting there and they like talking stories, and then they’re not doing things they’re supposed to do, or they might get treated differently by their, you know, their fellow coworkers. So I don’t know if it’s a good idea to get to know people personally at work.

D: Yeah. So you think, then, you can have a good work relationship without too much personal knowledge?

J: Um...I think...yeah, maybe.

D: Okay.
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D: Okay, so, first, tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

M: The industry that I’m at?

D: Yeah, or your job… What kind of stuff do you do during your job...

M: Okay, so, the title is District Manager.

D: Okay.

M: So, at the end of the day, I’m in charge of the education business in Hawaii.

D: Okay.

M: So, currently we have 15 accounts that I supervise. Um… so really when you look at the District Managers job…it’s, um, making sure that we’re financially, you know, healthy, and then we...I manage the client relationship.

D: Okay.

M: And then, you know, each of our accounts has a General Manager that technically reports to me.

D: Okay.

M: Um, we’re a contract services provider, so we manage, in my case, its food, right?...and all the different accounts. Our company manages more than food. Sometimes it’s food. We also manage facilities, environmental services, on the health care side, they do patient transport, um… but basically that’s what I do. On a day to day, my job is to make sure that we’re performing well on the relations contract.
D: So that’s, like, the whole Hawaii, right? All the islands, too?
M: Yeah, but we only have here and on the Big Island...
D: Oh, oh.
M: …accounts.
D: What would you say led you to this type of work?
M: What led me to this type of work?
D: Yeah.
M: I think, uh, at the end of the day, I just fell into it. Right? I started in college, waiting
tables, and then from there, I guess I must have did well, because I continually got
promoted. So by the time I…or when I graduated from [removed college name] then, um,
I was offered the manager job, yeah?
D: That was here, at [removed college name]?
M: No, at [removed place name].
D: Oh.
M: So from there, you know, every couple years, um, I moved up, so I stayed.
D: Mmm.
M: You know, it has nothing to do with my degree, but…it was...
D: What was your degree?
M: It was marketing. I graduated in marketing. So it was just kinda, I don’t wanna, yeah,
I guess I fell into it, and it was, uh, I continued to learn and grow. So it was a natural...
D: Um…so how long have you been working for the company?
M: Um, 14 years, I think, already.
D: And then, just recently you moved to Hawaii, and…
M: I moved back a little over a year ago.

D: So the people that you work with now, it's just been, like, a little over a year that you've been working with them?

M: Some of 'em, I wanna say, because some of 'em were managers when I was...

D: Oh.

M: You know what I mean? So I worked side by side with some of these people back when I used to work on campus. So, like, I've been away seven years...

D: Yeah...

M: So, for example, our manager at, um, [removed place name], he's been with the company 30 years. So I've worked with him before, and now I'm coming back.

D: Oh, now you're his boss?

M: Yeah, it's kind of weird. In that sense it's kind of weird, right, cause you come back as their boss, when they saw you just growing up through the system.

D: Wow.

M: So, yeah, some of 'em's been a year, some's been longer, because when I used to be away, too, I used to stop by and help them once in a while, um, but not in this pure supervisory role.

D: Yeah...wow, that's interesting.

M: But, you know what, in the beginning, at the end of the day, you know what it is? It's, um, it's only how you feel. It's not them. Because if you know what you're doing, and you're good at your job, right, everybody will respect that, I guess. If you don't, then that's another story. But, um, nah, they've been pretty supportive. I mean, sometimes, many of them think I'm nuts, but, you know, that's just part of it, I think. Cause they
don’t know right? They knew I went away for seven years, so they don’t exactly know who I am. I mean, they know of me, whatever, but in seven years, I don’t think the person changes, but your knowledge base changes, yeah? You grow up so much faster, so you come back with way more knowledge than you left, right, so that’s the difference.

D: So much different experiences...fast-paced, too, up there...

M: Oh, yeah...

D: Okay, can you draw me, um, like a organization chart of, like, you and just the people you work with closely?

M: In Hawaii?

D: Yeah, maybe just people that you oversee...

M: Okay, so um...

D: I know it’s huge...

M: This would be me, right?...[drawing]...then I have a...admin, or a district admin...then direct reports...I would say we have marketing...

D: That’s like an assistant? Admin assistant?

M: Yeah, district admin, admin assistant...not really like your secretary, ‘cause I don’t have, but she does, like, accounting and stuff, for the district, for all the accounts.

D: Oh, okay.

M: So I have a marketing manager. Um, I have, um, conferences, I don’t know why, but this falls under me. So it’s not really a direct report, but it’s a direct report. I have a controller, a district controller, and then on this side I have...these are like the accounts, so would be the accounts and each account has a GM, and then under here you have 15 accounts, yeah? And then under them they have whatever staff that each account has.
D: That’s the biggest section there?

M: Oh yeah, by far. Fifteen accounts, staff, probably about, uh, 600-700 people in this section. Um, so like, for example, each account can have managers too, right?

D: Mmhmm.

M: But, so I have right now 22 managers.

D: Wow.

M: Under...of which maybe 10 are GMs or whatever. So, like, you’re gonna meet...uh, I’ll write his name just so you remember. His name is Evan. He is technically not a GM, ‘cause I technically am the GM at [removed place name] also. He’s the ops director at [removed place name].

D: Operations?

M: Yup. He takes care of day-to-day. So under him, he has all the [removed place name] managers.

D: Oh.

M: But there’s about 22 managers. Actually, now it’s closer to, maybe it’s, you know what, it’s actually going to be 26 this summer. Twenty-six managers.

D: Wow.

M: So as far as the direct report, really the direct reports are...the...I think there’s 12...I think there’s 12 GMs. They directly report to me. The controller does, the marketing manager does, and then from there, there’s more managers.

D: About 15 then? Twelve, and then 13, 14, 15?

M: Approximately. So at the end of the day, cause I report up through an [removed name], so at the end of the day, whatever business accounts, those 15 accounts, is my
responsibility. Cause this guy is in Colorado. His org chart’s nuts. He probably has about 155 accounts. Probably has about…

D: So it’s the national…

M: He’s only West Coast.

D: Oh, West Coast, oh.

M: Our company has about 6,000 accounts total.

D: Ho!

M: Yeah, it’s pretty big.

D: Across the nation?

M: Across the nation. And then worldwide, we have like, we operate in, like, 72 countries.

D: Wow.

M: So it’s kind of crazy. But he’s the west, yeah? So he’s the [removed name] of the West.

D: Mmm.

M: He’s crazy. He probably has about 12 of me, across the Western states.

D: Oh, like one in each state?

M: Almost…some get two.

D: Oh.

M: Yeah, and the businesses. But that’s kind of how we’re set up right now.

D: Thanks. Um, what is a typical day like at work? What kind of activities do you do?

M: A typical day?

D: Yeah.
M: Um... communications is part of the biggest. So... I spend a lot of time on email. Um, I have a lot of meetings to go to, whether it be client meetings, vendor meetings, um, account visitations. So, not every day, but... there’s no way. But I might go see an account, you know, talk story with the GM, make sure their... the food looks good or whatever it is. Um...

D: Just making sure everyone’s doing what they’re supposed to be doing?

M: Yeah. And then, you know, ‘cause our business is pretty cyclical, yeah, so it depends on the time of the year what we do.

D: Yeah.

M: But at the end of the day it’s really about, um, building a team, right?

D: Mmm.

M: And then, hopefully, the team takes care of the finances for you. It’s basically what we try to do, or at least that’s my approach.

D: Okay, um, so think about that person that you want to talk about, that reports to you...

M: Uh huh...

D: Uh, what’s her name?

M: Michelle.

D: Michelle. Uh, how much contact do you have with Michelle?

M: Contact? Probably daily.

D: Daily. Um, what kind of... is that, like face-to-face, mostly email, or...

M: I think it’s... mostly on the phone... phone and email I guess... um... face-to-face... almost everyday. Because I travel, yeah, so I don’t always see her face-to-face. Um... a lot of communication, though.
D: Okay. Just estimate, like, how much time you would spend actually communicating with her during the day.

M: Oh... in total?

D: Yeah.

M: Maybe half an hour, hour, at the most. And it depends on time of year too, yeah, 'cause her job is marketing, so, some times of the year it's a lot and sometimes it's none.

D: Oh, okay.

M: But right now about half an hour, maybe to an hour.

D: Do have stuff where you're working together on something?

M: Projects?

D: Yeah, like, you're actively doing something, like, face-to-face together, working on some project or planning or something?

M: We do, I guess, you know, I can bring up... we're gonna open up the [removed name].

D: Oh, okay.

M: So, technically, I don't have a general manager for that account, so it's... I'm the client contact 'cause we just started. So I'm working with her on... we're gonna set up a retail store there. Um, and we're working with... well I'm working with her directly and our client to set up this retail store... it's gonna be like a 450 square foot store, that the client wants... um... local first, right? Buy Hawaii policy. So, I'm working with her to identify vendors, identify products, what is gonna be the strategy of the store... you know, that kind of stuff. Um...

D: So a lot of interaction, then, with her?
M: Oh yeah. Oh yeah. There’s two people that always gonna have interaction, right? The marketing manager for me, and the controller, because the controller wraps all the finances...the marketing manager is all the...I would say the soft things in the business?

D: Yeah.

M: So, all the project work would go to a marketing manager, per se, you know, compared to the regular general manager. The general manager’s are there for operations. They make sure the door opens and the door closes.

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: You know, so time spent with them is a little bit less than with projects, because she’ll do the projects for the general manager.

D: Oh, okay.

M: You know, as a support. Her role is to support.

D: Okay. Do you ever have lunch with her, or do stuff after work? Anything on, like, weekends, or...

M: Socially? Or business? Cause we have lunches. We go to lunch.

D: But you’re talking about work, though?

M: Yeah, that’s during our work day. Um...so I don’t wanna say socially, but all my managers, or the managers that I can, you know, I’ll take them to lunch once in a while. Um, now that it’s summertime, if we have some free time, like, I’ll take them down to the driving range. The ones who golf, you know.

D: Yeah.

M: Um, but totally hang out on a social level, no.

D: Okay.
M: If that makes any sense.

D: Yeah.

M: But like, you know, part of that is team-building.

D: Yeah.

M: And then part of it is, when I see everybody getting all kind of stressed out, whatever, it’s a relaxed kind of thing.

D: Yeah.

M: So, for example, her, and you’re going to meet Evan, and um, my concessions manager. Like, for her, she’s in her most stressful time, right? Summer’s her stress period, getting ready for the year and with the [removed name], so, you know, when they get all that tense, whatever, if I notice it, and I have time, then I’ll either take them to lunch or take them out of the environment, I guess would be the easiest way to put it.

D: Yeah.

M: So I told ‘em...I told her and a couple managers, “Let’s go hit balls.” You know, I mean, at the end of the day, it’s only half an hour, forty-five minutes, but it’s a release, yeah?

D: Yeah.

M: ‘Cause some people can differentiate when to release and some people cannot, so...

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: I try to help when I can.

D: So would you say you know Michelle on a personal level?

M: Personal? I think I know some personal things about her. Uh, I think ‘cause you...well, I think, with some of my philosophies, right, uh, I don’t mind being the coach...
for a lot of people. So, depending on each person, right? If they open up and they need help, I’ll definitely help. Um…obviously being very careful about the relationship, yeah?

About being their boss, but if there is a…a need to help, then I’ll help. You know, sometimes you take off the hat as a boss, and then you…you become more of a coach. Um…so do I know everything personal, her likes and dislikes, and all that kind of stuff?

No. But do I know a little bit about her personal life? Yeah.

D: Okay. Do you know her family and friends and stuff?...A little bit?

M: Like, have I met them, you mean?

D: Yeah, or do you know a little bit about them?

M: Yeah, I guess so. Some of it comes because of work. Like, for example, um, I know her…some of her, um…I don’t know what you call it…maybe her personal family history in terms of…I know she’s going through a divorce, so that’s personal, but it’s also business, right? Cause if you gotta go talk to a lawyer, you gotta go, whatever, you affecting my business.

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: Or met her current boyfriend. Uh, I know history about her mom, ‘cause I hear about it, but I don’t know her mom.

D: Yeah.

M: Her friends, because we’re in Hawaii, I meet ‘em. Obviously, some will cross over at some point, but, yeah, I don’t see them in a social setting by any means.

D: Uh…what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with Michelle?
M: Positive? In terms of the business aspect? Or what? What do you mean by relationship?

D: Anything. Like, just, overall relationship. What are some positive things about it...work or...

M: Positive things about the relationship...I think, uh, we developed a trust, where...we can share ideas or comments sometimes or whatever, without fear of it leaving the room. Um...for me, a big positive is because I have that trust, and for work, and stuff like that, I know things will get done. Um, other positives of the relationship I think is that...hopefully she feels the same that it’s reciprocal, where we can help each other out, whether it be personal and/or professional. Uh, and hopefully it grows into something more, in terms of...I think because we spend so much time at work, you need to have good relationships at work...whatever that means to you, yeah? So for me it was nice to see, like, [removed name], pregnant, whatever, she took the time to throw [removed name] a baby shower. So that’s above and beyond, right? It has nothing to do with work or whatever. So I think in that sense, that’s huge.

D: Yeah.

M: Um...not necessarily...

D: [unintelligible]...planned things...

M: Yeah...why? I don’t know. You know, I just get, “Hey, you got [unintelligible] whatever.” And, you know, it’s kind of funny because in Hawaii, it’s like that, right? In the mainland you would never see that. So relationships, I think, mean more today, in our business in Hawaii, only because of the nature of our business.

D: Yeah.
M: You know? But, relationships are important no matter what, because there’s always a
time and a need. Everybody has a time and a need, and you wanna make sure you can
count on people, or they’re gonna help you out. The only way you get that, right, is
relationships.

D: What are some negative things about your relationship with Michelle?

M: I think sometimes you can have a relationship that is too comfortable.

D: Okay.

M: So, especially in a boss-subordinate relationship, because you want them to be open,
but sometimes they can be too open, so um...and it’s not really bad, per se, but the
perception can be bad, right? If you have a good relationship with an employee...cause
you never wanna make...you never wanna have that opportunity for somebody to say
that there’s favoritism or anything like that.

D: Yeah.

M: So sometimes it’s like that right? You gotta watch the perception on the outside. The
other part is...sometimes you give direction or whatever, and you get feedback too fast,
too instant.

D: Oh.

M: Right? At the end of the day, they know they’re gonna do it. But sometimes, as a...as
a boss, you don’t want to hear feedback. You just want the thing to get done.

D: Yeah.

M: And so you gotta...that’s a negative, right? Sometimes there’s more explaining,
because they’re more comfortable with you, um, they’re not as accepting sometimes,
right? If you have a...if you don’t have a good relationship with your boss, let’s say he tells you to do something...tough, right? You gotta do it.

D: Yeah.

M: Sometimes when the relationship is too good, there can be a lot more questions, which at the end of the day, is a good thing, but for the boss, you’re not always wanting to hear all that kind of stuff, right?

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: Um, so discussions sometimes come a little bit more [unintelligible] than you would like.

D: So that happens with Michelle sometimes?

M: Yeah. I mean, anybody, well, for me, I’ll be honest, Michelle, yes, but some of my other direct reports, too.

D: Oh, okay.

M: But, um, yeah. I think if there’s any negative, I think that becomes a negative. And then if you get too close to a person, in terms of the boss, it becomes...you want them to succeed, so you have that need for yourself to coach somebody to succeed, uh, and sometimes it’s hard to give the harsh reality of what it is, right? Whether it be job performance or whatever. Um...so that sometimes is hard, but at the same time...Like, I’m a person, I tell it like it is, pretty much every time, so it just becomes interesting sometimes with those conversations, I guess, is a way to say it. Does that make sense?

D: Yeah. Um...sounds like you have a pretty good relationship with her. How would you say that relationship developed over time to where it is now?
M: How did it develop? I think, uh, one of the good things is, um, before I started working here, I used to come back and help, yeah? Um...so the interesting thing is it’s been, she’s seen me before, she don’t know who the hell I am, but, we met early on, before I actually physically became her boss, and then when I did become her boss, um, the good thing about it is, I think she respected what I’ve done for the company a little bit more, cause they’ve heard my name go around, her boss before must...might not have been the best boss, so it was a refreshing change. Um, with all my managers, I pretty much sit down with them when I first came here and I said, “Here’s the deal: this is who I am, this is what the expectations are, who are you and where do you want to be?” And I think some people latch on to that. So, you know, during that time, you start relating to different people in different ways. So I think that was a big part of it. Um...and then from there...it was interests lined up, right? Because she worked for [removed name], and then, um, at one point, I used to work down there. I was the manager for a little while, so then there’s common people. And because she was well ingrained in the community, that I used her to help me meet the right people, and do a lot of work. So you spend enough time with somebody, as long as you don’t kill each other, that the relationship develops. Um, then as a boss, you become a coach, like I said before. Almost like a mentor, yeah?

So I think that had a lot to do with it.

D: Okay. Um...so I think we kind of touched on this, but what do you feel are the reasons for the positive or negative aspects of your relationship?

M: What are the reasons?

D: Yeah...I know you mentioned, like, trust...would you say that’s part of it?

M: So...what are the reasons for...
D: Like, how would... I guess, for someone to develop the kind of relationship that you have with her, what would be some necessary, I guess, aspects...

M: Well, I think, uh, with any relationship, right, needs to be open, honest, straightforward, you need to click on a different level. You know, you have to share some common interests, whatever it might be.

D: Mmm.

M: Um, and then if two people have the same goals, or kind of the same goals, then I think the relationship develops a lot faster.

D: Mmm.

M: So then... and I think the reasons for negative, is a part of any relationship, right? Especially a boss and a subordinate relationship, or a manager-subordinate relationship, I think, uh, always as relationships develop, you have to... you have to ride that fine line. There needs to be the line of boss and subordinate. So as you grow the relationship, you gotta make sure that the line is never crossed. So, some people struggle with that.

D: Mmm, okay.

M: Yeah, it’s a fine line, and in Hawaii, the line is even finer.

D: Yeah, cause it’s so family-like, ohana.

M: And everybody knows everybody.

D: Yeah.

M: So you gotta, you know, that line is really interesting when you get down to it.

D: How would you say your relationship with Michelle compares to your relationship with other of your...

M: managers?
D: Yeah.

M: I think it’s uh, it’s not similar to all. It’s similar to some. Um, the reason is…time spent, right? Because she’s in a role that she doesn’t open and close the doors, uh, you see the relationship grow faster with her than some that I only see once every other week or whatever.

D: Yeah.

M: Um, is it the strongest relationship that I have within the district? Probably not. Um, you’ll meet Evan later. I have a pretty strong relationship with him. I worked with him in the mainland for a little while.

D: Oh.

M: Um, different level to a certain extent because he’s the operations director. So, we have a good enough relationship that we, uh, can talk back and forth, tease each other back and forth. You know that kind of raggedy kind of relationship?

D: Yeah.

M: Michelle, too, but, um, I have…yeah, there’s a couple out there. You know. And I play the role, depending on the person…whether I need to be the friend, whether I need to be the mentor, whether I just need to be the strict boss. It depends on their, um, I don’t want to say their make-up, but their personality, who they are, what they want, or what they want to achieve.

D: Okay. Are there any things that you do equally with everybody?

M: In terms of…

D: Could be anything, like, activities, or any kind of, I don’t know, things that you provide them, or resources you provide them…
M: Oh, resources and stuff? In terms of the company? All managers are equal. So, I will evaluate on a yearly basis all managers, and they all get evaluated equally. Um, I will tell all the managers the good, the bad, the ugly...um...equally. I take off any relationship hat when it comes to that time of year.

D: Okay.

M: Um, in terms of, you know, like, taking people to lunch and stuff like that? Hey, whoever’s around that wants to go, can go. Whether you can or not, that’s another story, but, um, the offers always there.

D: Okay.

M: In terms of things like we mentioned, the driving range, like that? Hell, I tell all my managers, just gotta have the time [unintelligible] wanna go. You know, um, so I try to be, well, let’s put it this way, to the ones who golf, um, I try to be fair. Even with, let’s say, like we sponsor a lot of golf tournaments. Um, I don’t always take the same people. I...sometimes it’s a business decision...it’s a strategic thing. Um, and other times it’s, who hasn’t gone, or I haven’t taken care of before, I wanna make sure I take care of. So, for example, [removed name] has a golf tournament. I’ll take our controller, [removed name], because the other ones that we played last year, he didn’t...he couldn’t go. This year he can, so, um, I try to offer it to everybody.

D: Okay, give opportunities for everybody.

M: Oh yeah. Oh yeah. One’s not more special than the other. You know, at the end of the day, it’s everybody. Everybody gotta pull their same weight, or else, the ship doesn’t run right?

D: Yeah. So people that don’t golf, do you do other things with them?
M: I try, um, it depends what their interests are, yeah?

D: Yeah.

M: So, some of them have no interest in doing anything outside of work, so if that’s the case then, I spend time with them at work to see…we do, um, some community events that I encourage everybody to be a part of. Like, our big thing is [removed name]. So, we go out on the side of the road, you know, collect with the fish nets.

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: Right? Our company…I think this year I think we had like 30 or 40 people that went out. So I encourage everybody to get involved…um…if they can.

D: Okay, let’s see…um…I think you kind of answered this already…what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

M: The foundations…of interpersonal?

D: Yeah.

M: You know, open, honest, trust…

D: Open, honest, okay…

M: Common interest…

D: How would you view yourself and Michelle ethnically?

M: Ethnically?

D: Yeah, or racially or ethnically?

M: I guess we’re same. I mean, she’s Japanese.

D: Japanese. Okay. Do you think there’s anything special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?…like similar cultures versus different cultures between, like a manager and their employee?
M: Does it play a role is what you’re asking?

D: Yeah.

M: Um, in Hawaii...I think it depends on sensitivities, but in Hawaii, I say it probably plays a small role. Um...now, it should not, right? An employee or whatever, it shouldn’t. But the reason why I say it plays a small role is because depending on personalities and where they come from, their belief systems are different, so I don’t wanna say people get, um, discriminated, because I don’t think that’s true. But I think that you look at certain cultures a different way based on those beliefs. So you see them through cultural lenses, right? In the mainland that happens, too. In fact, in the mainland it probably happens a lot more in that sense. But, I find Hawaii to be probably more prejudicial in that sense than anywhere else, because there’s a norm here. And the norm is “the Hawaii way” or “the Hawaiian way” or “the local way.” Whereas in the mainland, everybody comes from all over the different places. So, that is pure cultural in a sense that I don’t understand. But in Hawaii, if you don’t act or do it in a certain way, then, yeah, people look at you funny. So I think...

D: So, kind of like, local culture...

M: It overrides a lot of different things. It’s hard for people to fit in. Like if we were in California today, I don’t care if you’re from Hawaii, New Jersey, New York...you do your job, you do your job well, you’re good. In Hawaii, there’s a stigmatism attached to your...the way you look, the way you talk. Because, we’re...we’re ingrained in that sense.

D: Yeah.
M: So ethnic makeup makes a little difference, I think. Or the lack of understanding the ethnicity sometimes, maybe.

D: Okay, um, would you say you have a high quality relationship with Michelle?

M: High quality...what is high quality?

D: Like, uh...get along well...trust and respect each other...

M: Yeah, I think so.

D: On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate your relationship?

M: So what would 10 be though, I mean, how do you quantify that?

D: Ten would be like the most perfect person, you get along awesome, she does her job perfectly.

M: Performance? See cause, relationship is not performance, right?

D: I guess, overall...overall relationship. It’s kind of a...considering I guess, work performance and maybe their personal...whatever...

M: Then I would say between a seven and an eight.

D: Okay.

M: The reason I say that is because, like, for me, and I’m...maybe I’m weird like this, but when I...it doesn’t matter if I’m your best friend...when it comes to professional work performance, I’m gonna tell you like it is...I’m not gonna hold back just ‘cause I know you, or whatever. So, that’s why it’s kind of hard for me to quantify that.

D: Yeah.

M: Because I can be a good friend with you, have a great professional working relationship, but you not doing your job, that doesn’t mean I not going tell you that you retarded, right?
D: Yeah.

M: And then, um, I try to draw those lines pretty distinctly.

D: Yeah, yeah. Okay. Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues can be sensitive in the workplace?

M: Oh, definitely...definitely.

D: Mmm...is there any examples that you can think of?

M: Well, I can give you the opposite example when I went up to the mainland.

D: Okay.

M: ‘Cause I think that’s a better example. In Hawaii, people are a little bit more lenient, because we use a lot of slangs, when we don’t understand, we usually just turn away, we don’t care. Um, I can tell you that some of the slangs that I use here were not acceptable in the mainland.

D: Okay.

M: A good example is, I was in a meeting with a couple ladies, going over a catering event, and just by nature, um, I would use the term “you guys.”

D: Oh yeah.

M: Right? Like “a bunch of you,” “you guys.” I used it and the lady got pissed.

D: Oh.

M: She stopped the conversation and said, “I’m not a guy. You can address me by...” whatever, whatever, whatever. Um, and that’s like the opposite effect, right?

D: Yeah.

M: She wasn’t open, and I wasn’t politically correct, don’t get me wrong, I wasn’t. But because I didn’t know any better, that’s just the way I was.
D: That just comes from, like, a Hawaii cultural thing...

M: But it's not accepting, right? In a workplace, up there, where everything needs to be, well, especially San Francisco, it's so politically correct, right?

D: Yeah.

M: Um, so the issues are there. Um, we don't want them to be there, we try to keep those things out of the workplace, but the issues are there, regardless of who you are, or whatever. And it depends what lens you're seeing it through. Definitely there is.

D: More on the mainland than Hawaii?

M: Yeah, but Hawaii is a little different, right? It depends on your sensitivity to things. Depending if you know. We call everybody *haole*. Why is that? You know, it can have a negative connotation depending on how you use the word. Um, we use non-politically correct terms, so it depends who your audience is, whether it's bad or good.

D: Mmm.

M: If a mainland HR person was here, I think they would go crazy, right? But if it was a local HR person, certain things would be okay.

D: Mmm.

M: Um, in the mainland standards, none of what we say would be okay. Um, so, you know, that's the interesting part about the marketplace we...we work in.

D: Yeah, yeah

M: You know, um, we're a little bit laxed. We don't have structure like the mainland has structure.

D: Sometimes I feel like that. Like when I have phone conferences or meetings with mainland folks, I'm like, hesitant to say anything, 'cause...
M: Yeah.

D: ...it’s like, the pidgin will come out, and there’ll be funny looks and like, “What? What is he talking about? What did he just say?”

M: Yeah. Well I think that’s part of it, and culturally, we learned not to stand out in front of the class...

D: Yeah.

M: Right? So, that’s another thing that’s kind of weird. But, you know, I’ve noticed that people, you know, they, once they get used to it, they’ll accept. I mean, the people that I worked with, when I go to meetings on the mainland, man, I always spoke this way. I never changed. So, they either learn or they question. You know, it’s...it’s who I am, so...tough. You know?

D: Yeah. Okay, how long do you think it takes to know somebody well?

M: In a professional setting?

D: Yeah...you can answer that one first, and then...and then, like a friendship...

M: Because I think, uh, when you say, “to know somebody well,” there’s so many levels of “well.” So what is “well?” I guess, um, I would say it would take you at least a couple months to get a good understanding of where a persons coming from, and kind of who they are, and I think from there you start building a relationship. Um, I think “well” might take you six months. I mean, to build trust takes time. And it depends where this persons coming from, where their background is, um...I know that sounds retarded, but, in a professional relationship it’s hard, right? If you’re working with that person everyday, it might take you a lot less time.

D: Mmm.
M: Um, if you don’t see them everyday, or whatever, I think it takes you more time. And on the personal side, it takes probably years, depending on what level “well” is.

D: Yeah.

M: Yeah? I mean, the friends I have today are because I’ve, um, grown up with them. So it took years, right, to build that trust? And over those years you’ve learned, because you’ve gotten burned or whatever, you filter out who are the true friends or whatever, and who are the acquaintances, um…I guess is the easiest way to say it.

D: Okay, um…what role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?

M: What role does personal knowledge play in developing a good work relationship…personal knowledge of what?

D: Like just about the person, their background, maybe their strengths and weaknesses…

M: And how does that help professionally?

D: Yeah.

M: I think in the boss-subordinate setting, the more you know, and I’m not saying you gotta know everything, but the more you remember, maybe, would be the more interesting thing. Right? The more things that you remember about a person, the easier it is for the relationship on the professional side to grow. So, in terms of professional relationship, right, those personal questions become lead-in questions to make a person feel comfortable. The faster you get comfortable with a person, the faster the relationship develops. So, for example, if I have 26 managers report to me…Um, I’ll be honest and say I’m not gonna remember everything about them, I’m not gonna have great
relationships with all of them, I’m not gonna have personal relationships with all of them, but over time I will.

D: Mmm.

M: And as a boss, it’s my job to make sure that, hey, if there is personal information that is shared, that I remember it, so that I can check up on people. Because if you genuinely care about the person, then the relationship will develop. And usually, the care in the relationship, especially on a professional level, is personal.

D: Mmm.

M: Right? How you’re doing outside of work. ‘Cause I see what you’re doing at work.

You know?

D: So is it possible to have a good relationship without personal knowledge? A good work relationship?

M: A good work relationship? Yeah.

D: It’s possible.

M: I think it depends on what level you’re talking about. Right? Like I worked with a lot of people from the mainland, right? So, I can call certain amount of people anytime and I know they’ll help me out. But that doesn’t mean I know crap about them. Some of it is because it’s work. It’s...it’s you’ve proven yourself, they’ve proven themselves...and in the work setting, you know, you both flourish. Now, I’m not gonna say it’s as fast, but it’s possible. Um, I think the personal stuff just helps you get there faster and builds a deeper relationship with that person. But I can mention a lot of people that I don’t know too much about, except in the work setting, yet have a good relationship. Did that make sense?
D: Yeah.

M: Part of that, too, I’ll tell you something, it’s respecting the title sometimes.

D: Mmm.

M: Right? You don’t always gotta love the person, but you respect the title, and that’s important for any of our jobs, right?

D: So like, what they’ve achieved and stuff?

M: What they’ve achieved, but, or let’s say that you don’t always agree with your boss. Right? You hate his guts on a personal level, or whatever. But he’s your boss.

D: Mmm.

M: So you need to respect the title, even though you hate the person.

D: Yeah.

M: So can you work on that relationship, and have a good working relationship? Yes. And at the end of the day, 5:00, never talk to the guy until the next day, 8:00, or whatever it is, right?

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: It can happen.

D: All right, thanks. That was a lot of good... good insight.
D: So tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

M: Um, I’m the marketing manager for [removed name]. Um, but actually, it’s... since maybe about...well, actually since we, like, extended out towards the rest of the district, so, I can’t even recall how many accounts we have. I don’t know if Mike said it, but maybe around 13, I think, accounts that we have.

D: Yeah, I think he said 15?

M: Oh, okay, 15 now. Yeah, we just opened [removed name], yeah just [removed name], so yeah, 15.

D: Oh, okay.

M: Yeah, so a lot of our concentration, though, has been marketing for [removed name], um, because it is our biggest account. Um, but the rest of the accounts, I just service here and there. The biggest one is probably, now, the [removed name], we’ve been working on. It’s brand new.

D: Yeah, okay...starting it up and stuff?

M: Yeah, so just doing the marketing for that, advertising, promotions, um...graphics, um, communications...

D: Sounds fun.

M: No, it is fun...it’s just a lot...yeah.

D: Um, what led you to this type of work?
M: Oh, I started off at, um, sports marketing, down at [removed name].

D: Oh, okay.

M: Yeah. And then...I just...I enjoy it...so I just stick with it, even though my bachelors was in speech and my masters was in education.

D: Oh wow.

M: So, it’s not marketing, but since I started here and I enjoy it, I just...yeah.

D: Um, how long have you been working here?

M: Um...about 6½ years.

D: That’s at [removed name]?

M: Oh, wait...oh, sorry, 5½, yeah...gonna be 6 in September.

D: That’s in [removed name]?

M: Yeah, mhm.

D: Including your...with [removed name] and everything?


D: Oh, okay.

M: Yeah.

D: Okay. Um, tell me about a typical day at work.

M: Oh...

D: What kind of stuff do you do?

M: Um, I just, usually just come in, and you, you know, check your messages, you know, you kind of gather yourself, um...look at your to-do list...uh, and then prioritize which is the most important to get done for the day or the next couple days. And then target on that. And, um, it’s just so much.
D: Mmm.

M: It’s like a lot now, especially with spring break coming up [unintelligible].

D: Oh.

M: Yeah. Prioritizing what’s important, and what’s coming up, is probably the most important thing, probably right now.

D: You have, like, a lot of meetings...and...?

M: Um, meetings, maybe about 3 to 4 times a week now, because [removed name]. Before that it was maybe about, maybe once a week. It...it wasn’t too many. So yeah, it involves meetings, a lot of computer work, um, going out into the different units here on campus and then doing a walk through to see what things need to be updated or things need to be cleaned, um, new products, um...

D: You kind of spend a lot of time inside and outside.

M: It’s half-half, yeah. Um, half out because you need to keep up with what’s going on in your unit, and then the other half is, especially like, actually physically sitting down to get the work done, yeah?

D: Mmm.

M: Um, I usually start at home, and then I start to check my email from there. And then I come into the office, do some things here, and then, I don’t know if I’m a workaholic or what, but I go home and then I end up working [unintelligible].

D: Oh, just like Mike...I called him up last night, it was like 9:00, he said he was still working.

M: Oh yeah. Yeah, mmmmm. It is too much. It’s hard sometimes to find a balance. Yeah, but we gotta do it.
D: Yeah.

M: Yeah.

D: Maybe when we retire, we can relax.

M: Yeah, I wish it was before that, ‘cause oh, getting old already…

D: Yeah. Um, tell me about your experiences with your coworkers.

M: Um, what do you mean?

D: Um, how would you describe the people you work with...

M: Oh...

D: …do you work with a lot of people…?

M: Yeah, well actually more on a day-to-day basis it’s…a lot of it is with Mike, um, Evan, and I guess the people in my office is in the main office with the…they service people at the window...

D: Oh, okay.

M: And um, with meal plans and so forth…so a lot of my interaction is with [removed name] and then I have one marketing assistant.

D: Okay.

M: Um, on a weekly basis, yeah, I’ll see a bunch of the managers that we have that run our different units. Um…a lot of conversation, though, with them come through email, a lot.

D: Okay.

M: Um…it’s really hard, I mean [unintelligible] doing their thing, and then I have my thing, and lot of them, when I’m available, they’re not available, and vice versa…for support, so…yeah, but on a day-to-day basis, a lot of it is…I talk to Mike everyday, and
then, um, Evan, you know, mostly every week [unintelligible]. I mean, its fine, but I mean, he’s easy to talk to...

D: Mmm.

M: Yeah, like really easy, so, I mean, even if it’s something that is not what I’m thinking or whatever, and I can tell him and he doesn’t get mad, you know. He’ll just say what he thinks anyway. Same goes with the other people we work with. The majority of ‘em, they’re fine. I mean, it’s easy… they’re easy to talk to. You can suggest things, um, they suggest things as well. It’s kind of like a open communication kind of thing. Some, yeah, lazy… you just wanna kick ‘em in the pants. But, you know, there’s only like, maybe, 1 or 2. We have right now only one, yeah, definitely, hard to deal with. Yeah...

D: That’s pretty good. Usually there’s a lot of people like that. [laughs]

M: Yeah, I mean, you talking about just immediate in [removed name] yeah? You not talking about the client, yeah?

D: Yeah, just who you work with...

M: Okay, yeah.

D: Um… can I ask you to draw, like, an organizational chart...

M: Oh, yeah. Okay.

D: Of just, like, people that you work with.

M: Okay. [drawing]

D: Who you work closely with.
M: [drawing] I report to Mike, so I don’t know how that goes...but then I still, I work with Evan, because of [removed location name], ‘cause he’s in charge of [removed location name], but he’s in charge of the state. So...

D: Okay. Maybe would Evan go down? And then you...

M: Oh, I see what you’re saying. Oh, okay, okay. Sorry.

D: So Evan’s not your boss, right?

M: No, no. He’s not my boss, Mike is. Yeah. Um...

D: And [removed name] is that administrative person...

M: Yeah, she’s my marketing assistant. Yeah, mmm. Um, that’s pretty much on our day-to-day. The rest of the, um, managers are, um, that I work with, either come under Mike or they come under Evan.

D: Oh, okay.

M: But mostly on a day-to-day, this is pretty much...

D: Okay, looks good, thanks.

M: Okay.

D: Um, so...do you...so you don’t have any more people that work under you, too?

M: Uh uh. Yeah, that’s it. Yeah.

D: And you work with Evan sometimes, too?

M: Yeah.

D: Uh...how much contact do you have with Mike?

M: Um, everyday.

D: Like how much time would you say you spend every day?

M: Um, maybe like...a couple hours.
D: Okay. I think he was mentioning, um, a lot of face-to-face, email...

M: Yeah.

D: Are there other types of communication that you folks...

M: Phone. A lot of times if I cannot see him during the day, then on his drive home to Mililani, I’ll catch up with him, so that’s about an hour.

D: Oh, on his cell phone. Okay.

M: Yeah. So in some way, shape, or form, like, whether it’s face-to-face or it’s email, or a lot of it is with email, and then with cell phone, um, we communicate somehow, within those three. Yeah.

D: Okay.

M: Because if he’s out at...in the field with, um, the...at the different schools then I don’t see him.

D: Mmm.

M: Yeah. But then I’ll catch up with him on the phone.

D: Okay.

M: I wanna say that probably email is like the biggest thing.

D: Email?

M: Yeah.

D: Kay, um...so like, during work time, are there a lot of activities where you and him would be working on a joint project together?

M: Um...some of it...yeah. Um, I guess because he’s involved with the whole state. Um, when there’s things that are coming up with events for that particular school, um, I gotta talk to him about it anyway. So...he’ll shoot out ideas, and then, put it together, then after
I do my own work, and then, you know, I just come back and I talk to him, and then we go from there.

D: Oh, okay.

M: A lot of it is, like, back and forth.

D: Okay. You ever have lunch with him?

M: Yeah.

D: Yeah? Um, anything outside of work?

M: Um...

D: Like after work...

M: Yeah, um...um...just eat or whatever...

D: Like dinner and stuff? Lunch?

M: Probably lunch and then, yeah, after work, kind of just pupus and stuff, yeah, if anything. Yeah.

D: Okay. Do you feel like you know him on a personal level?

M: Yeah.

D: You know his family and friends...or...?

M: Um...some of his friends, or um...oh, [removed name]. I never met his parents though.

D: Oh, okay. [unintelligible]

M: Yeah.

D: You spent time with his family?

M: Mmm...family, no...mmm...friends, no not really on a social level. Yeah.

D: Um, what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with Mike?
M: Um, easy to talk to...um, I can learn a lot from him because he’s very, um, creative in the marketing, in his thinking. Sometimes I think he’s, you know, strong minded in a sense, where he knows what he wants, so it helps me to kind of figure out and map out things. Um...so for the future I can learn how to handle different types of situations when they come. Yeah...I kinda learned a lot of stuff from him.

D: Oh yeah?

M: Like, you know, how, just how to interact with the client. Um...

D: Mmm.

M: Um, there’s always, you know, conflicts or something that comes up right? And you just...sometimes you just don’t know how to deal with it, right? But if you have a lot of experience, you’re gonna...not so much in conflicts, but [unintelligible] just dealing with, um, business people, yeah?

D: Mmhmm...[unintelligible] maybe on the mainland, you really gotta...

M: Yeah, I know...cause they want straightforward...

D: Yeah...what are some negative things about your relationship with him?

M: Uh...sometimes, the timing, I guess, because he’s so busy and I’m busy...um, to actually sit down and catch up with him sometimes is hard. Yeah. So a lot of it is through email, but, you know, it’s like, when you have email, sometimes there’s more to it...

D: Mmhmm.

M: And then so you need to actually, you know, have follow-up questions and so forth. You want clarification for something, yeah? Then I rather talk to him. Yeah.

D: Oh, okay.
M: So, because he's out and about so much, I guess it’s hard sometimes. Um…the workload is huge…

D: Okay…

M: Yeah, and it’s not his fault. It’s just our company. That’s the way it is. Because if I had the 15 schools that he had, I’d be pulling out my hair already. But um, and my own little world is just marketing. His is, you know, the whole thing, right? That’s why. Um…but just…there’s a lot. I only got [removed name] like on May 16, so I’ve been, like, really lucky. ‘Cause before that, I was like…even now, it’s kind of still crazy, but then it…if she wasn’t here, I’d always be like…

D: You’d have to do everything.

M: Oh, my God, yeah, it’s crazy.

D: Oh.

M: Yeah. But I think that’s how our organization is set up. Um, like normal companies, for marketing, you’d have an advertising person, you’d have a copywriter, you’d have a graphics department…

D: Yeah, you’d have a whole department.

M: Yeah, yeah, but this is like, the whole one department is just, like, compacted into one…

D: You are the department.

M: Yeah. Mmmmm. And I told him that too, before. He goes, “Yeah, that’s the way it is.”

So…[laughs]

D: Deal with it. [laughs]
Yeah. [laughs] I’m pretty sure that’s what he tells his boss, and his boss just tells him, “Yeah, too bad, that’s what a GM does, so…” [laughs]

D: Oh…okay, how would you say your relationship developed with Mike, when you first met him ‘till…

M: Um, in the beginning I think I was more…like, I didn’t really say too much, because I didn’t know how he was, so I was more…I would talk to him but not…I didn’t share as much. You know, ‘cause I was…prior to him coming, I had a…like a boss that was like a tyrant…[laughs]

D: Oh.

M: Yeah. He was like…and he knows it, too. But he was a terror, you know, and anything that he would say, he would either want you [unintelligible] he would just fight you on it. You know, before, right? So, I think all…I can’t think for all of us, but some of us were, like, oh, we don’t know how to approach, you know, with your own thoughts and views with Mike, because you don’t know how he’s gonna react, right?

D: Yeah.

M: So yeah, in the beginning, yeah, I didn’t really say too much. It was just, um, just basic things. But then after, like, three or four months I got to know him, it’s like real…extremely easy to talk to now. You don’t have to worry about…I mean he’ll just tell you it’s stupid. Or, you know, you don’t feel offended. That’s what it is. Yeah.

Um…it’s just a different comfort level, yeah. It went from, I guess, cautious to comfortable.

D: Okay, so how long have you worked with Mike?

M: Oh…uh, a year and a half. I think. Cause he came back in January ’06. Yeah.
D: Um, what would you say your first meeting was like with him?...You remember?
M: Oh, I’m trying to remember...when was my first meeting with him?...Um...he was more, I think, trying to be [unintelligible], too [laughs], I think. Yeah? Cause I think we both were more on the...
D: First impression...
M: First impression kind of thing, yeah. I mean, I used to talk to him from before, you know, ‘cause he used to come down to [unintelligible], even though he was in California. He would do a lot of, um, coming here and just trying to fix [removed name].
D: Oh.
M: You know, as operations support. But, um, yeah it was still more, kind of like a boss-subordinate, kind of...
D: Oh okay.
M: Yeah. So that first meeting was...um, just more on a professional level, I guess.
D: Okay, um...let’s see. What do you feel are the reasons for the positive or negative aspects of your relationship with Mike?
M: Um...I guess ‘cause he’s open...um, he doesn’t...he’s not afraid to say what he thinks. Encourages suggestions from us, anyway, or from me. Because I’ll shoot something out to him, and then before he answers sometimes, um, I’ll notice that he would pose it back to me. So I think what he was trying to get me to do is try to think of my response first, and then he would [unintelligible] on to it to see if it was kind of, it was an okay response or not, so now, when I send emails to him or when I ask him questions, I tell him, “This is the situation. This is what I think. What do you think?” And
then, then he’ll respond. ‘Cause before it would be like, “Oh, what was your suggestion?” It’s like…I think he’s trying to get me to do the thinking. That’s what it is.

D: Oh.

M: Yeah. He encourages you to come up with ideas on your own.

D: Okay. Is there any negative aspects of the relationship?

M: Uh, nah.

D: Besides the workload?

M: [laughs] Yeah.

D: ‘Kay. How would you say your relationship with Mike compares to, like, his other relationships with his…

M: With his other?

D: …other direct reports, yeah.

M: Um, I think with Evan and I, it’s pretty much the same. Yeah. Um…with others, I think he’s…we’re pretty much a lot of it on a equal level, except for the ones he doesn’t really know, I think he keeps it more as a professional level. I mean he still keeps it professional with us, but at the same time, too, you can see that the barrier, or comfort [unintelligible] comes down, I think, with us, versus with the other workers that they have, yeah?

D: Do you notice some things that he does equally with everyone?

M: Uh, yeah. I mean, just, the way he, you know, treats everybody, the way he talks to everybody, it’s all the same. Yeah. Mmhmm. General rules, and so forth, with [removed company name], I mean, everybody’s the same, you know. He’s very consistent.
D: Is there anything he does with only certain people? Could be anything... work related...or outside of work...

M: I think only some of us he goes golf with. I think the others, maybe he doesn’t even, he doesn’t know what they do, or it’s just...

D: They don’t golf.

M: Yeah, yeah, or they don’t or...’cause actually for him, he can talk to anybody. It’s just weird, yeah. I mean, it’s a good thing, yeah?

D: Yeah.

M: But, yeah, he can talk to some bum on the side and make a conversation, I think. But, um, yeah, I think it’s more like, certain people you feel more comfortable with, I think. He feels comfortable with everybody, but I think certain people, he probably... yeah... it’s the same for, like, us, too right? Some people we hang out with, and some people we don’t wanna hang out with, so...[laughs]

D: Yeah. It’s always like that. Um, is there any stories that you could tell about your relationship with him, or anything that happened at work that would be interesting?

M: Braddah can’t spell to save his life! [laughs]

D: [laughs] Really?

M: It’s hilarious because he’ll send me emails sometimes, it’s like, “What?” You know? He relies on spell check heavily.

D: Really?

M: Yeah. He tortures, distorts people’s names. It was... we have a [removed company name] representative, his name is [removed name]. For a month he kept calling him [removed distorted name].
M: Yeah, and so I kept telling him, I said, “You know what? He’s [removed correct name]!” He goes, “No, Michelle, he’s [removed distorted name]!” And he was just set on [removed distorted name], okay? But we had an account representative in [removed place name], for [removed company name], that’s [removed name similar to distorted name].

D: Oh.

M: So I think he, like, [unintelligible]. I said, “You look at the man, he’s Japanese, ‘kay?” And he goes, “No, no, no. He’s [removed distorted name].” He was, like, arguing with me. And I was like, well shit! You know what I mean? Forget it...sorry...but, you know, forget it already. Never mind, yeah? And then, when I saw him the next time, um, I saw [removed name]’s friend, right, I said, “What is [removed name]’s last name?” He goes, “[removed name].” Hahaha! Start laughing, right? So, and then he goes, “It’s [removed correct name].” I go, “Duh!” [laughs]

D: [laughs] I guess [removed school name] didn’t help!

M: Yeah, I know, yeah. I don’t know.

D: Um....okay...How would you describe your own personal performance at work?

M: Oh, um...I think right now, I’m just slightly above average. Like, between average and above average. I think that’s what it is. Um...I guess I feel that way, because I don’t...everything has to be done by a certain time, and there’s so much, that I don’t feel like I can go outside of my work area to excel in something.

D: Oh.

M: Um, because everything is all compressed into one, my job, I don’t feel like I am mastering anything. Yeah, I’m just getting decent at all the different aspects of my job,
so...I guess I get worried sometimes, too, because who knows if we’re going to have this account later, I mean, you know...

D: Mmmmm.

M: Nowadays you need to be prepared for the future.

D: Yeah.

M: And, um, not...cannot always depend on your job or whatever. I mean, Mike guys can only do so much, you know, but...if we lose the account, we lose the account. You know what I mean? It’s not his fault. You know? Then, when I go out and I have to search for something else, it’s like, they’re gonna say, “Why are you mediocre in all these little things?” You know? So...

D: Yeah, that’s how I feel at my job sometimes, because a lot of our work is based on State or Federal funding and they only last a few years. So you never know what’s gonna be continued and you’re working on so many different things, and your brain just gets all scattered all over the place.

M: Yeah, exactly.

D: Um...what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

M: Um...trust...um, honesty...um...openness...how do you say, it’s more like a two-way street kind of thing?

D: Mmm...

M: That comes in line with communication, yeah?

D: Give and take kind of thing?

M: Yeah, I guess so. Something like that.

D: Okay, how would you view yourself ethnically?
M: Ethnically?

D: Racially or ethnically...

M: Oh, um...typical Japanese American, like everybody else, here...[laughs]

D: What about Mike?

M: The same question?

D: Yeah.

M: Oh, what do you mean?

D: How would describe his ethnicity?

M: His ethnicity?

D: Or race...

M: Um...same thing, I guess, like mine. Yeah.

D: Yeah. Um...do you think there’s anything special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?

M: Actually, for, um...for in our workplace it’s pretty interesting, um, because we deal with food, a lot of, um, diverse traditions and customs sometimes, um, we can bounce things off of other people, um, and learn from them, what kind of, um, foods they eat, time of the year, you know. It can help with menu planning, I think.

D: Mmm. Okay. What about as far as, um, like, working together? Relationship wise, if you have maybe similar or different backgrounds...cultural backgrounds...

M: Yeah, sometimes if you have similar cultural backgrounds it’s easier to work with the person, I think, um, because sometimes your mindset is probably similar. Um, if you have different cultural backgrounds, I guess the ways of dealing with people, personally, some may think that they’re too rough, or not [unintelligible] from Hawaii so to speak,
right? But, um, you know how sometimes you have, like, um, people from the mainland, right, and you have local people, right, and sometimes, a lot of times you hear, like, “Oh yeah, they come from the mainland,” you know, kind of thing.

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: Yeah, so that kind of thing, sometimes affect it. I would hear it before, not so much now, but, um, the past year, I think. Well, before...before Mike came, I think, you would hear more of it.

D: Oh, okay.

M: Yeah. Like, “Oh, ‘cause they haole, that’s why.” You know?

D: Mmhmm.

M: There’s a lot of that at [removed place name] I think. Yeah?

M: Yeah.

D: Even, like [removed name].

M: Oh yeah.

D: That cultural...he’s not doing things like the Hawaii culture and stuff.

M: Yeah. [laughs]

D: Wow...would you say you have a high quality relationship with Mike?

M: Yeah. Mmhmm.

D: On a scale of, like, 1 to 10, how would you rate your relationship?

M: Oh, 10 is the good and 1 is the bad?

D: Yeah.

M: Um, I think a 7 or 8. Somewhere around there. Yeah.

D: Okay. Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?
M: Um...no, not really...you know, I was...well, let me...I don’t think it is, but, um...our...like, there’s a few of us that are very, um...[unintelligible]...cause, like, my coworkers are in [removed place name], and um, like, when you talk to her...I mean, I don’t know if she’s gonna be like that with you, but they’re very, um...the things they say sometimes, it’s like, “What?” You know? But you just laugh. Yeah. It’s like, you know, like, they make fun of...they make fun of everybody and anybody.

D: Oh.

M: Yeah. It’s not a bad thing. Yeah?

D: Yeah.

M: It’s...because it’s contained within us, you know what I mean? But I think if other people heard it they’d be mortified. [laughs]

D: Mmm.

M: But, you know...

D: Yeah...Is it, like, racially, um, based kind of stuff?

M: Ah, nah, not so much, it’s like the person is dumb or something, you know, that kind?

[laughs]

D: I know in Hawaii, we always joke about other races and stuff.

M: Yeah, mmmmm.

D: How about gender issues? Do you think they’re sensitive in the workplace?

M: You know, I don’t think so. But I’m the only female manager [removed place name].

D: Really?

M: Yeah. When I think about it now, yeah.

D: For the whole company?
M: Um, for [removed company name] in [removed place name].
D: Oh, wow.

M: Yeah, I think, in [removed place name], I'm the only female manager. 'Cause I'm thinking our manager's names are on here and I think I'm the only girl. And then, um, as state as a whole, I think there's only three or so... um, the new [unintelligible] girl and [removed name]. Yeah, so there's only four females out of the... oh my gosh...
D: The whole state?
M: For food services. Yeah, for... I think Mike guys probably [unintelligible] about 20 managers...
D: Wow.
M: Mmm. Yeah.
D: Um, how long do you think it takes to know somebody well?
M: To know somebody well...
D: Could be on a work level or a personal level... or both...
M: I guess as a whole, maybe about a year, I think work and personal.
D: Okay.
M: Yeah... workwise, sometimes I think... if you're just thinking work alone, maybe about six months, I think. Yeah.
D: Would you say that because there's, like, less you need to know, or...?
M: I think you see the person more on a day-to-day level. [unintelligible], but, if you're talking about, um, I guess, personally, you hardly see the person, I guess, often at work sometimes, so maybe, um, the conversations in work that you may have with your co-
workers, you know, you hear bits and pieces, “You know what my husband did last night?” that kind of stuff.

D: Yeah.

M: Probably maybe about a year, I think.

D: One year, for within work?

M: Um, six months within work, and then outside of work, maybe about a year.

D: Oh, okay. What would you say…or what kind of personal knowledge would be needed to feel like you know somebody well?

M: Um…personal knowledge…mmm…I guess if you know their significant other…um, if you know their kids…

D: Family…

M: Family, um…It’s so strange, in Hawaii, where you went high school.

D: Yeah.

M: Because that ties into a lot…

D: It tells a lot…

M: Yeah, about [unintelligible].

D: And then you know all their friends.

M: Yeah, exactly. It’s…it’s really strange in Hawaii, yeah. I think in the mainland, it’s more, it’s like, what college did you go to, I think.

D: Yeah…that’s true, yeah?

M: Yeah.

D: Okay. Um, what role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?
M: Oh...um...

D: Do you need to have personal knowledge?

M: I don’t think so...not so much. I don’t think you really need so much personal knowledge with somebody for the work environment. ‘Cause I’m trying to think, like, on our client basis, I don’t really know them on a personal level, but professionally, as long as I know, I think, what their vision is, what they’re thinking, what kind of ideas they’re looking for, um, that...that’s, I guess, the main focus of getting my job done. I think the personal level thing is just a bonus.

D: Mmm.

M: More conversation piece perhaps.

D: What are the qualities of your ideal supervisor?

M: That I can trust them, they’re knowledgeable, they know what they want, they have a vision for the business, easy to talk to...

D: Okay. What are the qualities of a not so ideal supervisor?

M: Oh...let me just think back two years ago. [laughs] Um, lying...

D: Oh.

M: That’s what he did...um, I don’t know if strong-arm is the word to use anymore...but, he had strong-arm tactics...um, threatening...yeah. Not physical, but more like, “You know, you better do this or else...” kind of stuff.

D: Wow.

M: Yeah, he was weird.

D: What happened?

M: Huh?
D: He got fired or something?

M: He found another job. But um...

D: Oh, wow. Same company?

M: I think ‘cause, um...yeah, different company, but then, um, he just, he just...I think he just wanted more than what [removed company name] was gonna give him.

D: Oh.

M: Like, he wanted to be DM, but there’s no way he could be DM. He couldn’t even take care of [removed place name]. Yeah.

D: Oh, wow. Okay, so threatening...is there others?...qualities?

M: He was unknowledgeable about the business.

D: Unknowledgeable?

M: Yeah, he couldn’t actually physically do the work. He had to be able to be hands on, I think.

D: Mmm.

M: Um, I guess that’s...I guess...what Mike is, I guess, different is, like, he’ll tell you what, what needs to be done, but if, you know, shit hits the fan, he’ll be able to jump in and do it.

D: Mmm.

M: The other guy, no.

D: ‘Cause he’s been...he’s had those experiences, yeah?

M: Yeah. I mean, even, from unit level all the way to something like my job. You know what I mean? Like, being able to, you know, put together a strategic plan, and um,
physically set up the computer, design a...design a poster, you know what I mean? Or a flyer. My boss couldn’t do that.

D: Oh.

M: Like, he couldn’t even check email.

D: Oh.

M: Yeah, yeah. So it was pretty bad. You know what I mean? So, yeah, a lot of it was political.

D: Oh.

M: [unintelligible].

D: Ah...

M: But yeah, so, I mean...Mike shows me stuff on Excel that I don’t...you know, that I never really knew before. Or like Adobe, or something...you know, programs, yeah?

D: Oh.

M: Yeah, so...

D: Okay. So would those qualities of your ideal supervisor, would that be different than those qualities you would want in a friend?

M: Oh...I never thought...

D: Talked about trust...being knowledgeable...

M: Yeah, little bit different, yeah. I think more um...well, trust is, you know, a big issue...trust, honesty, um, I guess fun to be around, um...the easy to talk to thing kind of goes hand in hand.

D: Mmm.
M: But um, I guess compassionate more...’cause you know you ain’t gonna get compassion from Mike, so...[laughs]...Nah, he can be...he’s very...I’m surprised...yeah.

D: Yeah?

M: Yeah.

D: But it’s more important for a friend than a boss, then?

M: I don’t know, with the things going on in my life sometimes now, it’s good that he has it...yeah, and he has...he’s come a long way, so I was kind of shocked.

D: Kay, I think that’s good enough.
Interview with Evan – Supervisor of Merle

June 12, 2007

10:00 a.m. – 11:00 am

D: So, tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

E: I’m the operations director here at [removed place name].

D: Okay.

E: Um...basically manage the, um, campus, all the operations on campus, uh, which includes, uh [removed names]. I also support concessions.

D: Oh, okay...um...

E: I’m also the liaison between the subcontractors that we deal with, being [removed company names].

D: Mmm, okay.

E: Um, they actually subcontract from us. If they have any questions, I am the person that they contact, seeing if there are things that [removed name] address with them, I get the call and then I facilitate between the two parties.

D: Oh, okay...what would you say led you to this type of work?

E: Uh...started doing this when I was in college...um, more as a way to earn money. And then, uh, as I started getting more and more involved, uh, I thought this was a, uh, pretty interesting, uh, business to get into, with the business, as it evolved a lot since I went to college. Its...When I went to college, everything was more like [removed name]...all you can eat. You pay one price, its all you can eat.

D: Oh, yeah, yeah.
E: And, uh, I had...my uncle used to own a restaurant here in town, and uh, I just thought that the concept was pretty interesting in that, uh, you got paid all your money up front, you really didn’t have to...you had a...a built in customer base, and basically it was different than any other business on the street where you had to solicit business to come in to your establishment. Here, you already had the built in customer base, you got paid your money up front, and it was working [unintelligible]. Basically, you manage your business to the money you already had, so that you’d make a profit.

D: Oh.

E: Okay? So that...I thought that was pretty, uh...intriguing to me. It was very different than other businesses where you had to go out and attract business to build sales.

D: Yeah.

E: And then you manage your business from there, um...

D: Yeah. Interesting.

E: So this was a...it was very different, and when I first realized what was going on, I thought, “Eh, this is a very different way to do business,” and so I, you know, got more and more involved in it. And uh, when I was done with college, I also worked restaurants for a couple of three years, uh, just to see what that was like. I had a friend up in Portland, Oregon, and I opened a restaurant with him. I worked for [removed company name] for a little bit, and then worked for um, [removed company name], which years ago used to operate [removed name] restaurant and [removed name] down in Waikiki. But, on the mainland they had someplace, so I kind of worked with them. Um, then I came back here and then worked with [removed company name] years ago, about 25 years ago, and then went to the mainland and continued working with them.
D: Oh, okay.
E: But basically, because it was a different business.
D: Yeah.
E: Yeah, than most things that people are used to.
D: Um, how long have you been working here at this position?
E: Eight months.
D: Okay. Um, can you draw me, like a organization chart of, like, where you are and just...just the people that you work closely with?
E: [drawing] Basically I report to Mike. And then there’s, uh, oh I forgot to mention there’s a catering department. [removed naming of subcontractors]
D: So mainly you work with the managers?
E: Yes. Um, here we have one manager, talking about salaried, and one chef. [removed place name] there’s uh, two managers and one chef, that’s salaried. [removed name] we have one manager. Um, here we have one supervisor for [removed name] and [removed name]. Um, concessions actually reports to, uh, Mike directly, but it’s a dotted line to me because I help support also.
D: Okay, thanks. Okay...um, what would be a typical day for you? What kind of stuff would you do?
E: Um, like everybody else, when they come in...answer any phone messages and their email...um, then I usually, uh, try and get out to, uh, all the, uh...all the different accounts, uh, whether it’s, you know, um, [removed names]. If there’s, uh, high profile catering events, like something for [removed names], um, I’ll attend those. Basically my role is to support the managers, any things that they need or uh, the way they uh,
operational things that keep things going…and that can be anything from operations to HR items to...

D: Kay, uh, when did you start working with Mike?

E: Eight months ago.

D: Eight months ago. And then, I wanted to...we’re kind of thinking because, um, I want to also look at your relationship with either a direct report or someone above you, but I think...I think Mike didn’t want to do it twice, so we’re thinking maybe someone that reports to you...

E: Okay.

D: ...that I would also interview. Um, I don’t know who he has in mind, but did he ask you about that?

E: Yeah, maybe we can get Merle or somebody from [removed place name].

D: Oh, okay. His name is Merle?

E: Yeah, Merle.

D: Oh, yeah...I think he did mention that.

E: Yeah.

D: Okay, maybe we’ll use him then. Um, do you think he can make it today?

E: I’ll check with him.

D: Okay. It’s Merle. When did you start working with Merle?

E: Eight months ago.

D: Oh, okay.

E: Yeah, I’ve only been here 8 months. I came from the mainland.

D: Oh, okay. What part?
E: Uh, [removed place name].

D: Okay. Yeah, I was just there this weekend. Um, how much contact do you have with Merle.

E: Daily.

D: Daily, okay. Uh, like, how long...how long are your interactions, or how much time do you spend...

E: [unintelligible] formal meetings. Um...just basically, you know, as I go in, I’ll stop in three or four times a day, with him. Uh, it depends a lot on my interaction with other managers depends on, uh, their experience level.

D: Mmm.

E: We have, um, a new catering manager. So, I meet with him weekly. Okay? And we have a new manager down in [removed place name], so I have formal meetings with him weekly, for like about an hour. Um, [removed place name], I just go down there and just very informally talk with the managers down there, see what they’re doing, and if they need any help. Um, once a week, on Wednesdays, we have management meetings where all the managers on campus come to this room, and we sit down, and I share...it’s more of an informational meeting with them...I share with them information. Once a month, at month end, they come and bring information on their, um, P and Ls, profit and loss statements, and they share with us. We talk about finances, what they were budgeted to do, or what they did in actuality, if there’s variances, why? So, once a month they come to bring us information. The rest of the time it’s me sharing information with them. Uh, also use that as a training session...train managers on different things that are coming up.
Okay. Okay, so with Merle, um, is that more interaction than with most other folks, or less interaction?

E: Mmm...probably more because he’s a supervisor. Both he and [removed name] are supervisors, so I try and spend more time with them, uh, cause their hourly supervisors. The salaried managers and all the other operations, um, my expectation is that they’ll manage their business, and they reach out to me, uh, when they need help with certain situations or [unintelligible] that come up, uh...

D: Okay.

E: I think, uh...and a lot of it is dealing, um, on a corporate level, like if we had HR problems and we need to deal with the Human Resource Director for the region, I’ll get involved in that, or there’s operational things that we need to be in contact with somebody from corporate, uh, I’ll do that.

D: Okay. What are the different ways that you communicate with Merle?...like mostly emails...

E: Email, and uh, daily visits, yeah.

D: Oh, in person...in person visits?

E: In person. With him and [removed name], they’re in this building, so probably in person a lot. I do email stuff, uh, from time to time, and they communicate to me by email.

D: Uh. Okay. Um, are there a lot of...you talked about the meetings that you have with them...are there other activities that you engage in with Merle, like together where you’re working on something...um, like a joint project you’re both working on?
E: Usually, we have something that directly involves his operation. Like we may want to
do some refurbishing of his operation or something like that, then I’ll...I’ll, you know, get
some feedback from him.

D: Do you ever have lunch with Merle?...together with him...

E: No.

D: No? Or after work...

E: No.

D: Get a bite to eat or anything like that?

E: No.

D: Okay. Do you feel like you know Merle on a personal level?

E: No.

D: So you say wouldn’t know his family and friends and stuff?

E: No.

D: Okay. Um, what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with
Merle?

E: I think we’re very frank and honest with each other. I think he can...he feels that he
can be honest with me. And then I’m basically pretty honest with him. Um...I think with
all the managers...and this is my own personal opinion...Uh, you asked me about do I
know him outside of work, do I socialize with him...I don’t think we do that with, um, all
managers, any managers, whether it’s Merle or anybody else.

D: Okay.

E: Um, it seems to...um, I think...it needs to be a separation of work and social...In that,
um, I think part of being honest with somebody is so that you’re not too close to the guy
as a friend that you would feel bad telling him something he needs to hear that is
probably not very pleasant at times.

D: Mmhmm.

E: And so I found that, um, socialize very little one-on-one with the managers. There may
be times when we may go out as a group, all the managers together and we go have
dinner, but that is pretty much the extent of any socializing that we do outside of work.

D: Oh, okay.

E: If I go into the units, we may sit down and have lunch together, in the unit, but, um...I
personally believe you kind of need that separation where you don’t really...we do very
little socializing outside of work.

D: Okay. So when you folks have, like those, um, I guess, meals together, that’s mostly,
like, work-related stuff?

E: Mmhmm.

D: Okay, um, what would you say are some negative things about your relationship with
Merle?

E: His priorities and my priorities aren’t exactly in synch many times.

D: Okay.

E: I think, for example, I think sanitation and cleanliness is something that I look for
when I walk into a unit, and, um, I don’t think that’s...I gotta constantly point that out to
him, because I don’t think that’s one of his priorities.

D: Okay.

E: I’ll say, you know, you gotta clean up here, this looks like a mess, this and that.

D: Okay. Is there others?
E: Mmm...no, I think this is...when it comes down to it, I think, making, um, managers understand what is your priority, um, when you go into a unit, what you’re looking for, and, you know, I think if there’s anything, that’s where you always run into conflicts with managers.

D: Mmm.

E: And of course, it’s different, you know...I come in and I look at the overall, and they’re basically...they have different priorities. Their priorities are probably, like, service, you know, getting the people out. There’s a line of people out the door, they’re not real concerned with wiping up the spills on the counter, they want to get the people through.

D: Yeah.

E: So, and that’s why, I think...that’s why you have people in different positions. I mean it is my job to come in and point out to them that, basically take a step back from the forest and look at the trees, and kind of see the little detailed things. Cause they’re in there all the time and they don’t really notice it.

D: Yeah. Okay. Okay, um, how would you say your relationship developed with Merle, from when you first met him until today?

E: Ah, I think, as he’s got to know me better, you know, I mean, I think it’s...I’ll just say, I think when you come in, everybody’s a little leery of what you’re gonna be like, but I think as you go through it and then you build up more of a rapport, and then they understand what you’re looking for and where you’re coming from, I...I think it becomes more of a comfortable relationship.

D: Um...was there an orientation for Merle?
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E: [Shakes head]

D: Oh, so you probably came in after he started...

E: After he started, yeah.

D: Is there any stories about him that you could tell that’s interesting, something that you cannot forget...something that stands out for you...?

E: Yeah, the fact that he hasn’t paid a bunch of parking tickets and the police put a boot on his car.

D: Oh no. What did he get on his car?

E: A boot.

D: What’s that, so he can’t move the car?

E: Yeah.

D: Oh, wow. On campus?

E: Yeah.

D: So he’s not supposed to park on campus?

E: Well he’s been parking and not paying his parking ticket, so one day they ran his plate and then they put that boot on it. That was pretty funny. He called me because he thought I had something to do with having them putting the boot on his car. He thought I was joking.

D: [laughing] Okay...what do you feel are the reasons for some of the positive or negative aspects of your relationship with Merle?...You can start with the positive ones first.

E: Um...I think his attitude, uh, to want to learn, uh...more about how to provide good service. I think foremost in his mind is providing good service to the, uh, customer.
Um…so I think that’s, you know, some of the positives, is that, you know, I think from that standpoint, we’re on the same page. Ah…serving a quality product, making sure the drinks are done right with his people.

D: Okay.

E: Um, I think, also his, uh, wanting for his people to do a good job whereby he’s not afraid to, uh, comment on negative performance that they’re doing. I mean, he’s asked me to sit in on some counseling sessions with employees, so I… I think that can, you know…

D: Mmm. How about some of the negative aspects?

E: Probably, um, sometimes his, uh, flexibility… I would like him to be more flexible, uh, to do… uh, try new things, to create more change, uh, in his operations. Running specials, or trying new products, or what have you.

D: Kay, how would you say your relationship with Merle compares with your relationship with other people that you… that report to you?

E: Um… I am probably closer to the operation, in Merle’s operation, managing Merle, than I am with some of the other operations. Um, like I said earlier, um, Merle, um, not only is a working supervisor, so I, uh, work with him directly, and, uh, we solve problems that come up, whereas in other operations, there’s a manager in-between me and the hourly employees. So basically, uh, you’re setting, uh, big goals for the other managers, like, I need your, uh, labor cost to be ‘X’. And your telling them, but then how they go about doing it, you kind of let them do it. With Merle, I’m more directly involved in that. I’ll go into his operation and say, “Rather than running it with five people, I wanna run it with four people at this time frame.” So I’m actually giving specific instructions as to
how I want to achieve certain goals, whereas in the other operations, I go to a manager and say, “You know you were budgeted ‘X,’ and so you need to reduce it.” I don’t tell them how to reduce it.

D: Mmm.

E: So that’s [unintelligible].

D: Kay. Uh, are there certain things that you do with everybody equally?...Like certain activities that you do with everyone that reports to you?

E: Sharing of information and um...training on, uh, new items, new policies, new procedures...and I think also, yeah, ‘cause uh...other things will vary on amount of experience. There’s two things. Like, number one, there’s, like, your experience in the position that you’re in, is one. And so that will determine how much time we need to spend, uh, with that manager. And the second thing is, uh, how much time they had with [removed company name]. Um, like, the last two managers we hired, they were hired from the outside, so they are not only learning the job here on campus, but they’re also learning the procedures and policies of [removed company name]. Okay? So that’s...so there’s...there’s two-fold.

D: Okay.

E: Like, I think, when I came into my position, it was more of learning the job here at [removed place name]. Uh, I was already well-versed in the policies and procedures of [removed company name], and how we’re supposed to do things.

D: Oh, okay.
E: So I... and so, in that way, I, for the newer managers, I spend more time with them.

And part of it is focusing on operation here on campus, and then the other part of it is, learning the policies and stuff for [removed company name].

D: Kay, okay. Um, do you feel like you are able to provide enough materials and resources for everyone to do their job?

E: Yes.

D: Okay. And there’s performance evaluations for everyone to, yeah?

E: Yes.

D: How was... how would you describe Merle’s performance evaluation?

E: Um... I think from a... like I said earlier, I think from a service, uh, quality of product, uh, I think he’s, uh, good in those areas. I think, uh, knowledge of the financials, uh, I think, uh, would be average. And I think, uh, flexibility in the innovation in his operation, would be “needs work.”

D: Okay. What are the qualities of your ideal employee?

E: Someone that has a desire to progress out of the current position.

D: Okay. What are the qualities of your not-so-ideal employee?

E: Um... people that aren’t... not able to take direction. And uh, second part of that is, uh... not having passion for their job.

D: Kay. Um, I know you mentioned a line between work relationships and personal relationships... um, just thinking about work relationships, what do you think are the basic foundations that make a good working relationship.

E: Identifying what the different people need and providing them with that. Uh... that’s probably the most important thing is... you know, I think, a lot of times, people are afraid
to ask for help, so as a manager or a director, you need to be able to identify where they need help, and kind of step in and provide that for them. So they don’t feel, uh, that they’re, uh, being needy. You know what I mean? You can step in and say, “Hey, you know, I think, here, this is what I suggest you do this.” And they feel good about that, about somebody recognizing them and... and they’re not having to ask.

D: Mmm. Okay. What about, um, just personal relationships? What do you think are the basic foundations of a good personal relationship?

E: Um...

D: Like friendship relationships... 

E: [unintelligible]...you know, it’s kind of a cliché, but probably just honesty and trust, you know.

D: Okay... okay. Um, how would you view yourself ethnically? Racially or ethnically.

E: I don’t understand. What are you saying?

D: Like, how would you view yourself, um, like in terms of race or ethnicity, like Asian or Caucasian... Like, do you identify with any race or ethnicity?

E: Um...

D: Like if you had a... like you saw a question, “What is your race?” which one would you select?

E: Asian.

D: And you could only choose one.

E: I would choose Asian.

D: Asian. Okay. How would you view, uh, Merle’s ethnicity, or race?

E: Asian.
D: Do you think there’s anything special about racial or ethnic differences in the workplace? Differences or similarities? Does that play a role at all you think?

E: There’s differences in that, um... see, I think you need to understand that there’s, there’s like, yeah, obviously if you say “What race?” you would check off, you would say “Asian.” Characteristics, of you as a person, I think, um, there is some dissimilarities in that, um, Mike and I, uh, have spent years on the mainland, working for, you know, with Hispanics, African Americans, and of course, a lot of Caucasians. And... and so, I think, uh, when you... like I was gone for 25 years, and then coming back, um, you know, I think, to some extent, um, the local guys here still view me as an outsider. I’m not familiar with a lot of the things... or recent things that have happened here in Hawaii.

D: So more like a mainland-local difference...

E: Yes.

D: ... versus, like...

E: Yes. ‘Cause there’s... there’s very different ways that you manage, um, people. I think, um, priorities seem to be different. And I think a lot of it is, um... I think proximity to people that manage you. Like, out here, we’re kind of out here on our own. Uh, on the mainland, a lot of those units, you have people from corporate stopping in all the time, and seeing what you’re doing. So I think you have more of a tendency to, um... need to follow the procedures as outlined by the company. And then the other thing, too, is that out here in Hawaii, because ethnically it’s so different, um, the way they do business out here, you know, I think there’s something to be said for that also.

D: Mmm. Kay, would you say you have a high quality relationship, or a good relationship with Merle?
E: Mmm, I think a good… I wouldn’t say “high quality,” but I think a good working relationship.

D: As far as working relationship, how would you rate it, say, on a scale of, like, 1 to 10?

E: Ah...

D: It’s oversimplifying, but...

E: …probably about a seven or something.

D: Okay. Kay. Do you feel like gender issues are sensitive in the workplace?

E: Mmm… not really.

D: Um, how long do you think it takes to know somebody well?

E: Depends on how much interaction you have with them.

D: Um, what about like a work site.

E: Mmm.

D: Still depends, but...

E: Yeah.

D: An average… average person that comes in… a new person… Like, how long do you think it would...

E: A year.

D: One year? Okay. And what kind of personal knowledge do you think you need to feel like you know somebody pretty well?

E: History of working with them, the experiences of working with them. The reason why I say a year is because then you basically run the whole gamut of working… a full year.

D: Mmm.
E: I mean, year-to-year, um, unless there’s something specific that comes up, uh, the business doesn’t change that much. Um, so you see how they work in the first semester when it’s very busy, you see in the second semester when it slows down, you see what they work like during the summer, when it’s relatively slow, so you need the full range of the different conditions that they’re working under, to really get to know what a person is like in work.

D: Mmm. Okay. Um, what role do you think that personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship? Like, knowing kind of more about their personal lives, or, I think that could be like their personality...like, how much of that do you need to know...

E: I think knowing their personality is important. Uh, their personal lives, basically, to be very honest, like, you know, “What? You got problems at home? Leave ‘em at home.” Yeah. I think that’s...uh, so...I think the only time it comes into play is if it’s something that somebody’s going through a personal crisis at home that it’s affecting them at work.

D: Mmm.

E: Then, you know, I think those things need to be addressed. And...and, uh...but, other than...on a day-to-day basis, where you’re managing people, uh, their personal struggles or what have you, outside of work, should really not impact, um, you know, how you would manage them at the job.

D: Kay.

E: I know that’s easier said than done. Like I said, you know, if know somebody’s dad is sick or something, and, you cut...kind of want to cut ‘em some slack when they’re late or they have to leave early. Um, so, you know, that’s easier said than done. However, um,
in...in the reality of things, well, that’s your own personal thing, right?...I should manage you like I do the other people.

D: Mmm. Kay. Do you think you can have a good working relationship without any personal knowledge?

E: Um...yes I do. I think...you as a person...as a manager...need to control that, ‘cause you will have some people that want to share their whole life story with you, outside of work. And...and...and, you know, if...I think you could sit there and listen to that, you become more involved [unintelligible], it’s kind of outside of work, and I really don’t want to, you know, discuss that, or hear about your personal...so let’s kind of focus in on work...just work-related.

D: Yeah...okay...Um, from your observations, if you want...or somebody wanted to really move up in the organization, what process do you think they would need to go through?...Like, what are some important things that they should focus on?

E: Um, being very proficient at the position they are in currently...first of all, so you need to know what you’re doing, and be very proficient at the job you’re currently in. Then, um, constantly identifying other areas that, uh, you need to know, and then finding out how you can learn those things.

D: Okay.

E: And that would be like stepping out of the position, and maybe looking at the next step that you want to be in, and finding out what are the critical success factors that you would need to learn to be able to do that position.

D: Okay.
E: And...working for a company, those are all readily available to you if you want to take the time to learn them. There are little acronyms that you use, like KRIs, which is Key Result Indicators, in companies. Like, what are stats that you look at to indicate your business. You know? Critical success factors, you know, like what is critical to your job that would make you successful in a certain position. So, you know, there’s all things on that, and then...people keep statistics on that, so that you know what it is that you’re doing. It’s not a big mystery out there. It’s just whether you take the time to learn, and then how you utilize it as a tool to learn the business.

D: Okay.

Note: The rest of the interview was interrupted by recorder. Some of the other topics discussed, include:

Mainland managers sometimes clash with local workers -- the delivery of the message is different, while the basic message is the same.

For a lot of the local workers, their thinking is not out-of-the-box, and they don’t want to go to learn other methods, such as those on the mainland.

Participant expressed desire that people would have the experience working abroad.
D: So, tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

M: Uh, well, I’m overseeing two stores. Um, they’re actually two within one. Um, the [removed name] and the...the coffee shop.

D: Oh, okay. The [removed name], yeah?

M: Yeah.

D: Um...what would you say led you to do this type of work...and here?

M: And here?

D: Yeah.

M: Um, well, I’ve been in the service business for...let’s see...over...before here, um, about eight-and-a-half years...and uh, mostly in, um, kitchen management and front of the house.

D: Okay. And how long have you been working here?

M: For [removed company name]?

D: Yeah.

M: Um...going on five years.

D: Kay, what’s a typical day at work like for you?

M: A typical day at work...um, coming in, opening up the store, um, hoping no one will call in sick, um...basic everyday duties...um, making sure everything’s, um, [unintelligible] the temperatures, uh, the products...all the products are good, um, there’s
no fault in the equipments...um, what else...uh, checking cashier logs, sales from
previous days. That’s it. I guess managerial, general managerial duties. Check the
schedules...

D: Okay. Uh, how would you describe...oh, actually, do you work with the other people
that, um, that Evan oversees a lot?

M: Um, sometimes I do, but, um...like, downstairs, [removed name]? I do work with her,
because, um...um, we do...I guess we’re in the same area, so we help out each other, like
if she needs help with certain things, I’ll go down there and [unintelligible] downstairs,
she usually [unintelligible] cashing out days, or something like that.

D: And she’s a manager, too?

M: Yeah. She’s the supervisor downstairs.

D: But do you mostly work with, like, your staff, for [removed name] and [removed
name]?

M: [removed name]? Um, normally, yeah, [unintelligible], yeah.

D: Okay. Um, who would you say you work with more, like your...the other managers,
or more your staff?

M: My employees? Um, I would say more with the employees, cause I’m with them
everyday, so...um, Evan, I guess Evan would be the other person, I guess, I work with
more.

D: Oh, okay.

M: I think. Because, uh, he...he oversees me here, so...

D: Mmm. Okay.
M: I have to report to him, so...so, I would say, yeah, employees first, Evan would be second.

D: Oh, okay. And then the other managers?

M: Mike would be...if Evan’s not [unintelligible] Mike, Mike would be the last person.

D: Okay. How would you describe the employees that you work with?

M: Um...

D: Are they mostly students?

M: There mostly students. I have a few, uh, full time workers. Uh, I would say 95% are students...90% are students. Um, you know, every day is different. Uh, not one day is the same. Um, they all have stories to tell me, some good, some bad. You know? But, uh, you know, it’s the life of a student.

D: Yeah.

M: Um, but, in general, you know, they’re all...they’re all good employees. Um, they’re all fun to work with.

D: Kay. Um, can you draw me, like, an organizational chart showing, like, just the people that you work closely with? Like, the relationship...with...

M: The relationship?

D: Yeah...[getting paper]...I gotta piece of paper right hear...[unintelligible]...Evan is your supervisor...

M: Oh...yeah, so Evan would be above me...and then, I guess, um, I come under him.

And then, um...[drawing]...you want what the duties are, or something?

D: Nah, nah....

M: Just basically...
D: Just the people over there, yeah...

M: Oh, so...and, basically they oversee, over here is the staff...

D: So those are, like, the managers...?

M: Um, there...there, like, uh...

D: The shift managers?

M: Like shift managers, um, leads, um...[removed name] would be like a lead. And then he oversees all the staff. Yeah, so, um, [unintelligible], I oversee everything, um...he’s...I have him, um, take care of [removed place name]. Uh, and, I’m...I’m only on this side because...

D: There’s too many people?

M: Well, actually, there’s...there’s a lot of help in [removed place name].

D: Oh, okay.

M: Yeah, staffing-wise, there’s a lot of help. Not too many, um, students like to serve coffee...they rather be where, I guess, it’s more...

D: Exciting?

M: Yeah, exciting, or it’s more their kind of scene, yeah?

D: Oh, okay.

M: So [removed place name] is supposed to be energetic...

D: Yeah...

M: You know, youthful, stuff like that.

D: Oh, okay.

M: [removed place name] is more of a...you get a older crowd.

D: Is it harder to fill positions over there?
M: Um, no not really. Um, I would...but I would say because it’s a smaller area. Um, the staffing [unintelligible]. We don’t really need that much staff. [removed place name] being because, uh, the, uh, it’s the different areas, uh...steps in making a [removed product name], we do need a lot of staff.

D: Okay, thanks. Um, how would you say your relationships with your staff differ?

M: Um, well, I’m a lot older than them, so that’s one thing, my age difference. Um, I try to do things, we try to do things together as a group, um, like we’ll do camping or something. Um...or, um...

D: Outside of work time?

M: Outside of work, yeah. We try to get together, um, so that everybody has a chance to, uh, just let loose and have fun. Otherwise, [unintelligible].

D: Yeah, okay. Okay, how would you say, um...how much do you know your employees on a personal level?

M: Um...I try to...well, I try not to get into their personal life too much.

D: Okay.

M: Um...more I guess, um, just more like a friend...a friendship kind of thing.

D: Okay.

M: Yeah. Um, sometimes they will tell me things, uh, personal...personal as well. Other than that, some...um, most times they’ll...they’ll talk to their coworkers about it, something personal.

D: Mmm.
M: ‘Cause, I guess because of the age difference, yeah?

D: Yeah.

M: They ask me certain questions about things that I would know.

D: Mmm. Okay... so you folks do other stuff outside of work time? You said camping...

M: Uh, yeah, we try to plan things, um, try to do one thing a semester.

D: Okay.

M: Um, sometimes it doesn’t work out, because of schedules. Everybody has different schedules.

D: Yeah.

M: But we try to figure out what we can do, you know.

D: Okay, um... let’s see... tell me about some of your experiences with your supervisor, or Evan.

M: Evan.

D: Yeah.

M: Um...

D: How long have you been working with Evan?

M: Uh, I would say about a year. He moved back.

D: Oh, since he started...

M: Yeah, when he came back. Um, I mean, there have been times where I guess I needed his assistance, uh, when dealing with, um, I guess, um, customers, or uh, um, employees, but I guess, um, he’s normally, I guess, a second party, kind...

D: Second party?

M: Yeah, I guess, um, if...
D: If there’s issues?

M: If there’s an issue that goes beyond me, then I would talk to him about it.

D: Okay.

M: Um, most... most times I’ll let him know what’s going on and he’ll let me, um, deal with it, and then if it’s to a point where... if I need his assistance, [unintelligible].

D: Okay. Okay, how much contact do you have with Evan?

M: Well, I see him everyday, so...

D: Everyday. Is that a... do you spend a lot of time with him everyday?

M: Um, well, he’ll come by and we’ll talk, um, outside the store, or sometimes early in the morning, about things, um, [unintelligible] things. Um, he’ll help me out with other units... assistance and stuff like that.

D: Okay. And you folks mostly communicate face-to-face?

M: Yeah. Um, face-to-face, emails...

D: Okay.

M: Um...

D: Phone?

M: Phone, yeah.

D: Okay. Are there activities that you do with him, where you folks are both working on, maybe, something together...

M: A project or something?

D: Yeah.

M: Um...

D: Where you would have to sit down and work on stuff together?
M: Not yet. I mean, there hasn’t been anything, like um...I mean, you know, in time, you
know, if there’s a project coming up and, um, he needs my assistance for planning or
something, and, I guess, if it’s in my area, yeah.

D: Okay. Kay...do you ever get together with him for lunch, or after work, or
anything?...weekends?

M: Um, not really. I wouldn’t say...um, nah...just the work time...after hours, most
times I just...I just go home. Uh, and I think, uh, his day doesn’t end till late, so...

D: Oh. Would you...do you feel like you know Evan on a personal level?

M: Um, I guess, yeah...um, you know, we talk and kid around and stuff, you know, so
it’s, yeah, I guess professional and personal.

D: Okay. Do you know his family and friends and stuff?

M: Um, family, no, not really. Friends, um, just, I guess, just whoever’s here and stuff.

Yeah.

D: Okay, staff?

M: Yeah, staff.

D: What’s a, uh, story that you could tell about Evan that...that would be interesting,
something you never forget, or...

M: Story that I could tell Evan?

D: Yeah, that you could tell about him, that...something you remember that would be a
interesting story to...

M: Interesting story...um...[long pause]...um, I guess it would be, uh, how...well, about
Evan, or...about what he...

D: About anything related to him, or...
M: Um...

D: I’m just trying to get a sense of, like, maybe how much...how well you know him, or...

M: Well, let’s put it this way. There was a situation where I needed his assistance, and...I called him, and he did come down and help me out, and, uh, um, the next day I had to, um, I was going on a trip. And he actually looked into the problem that I had. So, called me up and let me know what needed to be done and stuff like that. So, you know, he’s, I guess, um, more than a boss, um, also a friend, yeah.

D: Okay.

M: So...

D: So he kind of went out of his way to...

M: Yeah, he went out...yeah, to help me. I don’t want to get into details, but that’s generally why.

D: Okay. What would you say are some positive things about your relationship with him?

M: Um...positive...I...I can tell him anything, um, that’s on my mind...um, personal and professional. Um, I can joke with him, you know, for him being my boss, you know, um, I guess its more [unintelligible]...friendship kind of thing.

D: Mmm.

M: Um...I know that if I was [unintelligible]...he got my back, you know, so...

D: Okay. And on the other side, what are some negative things about your relationship with him?

M: Um...I don’t think there’s anything that’s negative about it. Um, I mean, the things that I can tell him, you know, he will help me and assist me, so...
D: Okay. In your recollection, how would you describe how your relationship developed with him from when you first met him until now?

M: Well, when I first met him, I couldn’t remember his name. But as...as I kept seeing him around...the thing with me is, sometimes I have a bad memory. I just...I...I can see the guy, I know who he is, but...

D: Know the face...?

M: Yeah, just the name.

D: Yeah, me too...same way.

M: Um, but um, you know, when I first met him, I wasn’t sure who he was, or how...how to approach him. But as...as I got to know him, um, you know, I can open up to him and I can tell him anything, you know.

D: Mmm. ‘Kay. Kay...um, do you remember what your first meeting was like? Or your first...uh, whatever you had when you first met him? Like a orientation, or...

M: Um...

D: ...but you were here before him, right?

M: Yeah.

D: So...

M: Um, when I first met him, it was just basically just a, um, “Hi,” “Hello,” kind of thing.

D: Mmm.

M: Um, first meeting...um, I guess, was, uh, very, uh, informal.

D: Okay.

M: Um, but, um, he seemed very interested in what I had to say, so...
D: Okay. Um, what are some significant events that you think, um, maybe contributed to your relationship and how it is today? If there is anything significant...

M: Um, like, you mean work together? Um, helping out all the units. Um...

D: And so that way you kind of got to know each other?

M: Yeah, plus, um, every morning he comes and gets coffee, so, you know, we’ll talk about things going on. Um...um...

D: It’s kind of more of a gradual...

M: Yeah, gradual, yeah...

D: ...development?

M: Yeah.

D: Okay. ‘Kay, what do you feel are some of the reasons for the positive aspects of your relationship...You mentioned [unintelligible]...positive...like, how you can share anything with him...

M: Yeah...

D: Um, joke around...like a friendship level...what would you say contributed to having that...a good relationship like that?

M: Um, I would say it’s his personality.

D: Okay.

M: Yeah.

D: Okay, anything else?

M: Um...

D: Your personality, too, probably?
M: Yeah, well, I mean, he is a very...what do I want to say, um...he’s very easy to talk
to...yeah, because of his personality and stuff, you know.

D: Okay. Okay, how would you think your relationship with him compares to, like, the
relationship of all the other managers with him?...Is there...

M: Differences?

D: ...differences with the other managers?

M: Um...no, I think he, you know, he treats us all the same.

D: Okay.

M: You know? Uh...yeah.

D: Is there certain things that he’ll do only with certain people?...and not others?

M: Not that I know of. Um, you know, he’s...he’s all around, so...

D: Okay.

M: So, you know, he’ll...he visits every unit every day. So, he spends time, you know,
so, I would say every [unintelligible].

D: Okay...um, let’s see...how would you describe your personal performance at work?

M: My performance?

D: Your personal performance.

M: Um...above average, I would say. Um...you know...I see if I can get by every day. In
fact, I go day to day, so, you know, ‘cause every...not one day is the same, you know.

D: Mmm.

M: So, if I can get by every day, five days a week, you know, for me that’s a pretty good
accomplishment. You know, there are times when I come, I do stuff on the weekends,
but, you know...
D: Oh.

M: But that’s...that’s like...that’s like a luxury, you know? Anytime I have...I have time to myself, so I can concentrate. Still work, but I just...

D: Yeah...

M: ...you know, things gotta get done.

D: So you work a lot on weekends?

M: Um...I try to come by like once every other week, just to...

D: Oh, you have to come by here?

M: Yeah, all I gotta do is...I just, you know, maintenance and stuff like that.

D: Mmm. Wow, sounds like everybody works long hours.

M: Yeah, um, you know, it’s part of the job description.

D: Yeah. What are the qualities of your ideal supervisor?

M: Um...um, ideal supervisor would be, um, person would...can work well with others, know how to delegate, uh, duties...also, uh, also do the job itself, instead of, um, delegating, um, duties...um, can...can work with anybody, you know, whether it be someone who is challenged, or someone who has mood swings, you know.

D: Mmm... Okay. What are the qualities of a not-so-ideal supervisor?

M: Not so ideal supervisor...I guess someone who doesn’t do the job itself, you know.

D: Okay, so they don’t have, like, knowledge of...

M: Well, a person probably would have knowledge, but, you know, it’s one thing to have knowledge, but it’s also to do the job, yeah?

D: Mmm.
You know, you can have all the knowledge in the world, how to do it, how to, um, how to supervise a group of people, but if nothing gets done, or if you can’t motivate the people, you know, um, you know, I would say, either you’re doing something wrong or you’re not...you’re not trying hard enough.

D: Mmm.

M: It’s shown by example...you know [unintelligible], of how we motivate employees at a new job, and you know, who want to work for you...

D: Yeah, okay.

M: And somebody can’t do that, um, wouldn’t be...shouldn’t be in that position.

D: Okay. What about some, like, maybe personal kind of qualities, or could be like personality...um, is there any of those qualities you would prefer in a supervisor?

M: Well, um...yeah, well, you know, you gotta have personality, yeah? Um, you know, that’s part of trying to motivate, motivate your employees or people that work under you.

D: Mmm.

M: You know, um...like what I try to do is make it a fun atmosphere.

D: Okay.

M: Also, at the same time, you know, you still gotta work.

D: Mmm.

M: If a job was boring and...and, you know, not fun, you know, people get tired, people get lazy...

D: Yeah.

M: Um, you know, they really don’t want to come to work. If you can make the atmosphere a fun place, and, you know, uh, jokes, kid around, you know, and...and still
work, employees are more tending to come back to work…or would want to work for longer periods of time. Especially if they’re students.

D: Yeah.

M: If you got full time employees, you know, um, you still gotta make it fun for them to come back to work, but, you know, you still want them to want to come back to work.

D: Yeah. Okay.

M: Students, it’s a different thing. Because…they work short hours and stuff. You know, you want to make it to their benefit, where, you know, “I’d come to work for you for two hours.” You know? [unintelligible] Enjoy yourself. Not come to work and it’s another boring job.

D: With students, it’s hard to keep…

M: Yeah, especially when they come from class…come after class, and then come to work. So we try to make it fun for them, try to get their mind off of class. Sometimes it’s hard, because, you know, they have homework, papers, stuff like that, but, you know, if you can get their mind off it for two hours, and get to relax and still work at the same time, you know, and then, you know, it eases them.

D: ‘Kay. Uh, what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?...Like, what do you need to have to have a good relationship with somebody?

M: Um, trust.

D: Okay.

M: Um...

D: Could be work relationship or personal relationship…
M: Um...I think you need to trust the person, uh, I would say, you know...um, personaility, um, because we are a food service business, and they need to have a personality. Um...

D: Okay. How do you view yourself racially or ethnically?

M: How do I view myself...

D: Yeah...

M: How...what?

D: What would you identify with as far as race or ethnicity?

M: Uh, I guess I’m Chinese.

D: Okay, how would you describe Evan?

M: Evan?

D: Yeah.

M: Asian, Japanese.

D: Do you think there’s anything special about, um, intercultural relationships in the workplace? Like if you have different or similar, uh, racial or ethnic backgrounds?

M: Anything special about it, um...

D: Does it have a impact?

M: I would...no, not really, I mean...you know, um...to me it shouldn’t. You know, I don’t have a...you know, I base it upon, uh, who you are, what your likes, dislikes, stuff like that, you know...what you like to do, stuff like that, you know?

D: You think for other workplaces, you think that would be an issue?

M: Um, it might be an issue, but, you know...I would hope not. You know, and I cannot speak for everybody, you know. You know, there are people that, you know...sometimes
it's not a race thing, just a personality thing, and most times that's what it is. If it's a
dislike or like, it's a personality thing. That's what I...I would figure.

D: Mmm. Okay. Um, would you say you have a high quality relationship with Evan?

M: Um...

D: A really good relationship?

M: I say we have a good relationship.

D: What would you rate it on a scale of 1 to 10? 10...10 is like the best...

M: I would say, like a seven and a half, eight.

D: Okay. 'Kay, do you think gender issues are sensitive in the workplace?

M: Um...

D: Does it ever become an issue, about...

M: For me, well...like, in general, or...

D: Yeah.

M: Or for me personally?

D: Both.

M: For me personally, gender's not an issue. Um, you know, if you can do the job, you
can do the job.

D: Mhm.

M: Whether it be a small, little 4’9” Japanese girl, or a big, you know, six feet...

D: Samoan guy?

M: Samoan guy or something, you know. They both can do the job, that's great, you
know?

D: Mhm.
M: I mean, it doesn’t matter, you know? Um...

D: Mmm, what about in other work places?

M: Um...like I said, I wouldn’t know about that.

D: Yeah, okay. Um, how long do you think it takes to know somebody very well?

M: Um...

D: Maybe like...

M: I would say about six months...uh, I would say, no, not six months, um, about a year, I guess, depending on how long you spend with the person.

D: Okay. Um, what kind of personal knowledge do you think you need to feel like you know them well?

M: Well, I guess, you know, their likes, dislikes, um...hobbies, um, I guess general information...

D: Okay.

M: Um...

D: Kind of a tough question...What role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?

M: Um...well, I guess, a good work relationship with your employees would be working with them, you know? Um, not just by supervising or managing them, you need to, um, be there with them to work with them, you know? Um, that’s the only way, I guess, you can form a relationship. ‘Cause most times, you know, you would talk with them while you work, about things, and try to get to know the person, you know, and its kind of hard to just talk to the person, like, if you’re just supervising them and not...not working with them.
D: Yeah.

M: You know, it’s like…

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: You know, if you work with them at the site, it’s easier to talk to them. Um, it’s easier for them to talk to you, too.

D: Um, does it help when you get to know personal things about them? Does that help with your work relationship with them?

M: Um, yeah, ‘cause you get to know things about, uh…about the person itself, you know, um…um, what are their tendencies, you know, what…you know, sometimes, you know, who they work good with, who they don’t work good with. So…um…sometimes [unintelligible].

D: Do you think you can have a good relationship without personal knowledge?

M: Um, no…not really. Without any personal knowledge, it’s hard to get to know employees, yeah? Or people you work with.

D: ‘Kay. ‘Kay, I think we’re done.
Interview with Carl – Supervisor

September 15, 2007
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 pm

D: Um… so I’m mainly interested in, um, your work at the Philippines.
C: Mmmmm.

D: I know you have different projects you’re, um, taking part in. Um, so tell me a little bit about the work that you’re doing in the Philippines.
C: Well, generally, we, uh, go there to do a little bit of, uh, outsourcing work. We work with a team, uh, that’s part of, actually, a university there. Uh, one of our friend’s family runs the university, and they, uh…and he has a little outsourcing company that’s uh…we’re kind of attached to that, uh…so basically, uh, my main role there is to…to mainly team-build and, um, build up, establish that relationship and let them know that there’s actually, uh, real people that exist that send them the work and that they…we pretty much are looking out for their well-being, as well as, uh…you know…

D: Okay. Um… how long have you been working with those guys?
C: Um, it’s been about 6 months, maybe?

D: Okay. Um… oh yeah, can you draw me an organization chart of, um, what that kind of structure looks like there…like, your relationship with those guys.
C: Okay… [drawing]

D: Is this a person?
C: Yeah, uh… this has to do with a team… so this is a team… this one’s a team…

D: So from your company, you’re the only one that’s responsible for…
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C: Mainly, I’m the main communicator... so... uh... and that’s how it sort of works. And also there’s a line to... [unintelligible]

D: Oh, okay.

C: It’s very... very much... it’s not complex.

D: Program manager... project manager oversees the QA person...

C: Yeah, and she works with all the program managers... or they actually all work together.

D: Oh, okay. So what is your interaction like with that staff there? Are there like... how much interaction do you have with them?

C: Um, it’s a fairly, fairly extensive. I... I talk with them also on a daily basis. Um, it’s not necessarily always about work related, I always check in on their... their, um... their morale and their well-... you know, just how they’re doing. But um, I think it’s, uh... other than that, how their projects are going. Giving them specifications on work that needs to be done.

D: Okay. Wow, so everyday pretty much?

C: Uh, yeah, largely.

D: So it’s mostly, like, though emails, or...

C: Uh, lots of it is through instant messaging.

D: Oh.

C: So, lots of times we’re just chatting.

D: Yeah, everyday, phone bills can get kind of costly.

C: Right. Well there’s a 1-800 number if I need to actually talk to them, so it’s not a problem.
D: But sometimes you use...

C: Sometimes I call ‘cause it’s easier to communicate. And we’ve…we’ve done, um, like, uh, video chat. Yesterday we did video. It’s pretty, uh…more and more common now, to actually see them in face.

D: Okay. Um…so you’ve…pretty much have known that staff for 6 months now?

C: Mmhmm.

D: Okay. So think of one person that you could talk about. Um, and give me the pseudonym if you want for that person.

C: Okay.

D: Um, you thought of somebody already?

C: Yeah, I…there’s two people in mind. I…I’m not sure which questions pertain better to which, but…

D: Mmm, I guess somebody that you could talk more about, that you think you could have some…some insight about your relationship with that person more, maybe?

C: Okay, okay. There’s two people that I’m very close with.

D: Okay, um…I’m trying to help you decide which one to focus on…are they…what’s the quality of the relationship like with both of them?

C: Um…well, one is…one is a little bit more, uh, more personal, the other one’s more…their both very personal, but one’s a little bit more, uh…more on a professional level, it’s more technical, and the other one’s more…just the, uh…more relational versus anything. Yeah, so…it’s probably the, uh…you probably want the one that’s more, uh, business, work oriented?

D: Actually, that would be interesting if you could talk about both of them, too.
C: Okay, okay. I mean they’re both very close to me, uh, I feel. One’s more on a personal level, the other one’s more on a, like I said, uh, more of a technical...

D: Okay. Um...so how much contact would you say you have with both of them?

C: Um, pretty regular. Uh...almost on a daily basis, except for maybe the weekend.

D: Okay. Is it different for either one?

C: Yeah, it’s a little different for...for both.

D: So one...would you have more contact with one or the other?

C: Yeah, one’s a little bit more candid and the other’s more, uh...

D: Which one is that? Did you think of names for them...that we could use?

C: Yeah, we can use like Bob and Mary or something.

D: Okay. Kay, so which one is the more personal one?

C: I think the more personal one’s with, uh...with Mary. It’s more of a...

D: And then Bob is the other one...

C: Yeah.

D: Okay. Is the amount of interaction more with Mary?

C: Mmm...um, it’s hard to say...it’s, I mean, probably more as far as, uh, conversational-wise...

D: Okay, what about the different ways that you communicate with either of them...

C: Mhm.

D: Do you use phone more with one, or email more with one...
C: No, um, generally through...through instant messaging is the primary way of communication. Phone is secondary.

D: Okay.

C: Um...

D: Um...hmm...I know you kind of visited them twice, you mentioned. Were there...what kind of activities did you together while you were there with them?

C: Um...the first time was, was very...was a scouting trip. We even, didn’t even really form, uh...formulate any kind of a working relationship. It was just mainly a meet and greet and try and figure out where, what the next steps were. Um, between that and the second trip, uh...that’s when, uh, all of the formation of the team and, uh, sort of, our direction came about. And, um...and the second trip there’s a lot of team-building exercises. We actually went on a retreat, um, and there were a lot of...it was actually mainly for the team up there. Um, they had a lot of games that they had prepared for themselves, and, uh...and mainly, I was just there at the right time to be...participate in that. And so it was really good. Um, they got a chance to interact with me a lot more on a...on a personal level, um, as well as, uh, on a professional level as well, too. But, um, it was a good chance to, um, sort of see how everything operates there and a chance to learn more about them. So, yeah...

D: Okay. Do you feel like, um, for them, is it important to get to know coworkers on a personal level?

C: I believe so. I think there’s a lot of relationships that should be built, um, for...a lot of it for trust reasons, uh...uh, I think...for encouragement. I think a lot of the morale-based, I think...just because, uh, you want...you want them to do their best as well.
D: Okay. Um...How well...let’s start with Mary first...

C: Okay.

D: ...how well would you say you know her on a personal level?

C: Um...pretty well. Uh, I think, uh, I’m getting to know her a little bit more and more, but, uh...I know her on a...

D: Do you know her family and...

C: I know a little bit about her family, a little bit about her background...uh...so it’s a...

D: Okay, how about Bob?

C: Um, Bob’s...I think I know him very well. Uh, I know a lot of his family situation.

Um, I probably know a little bit more about Bob’s personal life than Mary actually, although I talk to Mary probably a lot more.

D: Okay...Have you ever spent any time with any of their family or friends?

C: Um, with Bob, yes, I actually have. With probably, uh, well mostly with, uh, Bob and his kids.

D: Oh. But not with Mary?

C: Uh, very...very little, but I have interacted with the family.

D: What’s a personal story you could tell about both of them?

C: Um...I don’t understand the question, sorry.

D: Like any kind of story that stands out for you, or that happened during work, or something that they told you about their life...some kind of story.

C: Well, Bob shared a lot about his, uh...his marital situation. Um, he, um...had to leave for work for a year, and his wife, um, cheated on him, basically, and, um...he was, um...it was hard for him to share that, but he was able to open up to me. It was good...it
was a good breakthrough...Um...I think with Mary there’s a lot of just, uh, really...on a personal level, it’s just a...it’s a...we just have a lot of...a lot of things that, in common, just we kind of enjoy just the, uh...the laughter of it, just the fun. Um, you know, just the joking around we always kind of run into the same mentality on certain things. So it’s just, it’s probably just more situational versus a personal [unintelligible].

D: Like similar interests, would you say?

C: Yeah, well we just really think alike, probably. We share the same humor, I think.

D: Um, what are some positive things about your relationship with Bob?

C: Um...Well, we’re just very, uh...very, like, brotherly. It’s a...uh, it’s very like a kind of a nurturing and encouraging, and, uh...you know, you find a lot of similarities with Bob, too, on a lot of levels.

D: What about Mary?

C: Um...

D: Um, positive things?

C: Um, I think, uh...it’s similar, too. It’s more on...it’s very, it’s interesting because they’re both kind of, uh, in a way, I find a lot of commonalities, um, in personalities. Um...

D: Okay. What are...what would you say are some negative things about your relationship with Bob?

C: Um...I think, um...I think culture has a lot to do with it sometimes. Uh...just that, um...I think it’s just common...it’s actually, not even culture, it’s just a common, you know, um, worry about, um, finances and stuff, and things of that nature that...that, um, is always a...you know, is always a pressing thing on his mind. So, it impacts us because,
um, it impacts whether, you know, we’re gonna continue to have him with us, and he’s a
very important part of our operations. So on that note, yeah, that’s kind of concerning.

D: Okay. How about, um, Mary?

C: Uh, Mary…I think she’s some…she has some emotional, uh, roller coaster rides
sometimes, and she’s very, um…she’s very closed to that, always holding it in, um, and
not, uh, really not allowing people to break through that shell, um, having it all together. I
think, uh, sometimes it gets too much for her.

D: Oh. Okay, um, so thinking back when you first met them, how would you say your
relationship developed with each of them?

C: Um…I think it really quickly, uh, took off. We really connected on every level with
all of them. Um, I only met Mary on the second…the second trip. Um…we all hit it off
quickly with everyone, and, yeah, it was, uh, we just connected on many levels

D: What do you think was the reason that it went very well in the beginning?

C: I think we share a lot of interests. Uh, we’re all technologists and we enjoy it. We’ve
all gone through the same sort of, you know, pains. We understand the same humor as far
as the industry…the industry goes. Um, so it’s really easy to relate to each other on a, uh,
career…but on our job basis.

D: Mmm.

C: And then, and as you get deeper, you realize that personality-wise, you’re not so much
different.

D: Not so much different you said?

C: Yeah, not…not very different from each other.

D: What’s it like…do you assign work to each of them?
C: Uh, yeah, generally...um...

D: What’s that like? Like, how’s your approach and stuff?

C: Um...it’s very simple. I...I mainly try to get them specifications on whatever we’re trying to accomplish, as detailed as I can be. And I usually go through Bob, um, but I’ll deal, um, lots of time with the people working on different projects, ‘cause Bob will delegate that out, and I’ll sometimes work with the programmers directly. Um, and I’ll also work with, uh, Mary, too, to sort of make sure we’re on track, sort of the status. So I actually have to work with everyone to some degree.

D: So Bob’s usually the guy to go to to get the work delegated, and Mary kind of the following up person?

C: Yes.

D: Kay. How would you say your relationship with Bob and Mary compares to your relationship with all the other staff that’s there?

C: Um...I think it’s a little bit deeper...uh, a little bit more personal compared to everyone else. And not that...there’s other...a couple other guys that I’m really close to, too, but they’re more on the, uh, just technical and, you know, just, um, as a team kind of level, uh, versus Mary and Bob, I kind of know them on a personal level, a little bit more deeper.

D: What do you think contributed to that?

C: I think it’s just our similarities, and our personality, as well as, uh, experience. We’re, you know, Bob and Mary are a little bit more experienced, uh, they’re a little older than lots of the rest of the staff. Um, in their own personal lives, they’ve been through, um, you know, a deeper level of experience, and similar to me. They’re about my age.
D: Um, are there certain things that you can do with Bob that you can’t do with other staff?

C: Um, yeah, I think it’s more on a conversational level. I think it’s a... just really being able to communicate with him to the degree where I actually can be an influence on him.

D: Is there anything that you can do only with Mary that you can’t do with other staff?

C: Um, I think it’s more on a personal level... the kind of conversations we have. It’s just more, uh... more personal. Just, uh... rarely, not too much work related, but it’s just...

D: Like what kind of stuff do you guys talk about?

C: With Bob?

D: With, yeah, with both of them.

C: Um, well Bob, a lot of it is technical, it’s... there’s a lot of work related, uh, issues, and between that there’s a lot of personal stuff that we just...

D: Is it family stuff, or...?

C: Yeah, just family, just checking in on how he’s doing, what is his status on his... you know, what... what he wants to do, and where he wants to be, and...

D: His goals, and...?

C: Yeah, just... you know, his, uh, his financial burdens or whatever it is, you know? Um, with Mary, it’s more of a joking relationship. It’s more of a, uh, kind of a bantering... just a [unintelligible] relationship. It’s sort of, uh, the opposite of a relationship with Bob. It’s a little bit less technical, and more personal... you know, just... not deep personal, not significantly deep personal. It’s just more of a bantering relationship.

D: Just out of curiosity, if there was one person that you would choose, if you had to choose to head up everything, which one would you choose?
C: Right, it would be Bob.

D: Bob. Is that because the technical aspect, he’s more...

C: Uh, yeah, he’s...he’s a very...experienced in this area. Um, Mary’s a lot less technical...but, uh, she’s very technical in certain aspects, um, but not in our field, so...but she has the capabilities of doing a lot more.

D: Okay, um...is there a reward system set in place for them?

C: Uh, no not necessarily...no, nothing at this point.

D: No, like, bonuses, or...

C: No, and it’s so...so early. We’re just trying to, uh...um, produce enough revenue to, uh, cover our costs, cover them...just getting them paid, but they...they, you know, they, um, know that, you know, eventually they will get compensated more and that’s the whole goal as to, uh...but I do...um, this past trip I brought them, you know, some gifts and, uh, some...I provided something.

D: Okay. Um, do you feel like they have enough resources to do their job?

C: Yeah, I think so. I think so. They...they, I mean...always could use more, but...I think they’re resourced enough, and they have more resources if they need to tap into the university. So they have a...a feeder system that...that can be tapped into.

D: Okay.

C: I think it’s mainly our responsibility here to make sure that they have enough work coming in.

D: Oh, okay...Okay, is there performance evaluations for them?

C: Uh, not really. Not from a [unintelligible] standpoint.
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D: Mmm... what do you think are the qualities of your most ideal employee?

C: Um, I think someone that can take initiative. Um, someone that has leadership skills... Um...

D: What kind of leadership skills?

C: I think where they can, um... they can guide and...

D: Guide?

C: Guide... their team, um, encourage their team, and, uh, just... just being able to take care of their team, serve their team, um, and that team believes in them. There's a relationship of trust, and integrity, um... I think that's a core. Um, communication is very important, extremely important. So a good communicator.

D: Okay.

C: And, yeah, that's uh...

D: Okay. What's... what's the qualities of a not-so-ideal employee?

C: Whatever's the opposite of that. [laughs] Someone that's, uh, very, uh, of course, disruptive, unchallenged...

D: Unchallenged?

C: Yeah.

D: They don't like to challenge themselves?

C: Yeah.

D: Kay. What do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

C: What? I'm sorry?

D: Interpersonal relationships? Like, to have a good relationship, what do you think are the foundations of that?
C: Well, trust is, I think, one of the most important aspects of that. Um, and that...that can go deep as to how you work that out. Um, how much they feel...how much people feel that you, uh, have true integrity. Um...you know, following through on your promises. All that stuff is trust related. I think that’s, uh, that’s probably your core right there.

D: Okay, um, how do you view yourself ethnically first?

C: Myself ethnically?

D: Yeah, what ethnicity would you identify with most?

C: Um...that’s a strange question...uh...

D: Like what...if you ever have surveys that say, “What ethnicity are you?” and there’s a list, which one would you pick?

C: I’d probably pick that Asian-Pacific Islander category.

D: Okay...Kay, and how would you view your...or Bob and Mary, ethnically?

C: Um, same. Asian-Pacific Islander. I don’t think I looked at them...

D: What if you had to choose more specific types?

C: Um, well it goes down to nationality? Is that what you mean?

D: Yeah...

C: Then they’re just...they’re from...they’re Filipino ancestry.

D: Kay. What about your ethnicity, if you had to specify?

C: Um, probably Japanese-American.

D: Okay. Um, what do you think is special, just kind of in general, if there is anything special, about intercultural relationships?
C: I think it gives you a, um...I think it shows you a new perspective, or provides a new perspective on the way that you relate to people. And, uh, it gives an awareness of...of, um...of the way other people communicate. Um, just culture...and the culture in general, like, how different you are, and how similar you can be in certain things, too. But it’s just this new awareness of understanding human nature.

D: Is there any examples you can think of...like, how communication could be similar or different? Or it doesn’t have to be communication, but any, um, aspects?

C: Well, I think if you took away culture and, um, if you just took away culture and nationality, there’s still the underlying thing of, um, of a need for relationships, the need for, uh...uh, intimacy, the need for, uh...I mean the enjoyment of humor, enjoyment of, um, you know, just being...fellowship, uh, and it’s just...just basic human needs. Uh, and that’s there, and that...that’s always the...the connection between people, you know? Regardless of race and culture...and religion.

D: Is there any differences you can think of, that you notice in different cultures?

C: Yeah, definitely. Um, you become aware that, uh, there’s certain, uh, rituals that are, uh...uh, that differ. Um, the way that even community is done. Um, for example, uh, lots of times when, in the United States, yeah, we’ll eat lunch with a friend or we’ll, um...or eat lunch by ourselves at our desk, or...and that’s pretty common, um, that’s my experience. There, it’s...it’s always a group...uh, always do it together. It’s very, very, um, group oriented. Um, when you eat, you eat together, and everybody goes and eats at the same time. You take a break together. It’s all...it’s all done, um, as a...as a group, and there’s a lot...lot of, um...there’s a lot of good in that.

D: Kay.
C: Um, yeah... anything else you want?

D: Any other examples?

C: I think, uh, one that stands out in my mind is, uh...it’s, you...you’re better off being killed than being embarrassed. So, there...you know, that’s a big thing to put on this great, uh, show of being...having it all together, when, really, everything is falling apart, um, inside. And I think there’s...for some reason it’s very difficult for them to express their emotions and their weaknesses, and having emotions and being, uh...having something wrong is a negative thing. And then, they don’t know how to deal with it. They usually close off, or they, um, isolate themselves. I’m not sure if that’s something I just noticed...

D: Yeah, that’s good. Yeah. Um, how would you rate your, first, your relationship with Bob? Say, like, on a scale of 1 to 10. Say 1 is your strangers and 10 is, like, really close, great relationship.

C: I think we’re like about a 9. Nine, or even...even close to 10.

D: How about Mary?

C: I think about the same.

D: Kay... Do you feel like racial or ethnic issues are sensitive in the workplace?

C: Um...not so much. There’s...I’m aware of it, but I don’t think it’s a major issue. You have to be aware of cultural differences so you can communicate properly without crossing any kind of lines, but generally, I think, um, there’s a level of tolerance that you...that they have for you...them knowing that you’re a foreigner, as well as, um, you...as your...my responsibility to...to make sure that I at least try to understand some
of the basic cultural rules, and not to cross those. And, um, I think that’s...that’s the best you can do.

D: Kay, do you feel like gender issues are sensitive in the workplace?

C: I think sometimes. Uh...as far as...

D: Are you thinking in the Philippines, or U.S., or both?

C: Uh...what do you mean by gender issues, like what particular way, like, uh, equality?

Gender equality, or...?

D: Yeah...or anything. Like, is that something that’s always kind of salient in the workplace, that you have to think about?

C: Uh, no, I don’t think it’s something very...um...in the culture, yeah, but not in the workplace...at least not where I’m at. It could be different, but, elsewhere, but not...what...not from my perspective.

D: Kay. Um, how long do you think it takes to know somebody well?

C: I don’t know how to answer that question. I think it, uh, I think sometimes, I think part of that is, maybe it’s a cliché, but there’s some chemistry. You, sometimes you just click with certain people, and then there’s others that, uh, it takes a while to warm up to. Uh, and I think it’s just a matter of how well the personalities mesh. Whether they do or they don’t, you can’t expect to always, uh...click.

D: Okay. Um, so when you think about how well you know a person...

C: Mhm.

D: ...what do you think, in particular, that you know, to feel like you know them well?

C: I think when I feel like I know them well, is when I actually know, um, when I break through that shell and I actually get to know the, uh, the deeper side, or the softer side,
the...the more vulnerable side of a person. You know, once that’s, uh, revealed or opened up, I think I...that’s when I feel that that relationship has blossomed to more than just, uh...a cordial acquaintance.

D: Yeah.

C: And that...that sharing can be mutual, that I can also be open on my own.

D: Should be neutral?

C: Well...

D: Oh, reciprocal?

C: Reciprocal, or, you know, that I should be able to do that as well, comfortably.

D: Kay, what role do you think personal knowledge plays in developing a good work relationship?

C: Um...I think, um...I think when you have personal knowledge, you know where the landmines are. So you’re not...not necessarily trying to tiptoe around things, but you know where not to...not to step, you know? You know certain...certain topics are gonna be hot button issues, and you know how...you can tell whether there’s a level of, uh, uncomfortableness or...or, um, comfortableness, whatever it is, um, by understanding their personality a lot more. Um, so you don’t have to guess. Lot’s of times you...it’s less of a guessing versus understanding that if this is good, or, you know, good or bad...

D: Yeah. Kay, do you think you can have a good relationship without any personal knowledge?

C: I don’t know...my, my first instinct, or gut answer to that question is, “No.” Um...at least for me, I don’t...that’s not my...that’s not my, uh, route I would want to take.
That’s not the way that I would want to establish, uh...establish, you know, a working environment, or whatever, especially if I’m gonna have to deal with people that often.

D: Kay.

C: But I think it can be done. It’s just not my style.

D: Mmm.

C: Or my natural tendency, actually.

D: Okay, how are we doing on time?...Is there anything else you thought of during the interview that, um, in terms of, like, relationships at work, that’s kind of salient for you, that you think could be important?

C: Uh, no, I mean I think I generally covered what I think I needed to...um, maybe just, uh...my realization is that...I don’t know how to...because I’m a foreigner, that they open up to me a lot more, because it’s a lot less riskier than, you know, people that they have to deal with daily. But, I feel like there’s a lot of, uh...confidence in me, or they confide a lot in...in me, and um, and I appreciate that a lot. And I’m not sure if it’s just because it’s...I’m not from there, or what...but, um...

D: Or a personality thing?

C: Or if it’s my personality, you know...I’m not...or it’s a combination, I’m not...I’m not sure. But, um...that’s my...that’s my quandary.

D: What are some other differences that you’ve noticed, um, in the way they do things at work, versus we do things in the U.S.?

C: Mmm...well I think it’s more of a, uh...it’s more economics...uh, they have to...they have to be really innovative, because they...they don’t have...uh, maybe it’s not even...anything to do with culture or ethnicity, but economics, because they’re very
limited on financial resources so they have to make do and innovate on things, uh, that, uh...technology that are...are less costly, right? And so, that creates it’s level of...high level of creativity and high level of, again, innovativeness, which kind of adds to their, um, talent, I think...just that experience. But as far as, you know, cultural, though, cultural-wise, I don’t...I haven’t...they’re very hard worker...hard workers...you know, not uncommon to many other people, I think, anywhere, but, and they’re very dedicated, uh, focused, and they, um, and they work really strong as a team. They...they really have this sense of...of no one gets left behind kind of thing. Where even...even, uh, an example like last night I was talking to, uh, I was talking to Mary, and, uh, so she was almost ending up there by herself, and the rest of the team said they had to leave for dinner, for they were gonna have a meeting or whatever. And so she was in the office, uh, by herself, and, uh...which I thought was odd, because usually they would have someone walk...walk her out, you know, to...to her ride, but...but, and then...and sure enough, um, a few minutes later, they came back for her and said, “Oh, we don’t feel comfortable leaving you here by yourself.” So there’s a very...they’re very caring of each other, and they’re very concerned about each others well being, where I rarely seen that here, where anybody would come back, and, you know, make sure that everybody’s okay whether, regardless of, you know, you’re a female, but especially in that case.

D: Interesting...okay...Anything else you thought of that you want to share?

C: No.

D: Okay, I think we’ll stop there for that part.
Note. Carl later reported that he didn’t mention that a somewhat romantic relationship was beginning to develop between him and Mary. Because of this, and because others in the office were beginning to notice it, he decided to cut off his personal communications with Mary, and only talk to her when necessary. Previously, Carl would contact Mary about project status; however, now these communications only take place with Bob.
Interview with Martin – Supervisor of Kristen

October 9, 2007

10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

(began recording a few minutes into the interview)

D: ...Did you think of someone you could talk about?

M: Well all the...There are literally hundreds of people.

D: Yeah.

M: Um...it’s...it’s been interesting with...and its not necessarily cross-cultural...I’ve brought up, I’ve trained several generations of researchers, who are people that I hire, usually as graduate students, and then grow them to basically become a researcher and to take over. Um...and I’ve trained two generations of those folks.

D: Wow.

M: Um...I’m on my second generation now, and I have two women that work for me as program directors, and I’ve brought them in as graduate students, and they’ve been with me for...for probably over 10 years.

D: Wow.

M: And then they subsequently had hired people to work for them...

D: Mmm.

M: ...and then they’ve largely taken over the whole programs that I had started.

D: Oh, wow. One of them might be a good choice, ‘cause it’s...has a really long relationship that you could talk about.

M: Yeah.
D: Um, and it could be a good or a not-so-good relationship.

M: No, no, no, it’s been fine.

D: Yeah?

M: It’s all been...It’s all been very positive.

D: Okay.

M: But they started out as graduate students, basically working as graduate assistants, and they’re similar. They’re about the same age, they’re out of the [removed academic program name] Program at the university.

D: Oh.

M: I hired them at about the same time. Um, one of them heads up the [removed name] program that I’m principle investigator on.

D: Okay.

M: The other one heads up a...uh, not a single program, but heads up a....or not a single funded program, but heads up, um, a series of projects in a program area.

D: Okay.

M: Dealing with, um, natural disasters and climate change...

D: Oh, okay.

M: ...stuff, and then they...and the second one has just got...she just got her Ph.D. about a year and a half ago.

D: Oh, okay.

M: And now she’s a principle investigator in her own right.

D: Okay...okay, so were you their advisor when they started?

M: No, I’ve never been their supervisor in an academic sense.
D: Okay.

M: Um, I was...this was when I was at the [removed name of research institute], and I was a researcher there...

D: Okay.

M: ...and eventually moved on to become the director of the institute.

D: Okay.

M: Um, and...it may be that I’ve been working with them for 13 years now that I think about it.

D: Oh, okay, 13.

M: But they both started as graduate students, and they both kind of picked a set of...areas of responsibility kind of evolved, and then we started talking about the areas of responsibility as programs, and they became...their titles are now program directors.

D: Okay.

M: One is the [removed program name] Program, and the other one is, uh, it’s a [removed program name] Program.

D: Okay. Hmmm, is their one of them that you think would provide some...

M: You could talk to either one of them...

D: Okay.

M: ...or both of them. Just email them, um...I’ll get you their email addresses.

D: Oh, okay. Oh, I was thinking, like, during our interview, if there was one that you could talk to...talk about more, or, you know, have some, maybe more insight on on how the relationship developed?

M: Mmm...
D: Or are they both kind of equal?

M: Yeah, it is. Salaries are the same, and it’s just, they’ve evolved the same. I mean, with Kristen, it’s just taking on more responsibility.

D: Okay.

M: Um, she’s, um, you know, she’s been managing a half million to a million-and-a-half dollar program for me for 10 years now.

D: Wow.

M: And, she started out actually working on another project as a research assistant, and then as this [removed name] thing developed, she...I dragged her into that, and she sort of evolved as the program director, and then hired staff under her to work for her.

D: Okay.

M: And...

D: Okay...and that’s Kristen?

M: Yeah.

D: Okay, and, yeah, so you could talk about both of them if you like.

M: Yeah, whatever’s easier for you.

D: Okay, Kristen...and I’ll change their names in here...

M: Yeah, yeah.

D: Um, so what was the name of the other one?

M: Carol.

D: Carol? Okay.

M: And then the nature of the relationship has been dictated in part because Kristen...I’ve been able to land a big program for Kristen.
D: Oh.

M: And so she’s had…she’s basically been with the one program for 10 years.

D: Oh, okay.

M: Carol’s been on multitudes of projects, and it’s always uncertain as to where we’re going to get money to pay her.

D: Mmm.

M: Because we’re having to generate new projects, as opposed to the program, which has been fairly steady.

D: Mmm. Okay.

M: And the…the…my philosophy of…I don’t know, mentees, I guess, mentoring, or whatever it is, has been to give them as much responsibility as they’re willing and able to take. Always let them know that I’m there if they need me, um, always give them as much credit as possible in public, and if I’ve got anything critical to say, do it in private.

D: Okay. Okay, um, so as…from when you first started supervising them until now, I’m sure it probably…it varied, but how much time do you think you spent with them in helping them to develop?

M: Um, well, when we were all at the [removed institute name] Institute, I would see them every day.

D: Okay.

M: I would see them every day, sometimes for, um, sometimes for an hour, sometimes for longer meetings.

D: Okay.

M: Um, Kristen has tended to work from home, because we haven’t had the office space.
D: ‘Kay.

M: And Carol, Carol I see...and since I moved here, in 2004, um, I see them a lot less.

D: Okay.

M: So, I see Kristen, on average, probably about once a week, once every 10 days. I talk to her on the phone probably at least once a week, maybe twice a week.

D: Okay.

M: Carol, probably see her about every two or three weeks.

D: Okay.

M: And talk to her on the phone about the same frequency, and then we’re in email contact on a fairly regular basis.

D: Okay.

M: Daily, probably daily, I guess.

D: Oh, okay. That’s just to kind of give updates on how everything’s going?

M: Yeah, and it evolved. I mean, when I moved up here, I basically told everybody down there that my...I was going to have to pass more off to them.

D: Mmm.

M: And we could continue, and they...they...I’ve kept a research appointment at the university, so they work for me as university employees, not as...I mean, they’re both [removed organization name] employees, but my relationship with them is as a principle investigator at the university, not as the executive director of [removed organization name].

D: Oh, okay.

M: So that...that relationship changed somewhat.
D: Okay.

M: And of course, I got different responsibilities up here than I had down there.

D: Mmmmm.

M: So...

D: Okay, so still pretty...fairly frequent communication?

M: Yeah, much less than before.

D: Okay.

M: Well, I mean...and they both grew into their jobs, also.

D: Mmm.

M: And they became...well, they took on more and more responsibility over time.

D: Okay.

M: And Kristen has had a staff. She has a staff of between 2 and 6 people at any one time. Carol has a staff intermittently. I think she’s got 2 grad students working for her now, but there...there was a period where she had nobody working for her. She was [indistinguishable].

D: Oh, doing all the work by herself.

M: Yeah.

D: So Carol was...how many staff did you say?

M: Kristen had...she’s got between 2 and 6 staff at any given time. I think now she’s probably got about 4.

D: Okay.

M: And Carol’s got, I think Carol’s got 2 graduate students now.
D: Okay, 2 GAs. Okay, um, so when you were kind of in closer proximity with them, while you were working with them, did you, um, go to lunch with them a lot, or...meet them after work or anything?

M: No, rarely. But lunch, yes. I would go maybe once...I don’t know, maybe once a month or more.

D: Okay.

M: To lunch, but it was mostly lunch to do work.

D: Okay.

M: And then, um, and then with the [removed program name] program with Kristen, we would often have meetings at lunch time. So there’s a...there’s a management committee that meets 4 or 5 times a year, and they always provide lunch for the management committee, so we’re together in these meetings for...from, usually from an hour-and-a-half to two days.

D: Oh.

M: Um, and then we’ve been on the mainland and Puerto Rico...Kristen and I have been on the mainland and Puerto Rico together for meetings.

D: Okay.

M: About once a year, I guess. And then Carol and I used to travel a lot together. Um, we had projects out in Guam and projects in American Samoa.

D: Okay.

M: A lot less now than...then and when we’re traveling, we’ll usually eat dinner together, and lunch.
D: Mmhmm. Okay. So during those times, do you feel like you’ve gotten to know them kind of on a personal level?
M: Yeah, to some extent.
D: Like, about their family and friends and stuff?
M: Uh, family mostly.
D: Okay.
M: And they hear about my...my family, and they used to hear about my wife before she died.
D: Oh, I’m sorry. Was that recently?
M: A year-and-a-half ago.
D: Oh, wow...
M: Actually, it’s going on...it’ll be two years in December.
D: Wow, that’s pretty recent still.
M: Yeah. And both of them are very...um, sympathetic sounds like it’s probably the wrong word. They were very supportive during that whole time [unintelligible].
D: Okay. Um, I want to kind of get an idea of what the...what their ethnicity is.
M: They’re both haoles.
D: Okay.
M: Both Master’s in Urban and Regional Planning. Carol’s got a Ph.D. in, uh, political science.
D: Oh.
M: Kristen is in a doctoral program at the College of Ed.
D: Okay, what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with both of them?

M: Um, we’ve had very good working relationships over the years.

D: Okay.

M: Um, I mean, they...they have taken on a lot of additional responsibility, and they’ve been very supportive of me. Um, I think there’s a genuine friendship there.

D: Okay.

M: And it’s something I value.

D: Okay. What would you say are some negative things about your relationship with them?

M: Um...there have been times...usually, well, early on, where, you know...like, for example, Kristen had a lot of trouble delegating responsibility and managing people.

D: Mmmmm.

M: And it was often a little bit awkward for me to...actually, no, it wasn’t, ‘cause I don’t mind telling people...I don’t mind telling employees that things have gotta change. It doesn’t bother me at all. Um...

D: So did...you had to kind of help her with that?

M: Yeah, well I helped them both. I mean, it’s...you know, with Carol, I don’t hesitate to let her know when I think something would do a different...that should be done...that the product should be different than what it was.

D: Mmm.

M: But I learned a long time ago from my father two things. One is, if you don’t...if you can’t delegate, you’ll never be a leader. And the second thing is, when you delegate, you
tell people what you want done, not how to do it. Let them...let them figure it out, they’re smart people.

D: Oh...

M: My dad used to say that... a good manager is a person who stays the heck... hires good people, gives them lots of support, and stays the hell out of the way, and lets them do their jobs.

D: Wow, he must have been a good leader, too, then.

M: Yeah he was. But it... there’s a fine line between how much you... the opposite of delegating is micromanaging, and it’s a matter of how much space do you give them and let them figure it out. And always, always understand that it’s... they’re not gonna do it exactly the way you did it... you would have done it...

D: Mmhmm.

M: ... and the product is never going to be exactly what you would have done...

D: Mmhmm.

M: But that’s okay.

D: Mmm.

M: I mean, that’s just the nature of being a manager, is give people... I mean, if it’s a positive... if it’s... if the outcome is good, then that’s all that’s necessary. It doesn’t matter how you get there.

D: Yeah. It doesn’t have to be, or, exactly that you want it to be.

M: No, no, you can’t do that. You can’t micromanage people.

D: Yeah.
M: And it’s especially... it was especially hard watching them learn how to manage other people. And that’s something that people... for a lot of people, it doesn’t come naturally. You kind of have to be very conscious of this issue of how much supervision do you give them, how closely do you work with them.

D: Yeah.

M: The other thing that Kristen had a tendency to do... she would shift into what I used to call “frantic mode,” and that’s when there would be a lot of pressure. And then she was constantly sort of giving assignments and changing assignments, and... and people don’t work very well under that kind of... you can’t transfer the pressure you might feel through your behavior to your staff, otherwise they’re gonna be as unproductive as you will be with, you know, moving from one thing to another and never getting anything done. It’s just... it’s really hard to... it’s hard to watch that, and it’s hard to counsel people, because, again, you don’t want to... you don’t want to micromanage it, but you also don’t want... you don’t want it to flounder.

D: Mmm.

M: And it’s a hard lesson to learn, it’s hard to know.

D: So you think both of them kind of got a lot better at that?

M: Oh, they did, yeah, yeah. They did a lot... they did a lot better. Kristen became a much better manager. Um, Carol has not had to manage a staff as big or a program as big. Carol’s had to juggle multiple projects, which is a different... um, and if, if Carol... if Carol has a fault, it’s not understanding... not being able to ask for help, which is a real problem when you delegate to somebody and they feel like they gotta do it all themselves, and especially, like, in Carol’s case where she didn’t have a standing staff,
she didn’t have a permanent staff, so, and she often didn’t budget enough staff for the projects.

D: Oh.

M: So consequently, she’d end up stuck. She couldn’t…she didn’t have any money to hire anybody to help her.

D: Oh, so she’d have to do all the work?

M: Yeah, it’s…it’s hard. And it’s hard to learn how much…how much help you’re going to need. And it’s really hard, even in an organization like this, it’s hard to know. You don’t want to hire too many people and have people idle, but you don’t want people to dead run for very long either, cause they’ll just burn out.

D: Yeah.

M: Peaks and valleys are very hard. I ran a consulting firm for ten years while I was half-time at the university and half-time in consulting, and it was feast or famine.

D: Yeah.

M: And I remember saying to this guy from [removed name], a consulting firm downtown, I said...he was putting me on a project, I was a stringer on projects, [unintelligible] people. So it was an aquaculture project, and he was gonna have...he said he wanted my [unintelligible]. And so I dropped it off late Friday afternoon, on my way home, and there was nobody in the office, it was a big office, and I said to him, “You know, people been telling me that...I really [unintelligible]. I oughta go ahead and get an office and hire staff, and...cause I’m traveling about 65% of the time,” and I said, “Yeah, and I have a family and I just...I’m not really happy with all this.” He says, “Well,” he says, “Yeah, 10 years ago, I was traveling 65% of the time, and people told me the same
thing.” He said, “Then I started this place. Now I travel about 62% of the time, and I have $40,000 a month in overheads to pay.”

D: Oh.

M: “Mouths to feed and overheads to pay.”

D: Wow.

M: So he said, “You can either worry about your traveling...you can either travel and worry about your traveling, or you can travel and worry about your overheads.” [laughs]

So he says it’s a catch 22.

D: Yeah, can’t win, eh?

M: No. And we’ve had peaks and valley problems with Carol, too.

D: Oh.

M: I mean, occasionally, we’ll get more than...more projects on board that....The [removed project name] program’s a more steadier cycle, or it was until this year at least.

D: Mmhm.

M: Um, and things have become more uncertain because of congressional funding changes, but...but for Carol, it’s been, I mean, she’s been...there were times when she’s paid out of 4 or 5 different projects at the same time.

D: Wow.

M: And it’s really hard to juggle. And she’s effectively a consultant. I mean that’s...she’s doing research, she doesn’t do a lot of evaluation, but she’s doing project planning, and...and, uh, policy analysis and stuff like that.

D: Oh.

M: It’s just...it’s a feast or famine problem.
D: Yeah, it can be hard on staff, too. ‘Cause, it’s like, once a few projects end, and you know, you don’t want to hire more people, ‘cause you’re not sure if there’s gonna be anything after that, so that...

M: Exactly.

D: ...so that staff has to do more work during that short period of time just to get through the valley part of it, yeah?

M: One of the things I learned from doing evaluation research is, most people don’t decide they need to do an evaluation until the projects already started.

D: Yeah.

M: And they never budgeted enough money for it.

D: Yeah.

M: And they’re always calling up and crying [unintelligible]. And we’ve had people from the non-profit sector call in and say, “You know, I’ve got $5,000 to evaluate this housing project out in Kalihi.” You know, for 800 people.

D: Yeah [laughs].

M: There’s no way in God’s name I can do that.

D: We get that a lot, too. It’s like, “Hey, we got a couple thousand dollars left.”

M: Right.

D: It’s like, “Oh, I don’t know. I’m not sure if that’s possible.” Okay, um, what would you think are some of the reasons for why your relationships developed positively how they did?

M: Uh...because I really...I mean, I think we value each other. Um, I think I treat them well, they think...I think they treat me very well, and we’re all relatively positive
people....and very collaborative. So, you know, I’m the boss, everybody knows I’m the boss, but I try to give them as much credit as, and as much responsibility, as they’re willing to take. And I think for a while, actually, Carol...well both of them...both of them suffered from being in my shadow.

D: Mmmmmm.

M: Because I’m so much older than they are.

D: Mmmmmm.

M: So, you know, Kristen’s 40 and I’m 60. And I did have a...I did have people working for me that would have been 50 now, but I lost them because of a valley.

D: Oh.

M: So I missed a generation. And it’s...it’s hard, especially when they start out as...well, maybe not “especially,” but when they start out as...as graduate assistants and they’re junior people, they’re always sort of considered my research assistants. Well, they haven’t been my research assistants for about 10 years, or 8 years.

D: Yeah.

M: And they’ve been professionals in their own right, and I often had to remind people that they’re professionals, they’re not...they’re not my students, they’re my staff. They’re not graduate assistants, they’re researchers.

D: Yeah.

M: But that...that’s a problem. With an age and seniority difference of that much.

D: Mmm.

M: That’s 20 years.

D: Yeah, I can understand that.
M: Well, and you know, to be... not to be critical of Carol and Kristen, and... Kristen was worse at this than Carol. If we were in a meeting, people would always turn to me, and Kristen would start to whisper stuff to me.

D: Oh.

M: And I turned and said, “No, tell them.”

D: Yeah, yeah.

M: You know, I don’t want... You know, I’m hard of hearing anyway, so... but “You just tell them.” And she still does that to some extent. And with Carol it’s less so, but similar.

D: Mmm.

M: And then a lot of the circles we run in, like with the [removed program name] program, you know, I’m one of the more senior people in the whole country in that area. And the same with, like, natural disasters and climate change. And so they’re... they’re, you know, standing in that shadow. And they do the work, I don’t do the work, and to try to get people to acknowledge the fact that they’re the ones who... they’ve developed the expertise. Having said that, there’s also kind of a... they’ve gotten this... somewhat more from Kristen early on, that... well, it was very early on... that she should just be able to jump right in to being a principle investigator senior staff person. And she used to resent the fact that people didn’t acknowledge her, and treat her like a graduate student or something like that. I can’t help that.

D: Mmm. M: Because I can do what I can do to give her the credit, and... so I don’t think it’s because... I don’t think it’s because they’re women, at all. A guy [removed name] worked...
for me a few years ago...he...[removed name] was the same way. And I was, like, 10 years his senior.

D: Okay. How would you say your relationship with Kristen and Carol compares to other relationships that you’ve had.

M: Well, here, [removed organization name] is different, because these folks have been...these folks are very senior.

D: Mmmmm.

M: And they’re much closer in age. So the Chief Financial Officer, retired Chief Financial Officer sitting in the other room, there, when I moved here in 2004, [removed name] had been with the corporation for 34 years.

D: Oh.

M: And I was just coming on board. And, you know, he is...[removed name] is 6, 7 years older than I am.

D: Okay.

M: Um, [removed name], the corporate secretary and my executive assistant, she’s...she’s been with the corporation for 23 years.

D: Wow.

M: And it felt funny to come here...I had been there client for...from 1987 to 2004, so 14 years as a client and then coming to be the boss, was...it was an interesting transition.

[laughs]

D: I bet.

M: And you see, here I was coming into an established organization as opposed to building an organization.
D: Mmm.

M: And that’s...that’s different. Like, even at [removed research institute name], when I was director down there, I came in when it was a...a 1.3 million dollar operation in 1998 and when I...actually it was in '96, but by the time I’d left in 2004, it was a 10 million dollar a year operation.

D: Wow.

M: We had gone from basically 3 office staff to like, 10, and so it...and I hired most of the people that were in the office, or the employees we hired. So that’s very different than coming into an organization like this, it’s...with a very senior staff.

D: Mmm. Okay.

M: And you know, down there, I had total, altogether, I had about 14 direct reports. Here I have 3.

D: Wow.

M: That was a 10 million dollar operation, this is a 300 million dollar operation.

D: Wow.

M: We had a total 136 employees down there, counting research staff, here we have 34 core staff instead of 14, but they’re spread all over the place, and we have 2,700 employees.

D: Wow.

M: So it’s very different...

D: Yeah.

M: ...coming into this organization. And it...one of my...one of the most difficult transitions for me, is I’m used to being a hands on manager. I used to be involved in
operations all the time. They don’t want me involved in operations up here. The executive director is supposed to be above all that.

D: Oh.

M: So it’s an interesting transition.

D: More looking for the money?

M: Problems, prospects, and politics. The three P’s.

D: Problems, prospects, and politics. Oh.

M: So whenever... whenever something happens with the legislature or something, I get hauled down. Whenever we get a lawsuit, I get hauled down.

D: Mmm. Hey, that’s a good way of putting it.

M: Whenever...[laughing]...whenever there’s a new opportunity or new direction... I get...

D: Uh, you’re on it.

M: I’m on it.

D: Yeah.

M: But the day-to-day stuff... I’m much less busy with the day-to-day stuff, much less busy with the day-to-day stuff here than I was down there.

D: Oh, wow. Is it a little easier you think? Like, stress-wise?

M: Well, yeah it is a little easier. Oh, it’s a lot less stressful.

D: Less stressful?

M: Yeah. And I don’t know whether it’s because of just coming into a mature organization, but, and we get sued much more up here than we did down there.

D: Oh.
M: I would worry about a lawsuit down there, up here I don’t worry. I don’t care, sue us. [laughs] We’ve got deep pockets, we’ve also got deep lawyers.

D: Oh [laughs]. Okay, what would you say are the qualities of your ideal employee?

M: Um, somebody that takes a lot of initiative. Somebody that will be blunt with me, [laughs] and tell me watch out for my back. Somebody that won’t get defensive, and responds well to constructive criticism. Somebody that sees new opportunities and kind of gets us to all go in that direction. Somebody who speaks well, writes well, thinks clearly, and is...is pleasant...pleasant to work with. Not candy, sweet pleasant, but...and with most of my employees I have a kind of a joking relationship, so we’re always kidding around. Just keep it light.

D: Mmm. ‘Kay, um, what do you think are the basic foundation of interpersonal relationships?

M: Trust.

D: Trust.

M: And respect.

D: Okay

M: And probably some degree of humility. Sounds old fashioned, maybe, but...

D: No, I don’t think so. Um, is there anything special about intercultural relationships in the workplace that you’ve noticed?

M: Um...it’s hard, when you’ve been around as long as I have...it’s hard to kind of think back to what it was like coming in, well, my professional life, I started out in the Peace Corps.

D: Oh.
M: So we…my wife and I were married in June of ’69, we went out to Micronesia for 3 years.

D: Oh.

M: So we were living in a…in a different culture for 3 solid years.

D: Wow.

M: And it was a Polynesian culture mostly, and so, recognizing that you don’t know about the values and behavior and cultures of other people, in a situation where you’re literally dropped into, you learn that very quickly.

D: Mmm.

M: And you become very sensitive to that whole thing. And then when we came here, it…this is much more multicultural than Micronesia was, and Kapingamarangi was. Uh, but it was not a hard…it was not a hard transition to come to…I mean, to acknowledge the fact that there were different cultures here and that they had different values and beliefs and behaviors and all that stuff, that was…that was an easy transition, because we went to something that was so completely different…

D: More extreme…

M: And then came back to something that was kind of more of the same, but more, but more different cultures.

D: Oh, okay.

M: And then we spent 2 years in New Guinea as well, which was another…that was a completely different…that was a situation where you assume a Pacific Island culture is a Pacific Island culture…no.

D: Completely different.
M: They’re different...completely different.

D: So New Guinea was after Micronesia?

M: Yeah, we were in, uh, Micronesia ’69 to ’72, and then we were in Papua, New Guinea, ’74 to ’76.

D: Oh. Wow.

M: And then dealing with things...Oh, and then I was the...after I got back...and I was in, actually, [removed name]?

D: Mmmmm.

M: Was my faculty advisor at [removed name] Center.

D: Oh.

M: So we came back here in graduate school, and I was at the [removed name] Center working on Cross-Cultural Psychology.

D: Oh, okay.

M: With [removed name].

D: Okay.

M: And, then I helped start the [removed program name] Program at [removed name], and I basically worked for Pacific Islanders from...from 1980 until 1985. I spent a lot of time out in the Pacific Islands. So the cultural difference stuff is kind of something that...that I grew up with. I mean, I didn’t grow up with it on the East Coast, except the Jewish culture and Black culture.

D: Mmm.

M: Very much part of my life.

D: So you think those experiences helped in the workplace?
M: Oh yeah.

D: Yeah?

M: Well, it helped just understanding that people are very different.

D: Mmm.

M: And, you know, there’s a fine line between cultural differences and personality differences. I mean, I’m convinced that there’s...there’s as much variation in terms of beliefs and styles and behaviors within cultures as there is between cultures.

D: Mmhmm.

M: It’s just that, you know, you tend to see a norm in the...in the middle of culture. So for example, um, in general, um, Japanese Americans tend to be quieter, less confrontational, less...more risk averse, than your average mouthy haole is.

D: Mmhmm.

M: Uh, and, uh, but you still have as much...there’s as much variation among...

D: Within...

M: [unintelligible] with Japanese ancestry as there is within them.


M: Yeah, yeah. The other cultural thing is the culture of bureaucracies. And they’re very different. [Removed name]’s culture is so different than the university culture.

D: Wow...that’s interesting.

M: And actually, the university culture, when I was at [removed name], I didn’t realize this until I was about to leave...the time we built up the [removed name], we built up a culture of service.

D: Hmmm.
M: And that you’re job is service, and that’s what...were here to make things easier for the faculty, and that’s your job. Uh, and you need to take chances, and you need somebody in the organization who’s the risk manager, which is me, and so you need somebody that’s willing to make the call and say, “Okay, we’ll take a chance and do that project.” And most people at the university avoid risk. “We can’t do that, something might happen.” Yeah, a meteor might fall on this office on Monday morning, too.

[laughs]

D: Yeah.

M: So let’s just stay in bed or something.

D: Yeah [laughs]. Oh, that’s interesting. I thought it would be kind of similar, [removed organization name] and university.

M: No, [removed organization name] is much more service oriented and much less risk averse than the university. I mean, our job is to try and make it happen.

D: Is that the difference between corporate and academic?

M: It’s not academic...it’s not necessarily academic. I mean, there’s an academic culture at the university, now there’s a...there is a state bureaucracy culture within the university that doesn’t exist here.

D: Kay, that makes sense.

M: And I remember...the risk manager at the university giving a talk downstairs in this building to a bunch of fiscal officers...

D: Uh huh.

M: [removed name]. [removed name] said, “Anything about the project, we need to think about it. Is there any risk something will go wrong? What can you do...how bad could it
be, and what could you possibly do to avoid it?" After he finished that talk, I said, “[removed name], you missed the biggest question. What’s the probability that something’s going to happen?”

D: Mmm.

M: He says, “Oh, well I don’t have time...I didn’t have time to talk about that.”

D: [laughs] It’s point, zero, zero...

M: Yeah exactly.

D: Then why bother?

M: What’s the chance that it’s going to go wrong?

D: Yeah.

M: So sue us.

D: [laughs] I don’t want to take up too much of your time. Um, just a couple more quick questions. Um, thinking about Carol and Kristen, say just on a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate your overall relationship with both of them?

M: Um...probably a 9 or 10.

D: Okay.

M: I mean, I think they’re good relations, very good relations.

D: Okay, for both of them?

M: Yeah. Very different relations in a way, because Kristen runs a big program and Carol runs projects, but...and in some ways I just wish, I wish they were more senior than they are.

D: Mmm.

M: That’s become less of a problem as they’ve gotten older, but...
D: Kay, what do you think, um... what kind of personal knowledge is necessary to, um, I guess, have a good relationship with them? Or is it necessary?

M: You need to know... Oh, no, no, no... you need to know enough about their families to know when they’re in a rough patch, and... and I’m very cautious about getting into personal stuff at all, because I don’t want to interfere, but I want to let them know I’m there to support.

D: Okay.

M: [unintelligible] Kristen’s wedding, and would have done Carol’s except that it was Thanksgiving time around the Big Island.

D: Oh.

M: And, they were at [removed name]’s funeral.

D: Okay. Do you think you can have a good relationship without any personal knowledge?

M: Um... maybe.

D: Okay. Depends on the situation?

M: Yeah.

D: Okay. It’s been about 45 minutes, so maybe we can end that part there.
Interview with Kristen – Employee of Martin

October 29, 2007

9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

The environment for this interview was unexpectedly loud and busy, so no tape recording was done. This interview transcript was completed on the day of the interview based on notes. The researcher attempted to reconstruct the interview as accurately as possible.

D: So first tell me a little bit about the work that you do...or what’s a typical day like for you...

K: Oh, wow...

D: I know that’s kind of a broad question.

K: It is broad...well, I run the [removed project name], and Martin is the principal investigator. I’m more involved in the day-to-day things. My title is Program Director. There’s so much...supervising staff, making sure deadlines are met and reports are turned in. It’s more of the logistics behind the research and not so much the hands on research activities. I make sure all the forms are filled out, I could be monitoring visits, I write grants, go to outreach events...right now I’m writing a curriculum...I also help decide how the reports are going to look, attend events...

D: Okay.

K: One thing that makes it difficult is because almost all of our staff commute.

D: Oh, do they all live down on this side?
K: Some of them do, and some of them come from the East side. But some of us work from home.

D: Okay, are there coworkers at your level that you work with...or...

K: Well, this is what it kind of looks like...there are many different projects going on, so the people I used to work with, like Carol, are not on the same projects anymore, so we don’t really work side-by-side. We each went down or own path. So we don’t talk to each other regularly. But we have had a long relationship where it’s kind of like friends, how you don’t see each other for a long time, but when you do, you can just pick up where you left off.

D: Okay, so you don’t have peers you work with so much as the people you are supervising.

K: Yes.

D: Okay, so tell me about some of your experiences with Martin.

K: I’ve known Martin for a long time.

D: I think he said about 15 years?

K: Yeah, it’s been about that long. I started off working for Martin as a GA. I had the qualifications and experience and we were working on [removed project name] first. Our work relationship was different back then. He had the equivalent of my position when he first started...he was the Program Director. Then after a couple of years he got the Director position at [removed institute name]. That’s kind of equivalent to the Dean’s position.

D: Oh.
K: And there’s a story…it’s much more funny now than it was back then…but even after Martin was the Director, he didn’t want to move from his same desk a year later…because he came into the organization about the same time as the other Program Directors, and, you know…and so there was this empty office that was supposed to be for the Director. And Carol and I were sharing this little space, so Carol wanted to take Martin’s desk. So one day, he went to [named a Pacific Island] for a month, and Carol and I moved all of his stuff into the Director’s office.

D: Wow.

K: And he never said one word.

D: He must have been happy…at least he wasn’t the one moving his stuff, you guys were…

K: Yeah.

D: But he wasn’t even like, [making a disgruntled face]?

K: Nope, nothing. And I swear we didn’t say anything about it, and he had no idea.

D: That must have been a lot of stuff to move.

K: Oh, it was a lot of stuff.

D: Wow.

K: And then Carol moved to his desk. Later I became a staff, not a Graduate Assistant.

D: Okay.

K: And I give Martin a lot of credit, because he’s not a micromanager. He gives people a lot of autonomy.

D: Mmm.
K: You know, it’s like a give and take. I have another story…sorry, I like to tell stories, it’s easier for me to get my point across.

D: No, that’s great.

K: For me, I tend to push things to the limit…maybe that’s not the best way of saying it, but I know how far I can push things. I think I’m more of an innovator than Martin. I’ll take more risks, which I think almost got me fired once. As an example, Martin is used to writing reports that look very…they look like this [showing a paper full of text].

D: Very academic?

K: Yes, very academic. He’s very good at the content, he’ll find every little thing in it. For me, I try to think of the people that are going to read the report, like legislators, the public…so I prefer to make it more user-friendly. So we had this report and I completely changed it to make it look better, and we spent a lot of money on it. And when he found out, he blew his top. That was the only time I’ve ever seen him that mad, and I’ve known him for a long time. But now, we still get compliments on that report, and he likes it and still uses it. It was a huge report and took one year to write.

D: Wow.

K: So now I think there’s a huge amount of trust there.

D: Do you think that was a critical moment where he felt like he could really trust you from that moment on?

K: Well, there are those 2 moments that really stand out for me. I think those are the major milestones in our relationship.

D: Okay.
K: I think in organizations, you need two people that are very different. One with the creativity that goes off in different directions, and one that keeps things grounded.

D: Oh, okay, that’s interesting.

K: And I think our relationship emerged slowly over the years. First, he noticed that my writing was good. Then he began to trust me working from home. Ever since my pregnancy, I’ve been working from home. He was there when my son was born, so he’s known him all his life. He was there at my wedding. But in the beginning, as I worked from home, he developed that trust in me that I could get the work done, so I started to completely work from home from that point. I can even bring my son to meetings with me…he goes everywhere.

D: Wow.

K: We really have a non-micromanagement culture, and it has allowed us to attract great people. It’s a great work culture. Martin started this culture and it has passed down through the generations. Is it okay if I talk about my staff, even though it doesn’t involve Martin?

D: Sure.

K: Because I’ve learned to manage from Martin, so I use the same style, and don’t micromanage my staff. For example, my office manager is amazing. Our schedules are very flexible, so she works 4 days a week for 10 hours. But she is amazing. And I think we are able to do more with the staff that we have. Another example is our graphics staff. He grew up here, and he is also amazing. He does graphics, art, film, everything.

D: Mmm.
K: And we don’t hire a lot of staff. When we do hire staff, we let them know in the beginning that the funding is soft money, so we can only be sure we have your position for one year. So they are actually more committed, because they want to work in the area, even though they won’t have a stable employment. And we hire a lot of people from [removed college names] because we find that they work better.

D: Really?

K: Yeah... And ever since Martin moved to [removed organization name], it has increased my responsibilities. Now I just need to let him know if there is something major happening, like if I need to let one of my staff go, or if there is a lawsuit, because he deals with all the lawsuits.

D: So it sounds like you have a pretty close personal relationship with him.

K: Yeah, I do.

D: I’ve been finding that there are different degrees of overlap between the work domain and the personal domain [showing diagram]. Say if this [pointing at circles] was the work domain and this was the personal domain, which one of these would best represent your relationship with Martin?

K: I would say this one.

D: Completely separate?

K: Yeah. There’s no overlap, and that’s why it works so well. We don’t hang out together outside of work. We know each other really well, but work is work and personal is personal. And this is how it is with all of our staff. For example, we tend to hire people that are friends of our staff, because people tend to associate with others who are similar, and since we have great staff, their friends are more likely to be good as well. So, like,
one of our staff has a niece that she recommended to work for us, and we hired her. But after a while, it just wasn’t working out so we had to let her go. But, that didn’t affect our relationship with the staff, because she was able to separate work and personal. In other words, the personal relationship doesn’t get destroyed through business decisions.

D: Oh, okay...how about in terms of this domain being specifically personal knowledge...how much does that overlap in your relationship with Martin?

K: I have a lot of personal knowledge, but not friendship. I would say it’s between these two [showing moderate overlap]. It’s not static. Sometimes there’s more overlap, like during a family crisis you may get to know them more personally, but then it can lessen again later. So that area of overlap tends to move around.

D: Oh, I see. Okay.

K: But you need to keep the friendship out of it...you wouldn’t want to get too close with some staff and not others.

D: So keep it equal with all staff?...so they don’t have perceptions of favoritism?

K: Yeah.

D: Okay. Oh, it’s already 10 o’clock. Let’s move on to the questionnaire part.
Interview with Andrew – Supervisor of Kyle, Edward, and Cathy

November 15, 2007

5:15 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

D: So your position is CEO?
A: Uh, no, actually I’m the Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer on the corporate side, and operational, uh, COO/CFO, and basically I’m one of the two co-owners of the company.

D: Oh, okay. Okay, um, so what’s a typical day at work like for you?
A: What’s a typical day? Um...well, I guess from the time I come I...I’m on my, um, PC a lot, because I’m checking email, you know, kind of checking my to do list...

D: Okay.
A: ...uh...and being that the three people you spoke to are my direct reports...

D: Mmm.
A: ...uh, and being that they’re at a managers level...

D: Mmm.
A: ...uh, I don’t really have to supervise them, you know, um, so, I mean, they’re clear on what their job descriptions and work responsibilities are, and...

D: Okay.
A: ...really through weekly managers meetings that we have, and we probably, I probably talk to each one of them virtually every day...

D: Okay.
A: ...on one matter or another, but I don’t micromanage them.
D: Okay.

A: If a particular task is time sensitive, then I might ask them about it more, you know, often, just...just to...but generally they’ll all be keeping me posted so I don’t have to ask them, yeah?

D: Okay.

A: Cause they’re all very...very good at what they do, and very organized and very detailed oriented, so...

D: Kay. Um, so when did you start the company?

A: We formed the company in September of 2000, but we opened our doors for business in January of 2001.

D: Okay, 6 years.

A: So that’s, yeah, six going on seven, completed, yeah?

D: Wow, that’s...that’s pretty recently. And so it...the company has built from just you folks all the way to what it is now?

A: Well, it...the brief history is, my partner and I, and maybe just a handful of our forty employees worked for a previous third party administrator, called [removed name].

D: Oh.

A: And they were a branch operation of a mainland owned company.

D: Mmmmm.

A: And when we...when...I worked there from 1991 to the time we formed this firm. My partner worked there from...gee...maybe 19...the late ‘70s, until the time I started. And he was the...basically the branch...branch manager.

D: Okay.
A: I was his office manager. So, he was my boss before.

D: Okay.

A: And so, um, you know, we ended up becoming partners, but, um...let’s see...the reason we were able to...we started modestly. We started in the...not modestly, but, we started in the [removed name] building, you know right down the street? [removed address], and we had the entire, um, 9th floor there...

D: Oh.

A: About 11,000 square feet.

D: Wow.

A: But, um, we were fortunate in that, because of the many years in this, um, type of work that we do, third party administration, um, and it’s very relationship driven with the clients that we have, so when we decided that we were going to leave the previous firm and form our own, the largest client, after he found out that we were leaving, decided to terminate the contract with the prior administrator and contract with us.

D: Oh, okay.

A: And, you know, we had just [unintelligible], we were, you know, when that contract ended with the prior administrator, you know, some of those people ended up working for us.

D: Oh, okay.

A: So we started maybe with 15 people and we grew to 40, yeah?

D: Oh, okay.

A: And 2001 is when we had the biggest account, and 2002, over the...over each year, 2002 to 2005, we picked up more and more accounts, you know, gradually, um, but as to
the account base our previous employer had, I would say we have, today, maybe about
two-thirds.

D: Oh, okay.

A: And the other third is through another administrator, a mainland firm that opened up
operation.

D: Okay.

A: But we like to think we have the best accounts. (laughs)

D: Yeah, of course. (laughs)

A: But, um, yeah, so a lot of it was relationship and, you know, we had...we...we started
with, uh, a core of people that had many years of experience among them and then it was
just a matter of selecting, you know, um, leading edge hardware and, you know,
software...

D: Mmm.

A: ...and getting that running.

D: Mmm.

A: You know, cause any time you’re an administrator, and you take over an account, all
the records, the boxes and boxes of records come over with you and the data...electronic
data [unintelligible] into your new computer system, yeah?

D: Wow.

A: So, yeah, it was...it was...when we looked back, we started...I mean, we just started
with, uh, used furniture and rented PCs and then, you know, to what we have today.

D: Wow, and that’s...yeah, that’s a lot in such a short time frame. Seems like.
A: Yeah, in part to our clients, yeah. If they didn’t come over and give us that big, you know, chunk of business, then we couldn’t have come this far.

D: Oh, okay. Wow. So, tell me about some of your experience with, I guess, all three of your direct reports.

A: Okay, uh, I’ll start with Edward because I worked with him the longest. Um, Edward started with us in January of 2001.

D: Okay.

A: I think late January, so right after we opened our doors, and I basically pulled him out of semi-retirement.

D: Oh.

A: Cause we had both worked together in the past at a company called [removed company name].

D: Oh, okay.

A: A [removed company type] company. This was back in the late '80s, early '90s, and he was the outgoing controller and I was the in-coming controller.

D: Oh, okay.

A: Um, and, you know, so we worked, you know, together just for maybe about a month or two, but, you know, I always thought he was a mellow guy and was, you know...knew his stuff, and so...

D: Mmmmm.

A: ...when we started, you know, I needed...I’m the accountant and operations person by background, and a little bit of IT knowledge, but I knew that I needed a solid, um, person
that could do the corporate accounting and payroll and, you know, be trusted and all of
that...be dependable [unintelligible].

D: Okay.

A: So he was the first hire in a key position. So, he...you know, he started and still is the
controller.

D: Oh, okay.

A: Uh, and then, let’s see...Kyle, was the next hire, I think he started, was it in, November
of...I shouldn’t guess, I should look at the log...seems like he’s been...he probably would
say that he feels like he’s been here longer than me...

D: (laughs)

A: Oh yeah, Kyle started in November of 2003, so he’s just coming up on 4 years
actually, now.

D: Oh, okay.

A: It’ll be 4 years this...this Friday.

D: Oh, wow.

A: Yeah, and then Kyle...Kyle actually, you know...when...when we were looking...we
had an IT manager, um, in our second year...initially, I was wearing that hat. And the
second year we hired him...no, I’m sorry...no, I’m sorry, we hired a previous...his
predecessor in the first year...uh, it was kind of through referral, and...and that...anyway,
that...that person was not as high a caliber as Kyle was, so that’s why I felt like I was
wearing the IT hat in those days.

D: Oh.

A: Some IT stuff [unintelligible].
D: Uh huh.

A: Um, when that person relocated to the mainland, we recruited for a new IT manager, and actually Kyle was one of the, um, final candidates, but the primary candidate was actually a personal referral...from my partner.

D: Oh.

A: And we ended up giving him a try.

D: Mmm.

A: And I kept in touch with Kyle, only because I thought...oh, you know, he came to the interview dressed in a suit and people don’t do that these days.

D: Oh, yeah. Wow.

A: But, um, anyway, to make a long story short, we hired him, and he’s been doing an excellent job for us.

D: Oh, okay.

A: So, he’s...he’s another very valued IT manager. Um...

D: Okay. So that first person is still here?

A: He went to the mainland.

D: Oh, okay.

A: Yeah, the first IT guy.

D: Oh, okay.

A: And actually that first IT guy had a staff of 2...3 actually. One ended up leaving. And then when that IT manager left, uh, one of the assistants left, too, so we had a staff person that Kyle inherited and then Kyle hired another person, and then those two people ended up leaving, and we have the two that we have today, so...
D: Oh.

A: I would say, basically, working with, you know, a department of 3, they’re probably getting more than, you know, the work of more than 3 people done, yeah?

D: Mmm, okay.

A: But anyway, yeah, so Kyle is very, uh, he’s...he’s also extremely detail-oriented and organized, like I consider myself to be [unintelligible]. So what made it real easy was...I think I kind of walked him through the first project that we had to do, and then the second one, aw, he kind of just took the ball and he ran with it, and he’s done that with subsequent projects.

D: Oh, okay.

A: I really don’t have to be concerned when it comes to the IT area.

D: Mmm. Kay.

A: Um...let’s see...then...kay, anything more about him you need to hear?

D: Um, well, I guess maybe later on we can kind of get back to everybody. So Cathy...

A: Cathy, okay. Cathy started with us, um...let me look at the calendar...she started with us...[unintelligible]...July of 2002. Oh, so I’m sorry, she was the second hire...before Kyle...July of 2002. Um, and for her, she...her background is largely in retail and sales distribution, um, but she was at a point where she wanted to make a change, so, um, being that she had supervisory and some indirect [unintelligible] experience, we decided to offer her the position with the understanding that she would be trained, cross-trained, by myself and Edward. We’ve done payroll and [unintelligible] kind stuff before, so...and I was office manager at previous administration firm, so I...I basically [unintelligible] was the primary cross-trainer for her. Um...and, um, you know, I...I don’t know what she’s
told you, but, what I...like I told you at the beginning, she’s gonna tell you whatever she’s
gonna tell you. (laughs)

D: (laughs)

A: Yeah, I think she had a harder time than I did at first, adjusting to working, you know,
together.

D: Oh yeah?

A: From, uh, getting the work done, and, you know, dealing with, having to service the
staff, as well as, you know, support the work we do for our clients, she does an excellent
job, too.

D: Okay.

A: So she’s another very valued manager.

D: Okay...kay, I guess besides Cathy, because she’s your wife, do you know Edward and
Kyle on a personal level, would you say?

A: Mmm...well I know them in terms of...you know, I don’t...I don’t socialize with them
outside of work. Um, but like Edward, you know, I consider to be a friend. I mean, I’ve
asked him to, you know, help me with things outside of work. I mean, you know,
sometimes when you gotta travel, Cindy and I both travel, we might impose on him for a
ride to and from the airport.

D: Oh. Okay.

A: Um, you know, I helped him...cause his mother’s kind of on in her years, maybe a
couple of years ago, since I had to do this for my parents, I installed rails...rails, handrails
throughout the house.

D: Mhm.
A: I kind of told him, I said, “Oh, let me...I want to do that for you.” And so I...he helped me, but I basically installed rails so his mom could go up and down stairs easier.

D: That was Kyle?

A: That’s, uh, Edward.

D: Oh, Edward.

A: Edward, yeah.

D: Okay.

A: Um...Kyle, yeah, I also don’t...don’t, you know, socialize with him outside of work, but...I would say, I consider them friends in a sense that if...like, my...my son and my daughter graduated from high school...you know...yeah, I believe they were invited to those functions, that sort of thing, at school.

D: Okay.

A: Yeah, we...and we...I would say although we don’t socialize outside of work, we do talk about, you know, family and things like that, cause, um, Kyle went through an experience with mom...his mom...and, you know, he lost his mom recently, and so, um, you know, I tried to pass on whatever I could to him in terms of, you know, caring for people that needed assistance, cause I had to go through that with my parents, yeah?

D: Mhm.

A: So...yeah...

D: Okay.

A: I mean, so it’s not strictly business, but, you know, we don’t socialize outside of work.

D: Okay. Um, what would you say are some positive things about your relationships with them? Maybe you could start with Elton.
A: Positive things?

D: Yeah.

A: Um...well...um, the first thing I would say actually applies to all three of them. You know, in terms of having the right work ethic and the proper attitude, those two things kind of go hand in hand.

D: Okay.

A: So, I don’t know if you want to call it the Japanese upbringing, or just the...our age, and relation to our parents, who were generally second generation, yeah?

D: Mmhmm.

A: Um...you know, our...our work ethic is, you work hard, you put your head down and, you know, you listen and...to what you’re told and, you know, you showing that initiative, and you do more than you’re asked to do, and you hope that people will say please and thank you and show appreciation, yeah?

D: Mmhmm.

A: So, I would say that’s...that’s our core philosophy and so that’s what we expect of people.

D: Okay.

A: Um, so, I would say for all three of them, you know, that’s like a ingrained trait in them that I really value.
D: Mmm.

A: Cause we all think...virtually the same way.

D: Okay.

A: Um, and then...I mean, that would be true of my partner and some of our other managers and a few of our supervisors, too, yeah? [unintelligible]

D: Okay. Um...would you...do you think it would be maybe harder for someone of a different, maybe like a culture that’s different from Japanese culture and their values, um, to be like your direct report? Do you think that would make things...?

A: You know, um, you know, learning what I learned about different culture and some being more collectivist and others being more individual...

D: Yeah.

A: ...you know, I think it really would...I couldn’t make a general statement that it would be more difficult to deal with, say, a Caucasian person, or a Chinese person, or a Black person, I mean, any other non-Japanese. I think it really boils down to the individual. Because, uh, you know, while we can say and we’ve studied the certain racial groups or certain people from certain areas or countries or areas are a certain way...or people from the mainland are fast-talking, and, you know, all of that...arrogant, or whatever...you know, its’...I...I don’t think it’s right to generalize. I think it boils down to...I mean, my philosophy actually even when we hired throughout all these years, even in the previous company, it’s almost like, you can put a bag over the person’s whole body and then we just look at the background and let me talk to them, and, you know, then through that process, we’ll find out...I mean, we’ll share everything about what we’re about and what...
we have to offer and the type of work that we do, and, uh, I would, you know, try to draw
out the same thing, and we’re looking for a match.

D: Mmm.

A: And then once we get the match, and you take the bag off over the person’s body
then...however they look, and, you know, it really doesn’t matter.

D: Could be anybody. Yeah.

A: Yeah. Um, because, um...because, yeah, over...over, um, the time I’ve been in this
third party administration business, I’ve had as administrative assistants, I’ve had a
Filipino girl, um, from, local girl married to Japanese, um, she was maybe like in her, you
know, late 20’s. I had a Black girl that was from Georgia that went to Cornell that
majored in HR.

D: Oh.

A: She was probably in her mid-20’s, but it’s really, uh...I don’t...

D: Doesn’t matter?

A: Yeah. It depends on the individual.

D: Okay. Um, what would you say are some negative things, if there are any negative
things about your relationships?...With them?

A: Um, with...with any of them?

D: Yeah.

A: Let’s see...let me go one-by-one...Kyle...I honestly can’t say there’s anything negative
(laughs), because, um, you know, he’s such a diligent and thoughtful person. Um...no, I
don’t have any complaints and I don’t have any criticisms.

D: Okay.
A: Yeah, he's just very valued.

D: Kay.

A: I would say he's the closest...the way he approaches work and communication and organization, it's the closest to the way I do things.

D: Oh, okay.

A: So that's why I would say I don't have any, you know, issues with him at all. Um...any negatives...I wouldn't call this a negative, but, for as much as his main positive is his technical knowledge, you know, is extremely good. Um, it's not a negative, but more a goal is, he just needs to expand his knowledge of the operations and the business and that's an ongoing process.

D: Okay.

A: So that's more of an area to learn, yeah?

D: Mmm.

A: So, if that could be called a negative, you know, maybe lack of full knowledge of...

D: Mmm. It just takes time, yeah?

A: Yeah. Um, in terms of, let's see, Edward...um, well as much as the end product that he produces is...is pretty much what I would expect. You know, the nature of accounting work is...um, you can have style differences, so, you know, for any given task, for it to be prepared and presented and say, "Okay, that's good. That's solid and I got no questions," like that, no, you know, editorial points...

D: Mmm.

A: ...you know, that happens sometimes. On other times, it's like, "Oh, okay, this is a good start. Um, you know, you need to expand here," and whatnot. So, I would...I would
say if there was a negative, he...we’re all creatures of habit in the way we produce things, um, and I would say that, by and large, what he produces is...is substantially complete, but it could be a little bit more complete or detailed, um, you know, with respect to what I normally expect, yeah, in a finished product.

D: Okay.

A: The finished product...and then things like...I’m a stickler for referencing the file name in the document so you don’t have to go figure out what it is, and then, you know, making sure you have it on your hard drive and you have it backed up to, you know, the server, or to a, you know...

D: Yeah, yeah.

A: Not just on one place, yeah?

D: Yeah.

A: So, I would say not a negative, yeah? He’s not 100% religious about that.

D: Okay.

A: So...but, uh...but other than that, uh...Edward...I would say [unintelligible] that area is just that, you know, we’re all human, so our limits, and our ability to maintain our composure are all different.

D: Mhmm.

A: And, um, you know, and I think...anybody when they’re pushed pass their limit is gonna kind of...kind of blow.

D: Mhmm.
A: But, uh...how should I say, um...that’s just an area that he could work on, yeah?

D: Okay.

A: I say it’s a negative, but it’s an area to...to improve and maintain.

D: Okay.

A: And he knows it.

D: Okay.

A: Cause we’ve talked about it before. So, yeah, nothing I’m telling you is not something...it’s not anything I haven’t already [unintelligible]

D: Okay.

A: Uh, Cathy, let’s see, in terms of negatives, um...and I don’t know if this is where because she’s my wife, you know (laughs)...um, but...I guess...I think this is more just individual differences, where, on the one hand, she’s good about policies and procedures and monitoring and, you know, enforcing them.

D: Mmm.

A: Uh...and...you know, I guess one criticism would be, is that I think it’s important in any situation to be able to take a step back, and besides looking at things from your vantage point, if there’s another party involved it’s important to look at it from their vantage point, if there’s multiple parties involved, from the different vantage points.

D: Mmm.

A: Um...and then just so that, you know, um, it helps to...it helps in the decision making and the evaluation so I would say that’s an area that she is fairly good at, but she could...she could be better at.

D: Okay.
A: And here again, I don’t know if it’s because she’s my spouse, but, you know, I do my best to keep personal at home and keep things and business at work.

D: Mmhmm.

A: Um, but I think pushed to our limits and stressed out, then, you know, we can be short tempered or argumentative, so...(laughs) um, that would probably be another constructive criticism...

D: Okay.

A: ...where...um, you know, if I think back to my previous encounters with my previous, you know, supervisors, I don’t think I’ve ever argued or thrown a tantrum, or anything like that, yeah? Not to say that she’s thrown a tantrum, but there’s a way you can debate a point rather than using moaning and groaning...and so, that’s where I think there’s that little difficulty in drawing the line between business and personal.

D: Okay. Um...For Cathy, I know you’ve known her for a long time and it’s a little bit different, but maybe, like, for Edward and Kyle, is there any things that you can recall that maybe helped your relationship with them develop? Is there...in thinking from the beginning to now, because it sounds like you have a good relationship with both of them...like, is there anything that you can think of that...specific events, maybe, that contributed to that development?

A: In terms of the positive development?

D: Yeah.

A: Mmm...

D: Or was it just kind of gradual?
A: You mean from the time they started, and like, uh, Kyle, he was a stranger to the point where...where we are now working like a well-oiled machine and we’re also friends on the side?

D: Mmhmm.

A: Mmm...well with Kyle, you know...I suppose there was a certain amount of cross-training more in the beginning than now, in terms of how the business functioned, you know, the personalities of the co-workers...

D: Mmhmm.

A: ...the...the, you know, relationship between us as a third party administrator and the multiple, uh, site professionals that are also hired to service our common clients, yeah, so...mmm, there’s a lot...there was a lot...I mean, I always, um...I try to teach people and pass on knowledge in as much detail as possible and probably more than they would care to know. Cause they...I’m always criticized for, “Oh boy, he always takes so long and he always goes from A to Z.” And...(laughs) to me, if the person is ready, then, you know, I like to give the full story rather than hop, skip, and a jump and then they, “Well, so what’s the in-between,” you know?

D: Mmhmm.

A: But, um, so Kyle was a quick study in that respect. Um...you know, we had gone to a couple of conferences...more records management, and information, so...technology type of conferences together, so I think that helped to broaden both our horizons, so...mmm...yeah, you know, um...but, no, he’s always been a quick study and he’s just so industrious, I mean, these three people all don’t only work 35 hours a week. That’s our
standard work week. I’ll see on average it’s 40 to 50 sometime more than that a week, yeah?

D: Wow.

A: Um...so, I mean, I don’t expect that of them. But then again, that goes back to the work ethic, yeah?

D: Mmm.

A: It’s kind of...it’s kind of built into that. So...but, yeah, I...what I’ve tried to do, you know, just going back in time just a bit, is, I think we are all products of our education, our parental upbringing, and the work experiences we’ve gone through, and especially, the type of supervisors we’ve had, and I think ultimately, we try to take the good and...and...and apply it, and take the bad and discard it. Yeah?

D: Mmmmm.

A: Uh...and so, in terms of that being said, the underlying philosophy that I had adopted, gee, back in...probably from the late ‘80s, because I, you know, I graduated from college in ’78, December, and I started working in ’79, um, so I had...kind of had a cross-section of different types of supervisors, and I came to...to know what I valued and what I didn’t like. So...I tried to take all the positives and be that way, too, and ultimately what it is is a very team-oriented, family-oriented type of management philosophy.

D: Okay.

A: Um...you know, and...and I would say I’m pretty demanding, but yet I’m fair. I think I probably under-delegate tasks, only because I’m sensitive to what the persons work-load is, and whereas I’ve had bosses that say, “Okay, here do this. Okay, add this, Okay, and I need that.” You know? It’s like (growls), you know?
A: I always try to say, “Well, [unintelligible], and you know, okay, and this is something else, and this is kind of important, and can you get it done by here, and, you know, if not, then what else has to get pushed back?” So, I try to be, you know, very understanding of what they have to do and what their workload is. Like I say, sometimes I’ll keep something and do it.

D: Mmhmm.

A: Or, you know, just because I don’t want to overburden them.

D: Okay. That’s interesting, some of the...maybe what you’ve taken from your different experiences, um, and so, team-oriented, family-oriented philosophy would be...would you say that’s the main, um, thing? Or...?

A: You mean from...from the upbringing and the work experiences...

D: Yeah...like, what would you consider...?

A: Honestly, if I can encapsulate it, yeah, team-oriented, team-slash-family orientation, uh, you know, simply, you know, it’s kind of the golden rule, and including saying please and thank you. Uh...and then the last part of it is, and this goes back to the team-orientation, is, you know, we might have different job titles and responsibilities, but everybody’s important from the owners of the company to the messenger, and you know, all of us together is what’s needed to provide our collective service, and if I gotta go be the messenger, because no one else can be it, so be it. You know? Or if I have to go carry mail and drop it off to the post office or go stuff the mail box, you know...um, so there’s no task to small, yeah?

D: Mmm.
A: Whereas, you know, I worked with some people, it’s like, “Oh, I don’t do that kind of stuff anymore. That’s too low-level for me.” I don’t believe...we don’t believe in that.

D: Okay. Um...what do you think are the basic foundations or requirements for having a good interpersonal relationship?

A: Basic requirements for having a good interpersonal relationship?

D: Yeah.

A: Hmmm...that’s a broad question, um...

D: Yeah.

A: I think, um...I think being honest is important. You know, you have to be clear on your communication and expectations....and both on what you expect from the other person, as...and, and it’s a two-way street, it’s also in...with respect to what, you know, cause it’s always a give and take, yeah?

D: Mmm.

A: So, I think if the communication is honest and clear, um...I don’t, I don’t think it should be...I think it’s pretty...pretty...it’s pretty much 50/50.

D: Mmm.

A: And even though you have a superior and a subordinate...

D: Mmhmm.

A: Uh...you know, I can expect the person, “Well, that’s your job and you’re getting paid that much for it. So, you know, get it done.” But yet, you know, as the...as the superior, then, and I’ve always thought this way, and I think the concept was learned through my master’s program, too, where your employees are really your internal customers, so even, in an individual situation...so for me, in relation to my direct reports or even other
employees and supervisors or even staff...you know, I think that’s true, where, um...you know, I think the old style is, “Oh yeah, you getting paid and, you know, so, you getting the benefits, so just do it.” You know?

D: Yeah.

A: But I would call that the strictly business approach. And I’ve worked in jobs like that before and I’ve left jobs like that. Some of them paid very well, but, you know, I mean, I didn’t...it’s not the way that I felt people should be treated, and it’s not the way that I treated people, so, I, you know, I...I never...I always left after a while, yeah?

D: Mmm, okay.

A: And then...out of college, I had...2...3...I had 4 different jobs...5 different jobs before I formed this company, so...not that many, yeah?

D: Must have been for long times though.

A: Yeah, relatively, yeah.

D: Okay...I guess compared to me, I’ve had so many. Well, I guess as a student, too, you’re always working part-time, and especially in research, contracts end and stuff.

A: Yeah, right. Well, I think the generational, though, it’s like...you know, the younger generation, it’s like, just finding the right place, never mind job-hopping. Whereas, you know, in my day, it’s like, ooh, this person can’t hold down a job in a job market.

D: Yeah.

A: But, you know, it’s...that’s something we would kind of take a step back and go, “Oh yeah, we can’t look at that,” you know? When we do recruiting, we don’t strictly rule somebody out because of that, yeah?

D: Mmmmm.
A: Because, ultimately, everybody's looking for the proper fit, yeah?
D: Yeah.
A: Did I answer your question?
D: Yeah.
A: About...about the...?
D: Yeah, yeah.
A: But that would...that would be the crux of it, I think.
D: Okay. Um...what do you think...I know we kind of touched on this, but...what do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?
A: Special about intercultural relationships in the workplace...
D: So, if you have two people of different cultures or similar cultures.
A: I think what’s...it’s, um...it’s special because it can be a learning and growing experience for both parties. It’s like, whereas you could have friction initially, because it’s like, you know, you do something and you expect the other person to react a certain way and it’s totally different and it can upset you.
D: Mmm.
A: I think by experiencing that, and then learning, you know, and then addressing that in a nice way with the other person, and then finding out why a certain action, you know, or reaction, you know, met a certain action, that’s where people say, “Oh, okay. I didn’t...I didn’t know that that’s how you look at it.” Or...
D: Mmm.
A: ...you know, and so, I think that’s how people grow. Cause like I touched upon earlier, too, I think one key skill, just harmony in the workplace, let alone, I think, advancement
from a staff to a supervisor to a manager, is that ability to take a step back from what’s
going on and look at things from, you know, both sides. So, I think that, um...that
intercultural interplay in the workplace, it provides a forum to do that.

D: Okay.

A: Uh...and a lot of that is trial and error, yeah? But, but...I mean, that can be an area of
training, too.

D: Mmm.

A: So...

D: Um, how would you rate your relationships with your three direct reports, on a scale
of 1 to 10.

A: (laughs)

D: Just work-related relationships.

A: Later on you can tell me what they said.

D: Oh, it’s good. (laughs)

A: Uh...work relationships...well, all in all things considered...I like to think with Kyle
it’s a 10.

D: Kay.

A: Cause that’s how I feel. Uh...with Edward...and then, is it no fractions and no decimals
in between?

D: Uh, that’s fine, too.

A: Uh, Edward...probably not a 10, but I would say very high...maybe like a 9.5.

D: Kay.
A: Um...Cathy, in terms of work relationship...ah, I would say maybe a 9. And it’s still very high, but not as high, only because, um, you know, there’s times where there’s differences of opinion, and...yeah, we’ll leave it at that.

D: Okay, um...let’s see...what kind of personal knowledge do you think is needed to feel like you know somebody well?...Like, could be outside of work or on the job...

A: Can you define what you mean by personal knowledge?

D: Um...like, well, okay, maybe let’s just think of...so for work relationship, what kind of non-work type of information would you think is needed to know about to help the work relationship? Or is that needed at all?

A: So in other words, could...could I function perfectly well by knowing nothing about what a person does outside of work, or does knowing about this or that help?

D: Yeah, yeah.

A: Um...you know, I think knowing things outside of work helps, because it goes back to our application form. Um, you know, and we ask for a hobbies and interest section, and you know, and people...some people customarily put that down in their resumes, too, but, um...I think...I think knowing what their interests are helps because if there’s a common interest then that’s something to talk about, and, you know, and if there’s not a common interest, it kind of goes back to that cross-cultural thing where, it’s like, they do, like, something exotic so, you know, you know nothing about so you can ask them about how that’s going. You can learn something, yeah?

D: Mmm.

A: Um, I think if their outside activities, say, touch on community service type of, um, organizations, or...cause I know like Edward does some community service work. Um...
don’t believe Kyle was doing, but, you know, because he was caring for his mom who
was...was ill. Um, Cathy...yeah, Cathy...I mean, my mom is in a care home, and beyond
being my wife, you know, I think that she not only goes to visit, but she goes to help the
staff their too, so, I think it um...I think just knowing what...what a person does outside of
work, and they could be in school, like, you know, Kyle was in the master’s program, the
MBA program at [removed school name].

D: Oh.

A: So, you know, it just...it just helps to be aware of things and their interests, or the
family situation, because no matter how we try as human beings to leave things outside of
work...outside of work...you know, even though you may not talk about things, or
whatnot, you come in and you’re tired or you look kind of worn, then, you know...I think
it just helps to be aware.

D: Mmm.

A: And so for if a supervisor or coworker can be aware of these things, I think it just
helps, gives some comfort to that person for...it’s like, “Oh, okay. At least this person
cares about me more than just as an employee.”

D: Mmm.

A: So, yeah, I think it helps, too, to know. Um, but yeah, I guess where I kind of draw the
line is, is just, you know, to talk and to be aware, and if there’s assistance needed
sometimes, you know, I’ll actually offer my help or go and help with something, but
um...yeah, where I draw the line is, you know, other than a major social event then it’s
not like...well I haven’t yet, I haven’t done, like, outside activities with co-workers since I
was like in a staff position, yeah?
D: Oh.

A: Anyway...

D: Okay. Um...

A: Did I answer your question?

D: Yeah.

A: Okay.

D: So, basically what I got was, like, a little bit helps...

A: Yeah.

D: ...but, uh...so where would you say, say like, uh, if I drew a picture (drawing)...say this was maybe the work and that’s the personal domains, um, how much...

A: How much the overlap?

D: ...overlap, would...do you think...

A: Um, I’ll use a pencil. You know, I think...

D: Muhmm.

A: Probably, maybe only about a third. Because, you know...yeah...

D: So, like, that much?

A: Yeah.

D: Okay. Okay, uh...I think that should be good cause it’s getting kind of late already.
D: Okay. Okay, so tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

K: The work that I do...basically my responsibilities are to oversee, um, the technical portion of the company. That is, um, anything to do with, uh, networking, uh, office products, uh, phone systems...um, and to make sure that, uh, that not only the system is running, but also that, uh, the security and privacy of that information and all that data is...

D: Okay.

K: ...is addressed.

D: Okay. Um, so what led you to do this type of work?

K: It in general...I guess, uh, ever since I was young, um, young being as far as I can remember...elementary school...I’ve always had an interest in computers. Um, I’ve always been the type to hang around with the “squares.”

D: Oh.

K: You know, “the brains,” um, in the school...

D: Uh huh.

K: ...uh, type of a grouping, so this field kind of...I guess is...matches my personality.

D: Okay.

K: [laughs]

D: And how about at this place of employment?...What led you here...
K: What led me here?
D: ...to this company? Yeah.
K: Um, I was referred here by another, uh, employee of Andrew’s, which I believe you might interview, Edward.
D: Oh, okay.
K: He’s a controller, and so, uh, he referred me here, and he told me a little bit about the company and what they do, and, uh, at that time I...I thought it was very interesting.
D: Okay.
K: A new challenge. Uh, and so I figured I would apply.
D: Um, so how long have you been working here?
K: Yeah, I’ve been working here for four years now.
D: Four years. Okay. And that’s with Andrew, too...working under Andrew?
K: Yes, working under Andrew...past four years.
D: So what’s a typical day like at work for you?
K: A typical day? Um, basically my responsibilities, uh, have shifted more toward the management side.
D: Okay.
K: Um, I have a good staff, so they, uh, have pretty much taken over a lot of the day-to-day activities, day-to-day meaning, you know, any kind of problems users are having, any kind of problems with the system, things of that nature, so my responsibilities more fall under the management side, where, you know, I’m preparing security documents, um, I’m reviewing, um, things that Andrew has given me to review, and, uh, writing reports, doing budgets, um, those kinds of more administrative type functions...
D: Okay.

K: ...and not so much the technical. The only time I get involved with the technical on a day-to-day basis is if something my staff cannot handle...

D: Okay.

K: ...and they need assistance, and so that’s when I’ll...

D: Okay.

K: ...kind of jump in there.

D: Um, what’s your experiences with your coworkers like?...Maybe your peers in this company...

K: In this company? My experiences meaning, um, on a professional level or on a personal level?

D: Both!

K: Oh, both, okay. On a professional level...um, I...for me it’s been great. Um, my experience has been very positive. Um, the...for the most part, most of the individuals here, uh, have the...have been, um, working towards the same goals. You know, we’re all paddling in the same direction.

D: Mmhmm.

K: Um, other companies I’ve been at...mmm, might not be so. But here, it’s...it’s very good. Um, on a personal level, I...I really enjoy working with everyone. There’s no personalities here that I have conflicts with....

D: Oh, okay. That’s good.
K: So, um, none to speak of, no. So overall, um, for me, it's ideal.

D: Okay, good.

K: I really...I really enjoy being here.

D: All right. Um, so...tell me about some of your experiences with Andrew.

K: Mmm.

D: Um, maybe...maybe you can go back to when you first met him...when you started, and...

K: Okay. [laughs] Is this going to be shared with him?

D: No, no.

K: Okay. [laughing]

D: I won’t say anything. There’s no microphones in here, huh? [laughs]

K: It wouldn’t change my answer, but I was just wondering if he was going to hear this!

But anyway, my experience when I first met Andrew, was that, he’s very detail oriented.

D: Oh, okay.

K: So, when it comes to working for him, um, you want to make sure that you fully do your research, and you fully understand, um, anything that you bring to him...

D: Okay.

K: ...because he’s going to ask you questions, and...and you need to be able to answer those appropriately. So, again, very detail oriented, so you need to be prepared for that.

D: Okay.

K: Um, outside of that, um, he’s very professional...

D: Kay.
K: ...in that, you know, there is no...there is no tolerance here, especially by Andrew, for...for swearing, for, um, inappropriate comments, things of that nature.

D: Mhm. Okay.

K: So everything is on a professional level.

D: Okay.

K: On a personal level, I have had...I think I’ve had the pleasure of, um, seeing the more personal side of him in that this year, especially, uh, my...I’ve had some personal experiences with my family. My mother passed away from cancer.

D: Oh, I’m sorry.

K: So, she, um...he would give me the time off if necessary. In other words, he’s very empathetic.

D: Oh.

K: Although he understands that the work needs to get done...

D: Mmm.

K: ...and that, you know, you need to, um, fulfill your responsibilities. He’s willing to, I guess, give you the extra time you need to handle those personal issues, yeah? So it’s not strictly business, business all the time.

D: Mmm. Okay.

K: So, it’s...I think he has a very good mix. In...in regard to him being a boss, a good mix of that.

D: Okay. Um, would you say you kind of know him on a personal level, too?
K: Mmhmm. On a personal level, uh, only that we share things when we meet, um, one-on-one. You know, we’ll share interests, um, we’ll share, um, things we’ve done over the weekend. Um, but pretty much that’s the extent of it.

D: Okay.

K: Uh, we don’t socialize outside of the workplace. In other words, you know, go and have a drink after work kind of thing. Uh, nothing like that.

D: Okay.

K: So, um, yeah. That’s the only personal level I know Andrew on.

D: Okay. Um...how would you say your relationship developed from the beginning until now? Like what...what would you say are some of the factors that maybe helped the relationship develop good...or maybe not so good...or...?

K: I think, um...I think two words...

D: Mmhmm.

K: ...off the top of my head that come to mind that help the relationship develop. One is respect. Um, I think respect, like the second item, which I’m gonna say, which is trust...those two things are earned, yeah? They...they aren’t just given. And so, because we...I’ve come to respect him, and I hope the same is true...uh, he reciprocates on that, um, in terms of our knowledge of our associated positions, and um, the way we handle ourselves, and everything that goes into respecting one another, as well as the trust, uh, we place in one another.

D: Kay.

K: Um, I think those two items above anything else, for me, has really helped to solidify our relationship. Um, and, uh...to the point where when we...when I first started, you
know, you’re kind of apprehensive. You don’t know what’s expected of you. You don’t know, um, how your boss is going to react to certain things. Um, all those unknowns to the point where we are now, where I’m fairly confident that I know what he wants, um, he trusts me to get it done, um, and I respect him to...enough where if there are problems or issues, I’ll bring it to him, and, um, you know, we’ll talk about it.

D: Okay. What are the different ways that you communicate with Andrew? Is it mostly in person, email...?

K: Um, mostly...I think it’s...oh, that’s a good question...probably fifty-fifty, email and in-person.

D: Oh, okay.

K: Um, in-person being in manager’s meetings, as well as, uh, one-on-one weekly meetings that we have periodically. Periodically meaning maybe twice a week.

D: Okay.

K: Um, emails, just any time of the day, going back and forth, [unintelligible], but those are the primary means of communication...very rare on the phone, um, and any other means.

D: Okay. You folks are pretty close together...the offices?

K: Physically? No, we’re on opposite sides of the office.

D: Oh, okay.

K: Yeah.

D: Okay. So if it wasn’t for those meetings, you might not see each other too much then?

K: Probably not. Yeah. You’re probably right. There, in fact, yeah, except for these items, I...I probably wouldn’t speak to him, maybe, or see him given...in any given day.
D: Oh, okay. That’s a good thing then. [laughs]

K: [laughs]

D: It means nothing’s going wrong.

K: [laughing] Yeah, I guess it can be that, yeah, that’s true.

D: Um, so...maybe like in a day or in a week, how much, maybe hours or minutes, would you say you actually are interacting with him?

K: Whether email or in-person?

D: Yeah.

K: We work on a 35-hour work week.

D: Oh.

K: Kind of nice, yeah?

D: Wow.

K: Hours only, well my shift, is only 8 to 4.

D: Mmhmm.

K: So in a 35-hour work week, mmm...I would say maybe, average, 5 hours...

D: Okay.

K: ...of that 35 hours is spent communicating in some form or fashion, whether it’s email or in-person.

D: Okay. Okay, um, what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with Andrew?

K: Positive things? Um, again, goes back to respect and trust, are two definitely positive things. I think, um...um...I don’t know what word to use, whether it’s empathy, or, um, something where he’s very, um, sensitive to my personal, um, well-being, I guess.
D: Okay.

K: Uh, so I don’t what word you like to characterize, um, by that characteristic...

D: I think that’s a good word.

K: But, um, yeah...

D: I understand.

K: So, you know, again, given, um, you know, whether, it was this thing with my mother or, you know, I have...I gotta go to the dentist ‘cause I’m hurtin’...

D: Mmm.

K: ...then he’ll give you the time necessary. So I think, um, that...those three characteristics...I think the fact that we are similar in personalities, and when I mean similar, um, he...like I said, he’s very detail oriented, and for the most part...[laughs]...okay, this is the part where I was asking whether he’s gonna hear this...“anal”...if you wanna go to that.

D: Uh huh.

K: He’s very “anal” about things, but the thing is, so am I.

D: Mmm. That’s not a bad thing.

K: Yeah, it can be a good thing. Um, the different levels of “analness”...is that a word?...Um, I think he’s more and I’m less, but I’m definitely anal about things. So because we share those common characteristics, I think it, in regard to...it affects the relationship. It makes it easier. Whereas, if I was the type of person that, you know, just whatever kind of guy...

D: Yeah.

K: ...I don’t think we would get along as well.
D: Oh.
K: Yeah.
D: Okay. Are there any negative things about your relationship with him?
K: With Andrew?
D: Mmm...
K: Mmm...not...no...not negative. The only negative, and I don’t even know if you’d consider it negative, is...is maybe more self-imposed, and that is that I know what he expects of me, and I’m always, for lack of a better word, afraid, of disappointing him.
D: Okay.
K: Um...I guess you set a bar for yourself...
D: Mmm...
K: ...and, um, he’s come to expect that level of performance, and then should you ever fall short, you know, you kind of...yeah, it just doesn’t look good for yourself, and you just don’t feel good about yourself. So, if that’s what would consider negative...yeah, that would be a negative.
D: That could be kind of like a pressure...
K: Yeah.
D: Okay. Let’s see...do you remember what your first meeting was like?...Was that an interview?
K: It was an interview. Yes, it was. It was an interview. And, uh, yes, I remember exactly what it was like. In that interview, I spoke very little.
D: Oh.
K: Believe it or not. You would think in an interview, the interviewee is the one speaking the most.
D: Yeah.
K: But actually, it was the interviewer, which was Andrew...
D: Oh.
K: ...that spoke most, and what he talked about was the functions of the company, what my duties would be, and so forth. And the purpose of that, he told me later, was to make sure that I fully understood what I was getting into.
D: Okay.
K: So, um, I found that rather odd, that I didn’t speak very much, short of him asking me, “Do you understand?” “Yes, I understand,” or “Not quite.” That’s really all I said.
D: Pretty easy interview.
K: Yeah, not bad. It was the second interview in which he asked me, you know, all these different scenarios, and questions, and...and so, that’s where I talked more.
D: Oh, you had to go through multiple interviews, then?
K: Mmm. I did.
D: Kay. Okay. Um, was there a separate orientation to the company, or did he kind of provide that?
K: You mean after I was hired?
D: Yeah.
K: Yes, um, after I was hired, I had a separate orientation. In fact, the company holds...what happens is that all new employees, um, go through this, I guess for lack of a
better word, some kind of seminar, in which, uh, all the new employees are brought in at the same time...

d: Mmhm.

K: ...and each department head will come in and explain what....what they do and how it relates to the business.

d: Okay.

K: So, between that seminar orientation as well as HR providing me with, you know, things about parking, you know, the standard things about vacation and explaining all of that...

d: Yeah.

K: ...um, yeah, those...those are the two things I remember being oriented to.

d: Okay. Yeah, this is...I didn’t know it was such a big company. You guys have the whole floor?

K: Yes, we take up the whole floor.

d: How many employees are there?

K: Uh, we have less than 50. I...honestly, I don’t have an exact count. Forty-something...

d: Wow.

K: ...yeah, employees.

d: Wow.

K: And then we also have, um, someone on the outer island, on, in Maui, who also works for us.

d: Kay.

K: So, um, yeah. We used to have a Las Vegas office, which we, uh, have since closed.
D: Oh, okay. I still don’t really understand what you folks do. [laughs]

K: Do you want me to kind of explain that?

D: Yeah.

K: Do you have time for that?

D: Yeah, yeah, that’s fine.

K: Well, we are a third party administrator. Like you, when I first...[laughs]...when Andrew was explaining this to me in my first interview, I went, “What, what, what exactly is it that the company does?” [removed explanation for confidentiality]

D: It sounds like really complicated stuff.

K: [laughs] There’s a lot, especially with the laws and things, you gotta make sure you’re compliant.

D: Yeah. Interesting...Um, how would you say...you were talking about respect and trust...um, how would you say...I know you kind of talked about it, but maybe in more depth...what you think about how they developed over time?

K: Mmm...elaborate how they developed over time.

D: Yeah, like maybe, were there incidences where, you know, he really felt he could trust you...

K: Mhm...

D: ...or vice versa...

K: Hmmm...okay, let’s look at the first one, I guess, trust. Um, in regard to trust...uh...at least from my side, in terms of how I try to help develop the trust, is that when he shares things with me, I make sure that those things I don’t repeat. And if you repeat it to
someone eventually it might get out, so I make sure that none of those things that are said
to me in confidence that I share.

D: Okay.

K: Um...a lot of the information that’s entrusted by me, or to me, um, because we are
from the system side, so we see a lot of real sensitive...

D: Mmm.

K: ...anywhere from personal HR records, to a lot of the medical records, I try very hard
to, uh, assure him that those things, um, that I’m not sharing those things, that those
things are secure, uh, things of that nature. Um, so that’s from on my side. And then I
also try to make sure that any kind of issues that come up, I’m as straightforward and as
honest as can be. I don’t try to sugar-coat it, or anything like that, so that he knows that
I’m giving him the straight answer, even if it’s something he doesn’t want to hear.

D: Okay.

K: Um, so that’s on my side. On his side, how he builds trust in me, or rather, how I feel
that he trusts me, is that he will give me things that I know that are sensitive.

D: Okay.

K: Um, for instance, he will ask me...he will ask only me to come work on his laptop,
because, of course, it contains all the, kind of, company-related information. My staff, he
never calls my staff, to...to come and help him.

D: Oh, okay.

K: So I know that’s part of...because of the trust thing. He knows that those things are
sensitive and that he can trust me to look at those things only.

D: Mmm.
K: Um, when it comes to, like, um, working with HR, again, a lot of those records are confidential, and really, the controller can work with HR on some of those things, but he’ll ask me to work with HR...

D: Oh.

K: ...and then in doing so I see a lot of the employee information and all of that. So, it’s in trusting me, I guess, with all these different jobs, that shows me he trusts me. So that’s from his side.

D: Okay.

K: Now going to the side of respect...on my side, how is it that I try to show respect to him, in that whenever he gives me, um, things to do, I never...I try never to make a face or make any kind of comments. It’s...it’s...as long it’s not immoral in any way or illegal, I will just do it. So because he is my boss, I respect his position, he tells me to do it, I will do it. Um, so I’ll never give him an argument about things. Um...

D: Okay.

K: ...whenever there is decisions to be made, um, I’ll always defer to him. Uh, no matter how strongly I feel about it. Um, again, that goes back to respect. In...in the end, he’s the one. It’s his company. He’s...whatever consequences come about, he’s going to be the one to suffer those consequences, and I need to do what he tells me to do. So, on my side, I try to do those things, to, again, show my respect for him.

D: Kay.

K: Um, in regard, from his side to me, how he shows respect to me, is, again, with those personal things. Um, he’ll let me go if I have a personal problem or issue, give me that time off that I need. Um, which kind of tells me that, you know, he...as a person he
respects me. Um, he’ll never yell at me or embarrass me in front of other staff members, anything like that. Although, he doesn’t do it to anybody. It’s just, if your looking at it strictly from my point of view, he’s never done it to me, so that’s, to me, part of that respect. Um, when he...when it comes to the technical side, um, and there’s things that I really feel strongly about in terms of...this is just an example of, the technical part, components that we need, um, he’ll defer to me in a lot of those things. Um, so that’s part of showing his respect for my expertise, my knowledge, um, that, you know, if I really feel we need it, he’ll get it, you know, despite the way it fits into our budget. So it’s those, I think those little things that he does, um, that kind of, uh, kind of shows the way it’s evolved.

D: Okay. Oh, good answers.

K: Oh.

D: Um...how would you say your relationship with Andrew compares to other people’s relationship with him.

K: Hmm...you know, I’ve never really thought about that. Um, other people meaning other staff members?

D: Yeah. You noticed any differences or similarities?

K: I...because Andrew treats everyone professionally, I really don’t see a difference in the way he treats me as opposed to the way he treats another person.

D: Okay.

K: Um, the only differences, if any...if it’s...if I had to discern one, is the fact that, um, again, when it comes to giving out certain duties, he’ll...he’ll come to me...

D: Okay.
K: ...um, more so than someone else.

D: Okay.

K: Um, and that’s the only discernible difference. To give you an example, we were in a different location. We were in a different building down the street, and we moved here.

D: Mmm.

K: So one of the job duties that he gave to me was to help him oversee this...this move. Now, I don’t know anything about furniture, and, and, you know, I just know the IT side, so I had to kind of learn all of that, whereas those duties may be better off with the office manager.

D: Mmm.

K: Um, giving it to the office manager to do, so I...

D: But he gave those to you.

K: He gave those to me to help him oversee, so, except for those kind of discernible differences, no he doesn’t treat me different compared to another staff member.

D: Kay...um, what do you think...might be the same answers you gave before, maybe not...what do you think are the basic foundations of interpersonal relationships?

K: With...with anyone, or with Andrew specifically?

D: Yeah, with anyone...to make a good relationship...

K: To make a good relationship, I think communication...

D: Okay.

K: We’re talking about, I’m sorry, characteristics?

D: Basic foundations...

K: Oh, foundations, okay.
D: ...aspects...

K: Aspects, okay.

D: ...Yeah, characteristics, I guess.

K: Okay, communications, again, trust and respect...

D: Mmhmm.

K: Um...hmm...

D: What are some of...at...in your work relationships, what is needed for it to work well, I guess?

K: Mmhmm, okay. In a work environment, it’s, um, professionalism would be the one word...

D: Okay.

K: ...that I would...I would say, and under professionalism, you know, comes with it, um, all of those are the things I guess we discussed. Um, respect for one’s position, um, and so forth. Yeah, kind of the same things I guess I’ve been saying all this time.

D: Yeah.

K: Um, I think...

D: All related, yeah?

K: Yeah.

D: How would you view yourself and Andrew ethnically?...or racially?

K: In regard to what...what are...

D: Yeah, what’s your ethnicity, or what would you identify with most, and what would...what do you think he identifies with?
K: I think...is Asian kind of what...kind of what we’re looking for here in terms of your question?
D: Yeah.
K: Um, I think an Asian, um, background, um, specifically, Japanese, um, we share a lot of the principles I...I kind of associate with that kind of ethnicity, and that is respect for elders, um, oh this is part of being Japanese...you know how you’re a little more timid in certain situations?
D: Mhmm. You don’t want to be the nail that sticks out.
K: Yeah, exactly, exactly. Kind of, um, blend in. You wanna blend in with...you don’t wanna rock the boat. Um, work hard...
D: So you would say those are kind of shared, um, values?
K: Between Andrew and myself, yes.
D: Okay, work hard...okay...so you both probably identify as Japanese?
K: I would say so, yes.
D: Okay...Is there anything special, you think, there is about intercultural relationships at work?
K: Special...
D: Anything you’ve noticed that stands out for you?...Maybe not...maybe it’s not even an issue, or...
K: That, um...I’m sorry, these things that stand out that causes conflict, or...just make the workplace better, or...?
D: Yeah, anything like that, yeah.
K: Anything? Yeah, definitely. Um, I think culturally, or ethnically, uh, there are
differences. For example, uh, you’ll noticed that we have a lot of, um, Filipino-based
workers...
D: Okay.
K: ...and, um, although, again, Asian in background, you’re values are different which
causes, I think, some conflict or jealousy, in some respects. Um...what exactly those
conflicts and jealousies, I can elaborate if you want, but...
D: Yeah, sure.
K: Yeah? Okay. Well like, you’ll notice that certain of...certain key positions, um, are
dominant...dominated, I should say, by Asians.
D: Okay.
K: Whereas, um, the...when you’re looking at the Filipino ethnicity, are more...they’re
more towards the staff level.
D: Okay.
K: So there’s, I think, there’s a little bit of jealousy, or envy, or I don’t know what...what
you want to call it, there. I just sense that.
D: So like the...more of the higher positions, um, would be, like, just Asians in general, or
more Japanese?...
K: Um...
D: ...Chinese?
K: Mmm, yeah, more Japanese, I would say.
D: Okay.
K: It's kind of fifty-fifty. Some are Japanese, some are Hawaiian-based, Polynesian type...

D: Okay.

K: But very rare on the Filipino side.

D: Okay.

K: Um, then you have, when we're talking about the work environment, ethnicity... 'kay, so that's the Filipino side, that's what I sense. On the Polynesian side, which is like, Hawaiian, and so forth...

D: Mmm.

K: Uh, [laughs] I hope this is not...this does...not prejudiced. Well, I'm probably prejudiced in some way, but I noticed is that there's a different...difference in work ethic. The Polynesians are more, um...more laid back, whereas the Asians are more intense.

D: Mmm.

K: And so, because of those two differences in work ethic, it...it conflicts sometimes, um, between the staff. So again, that may be a prejudiced statement, but, ah, that's just what I noticed.

D: Well, the cross-cultural literature does talk about differences in concepts of time between cultures...

K: Oh, does it?

D: Yeah.

K: Oh, interesting.
D: Um...would you say you have a high quality relationship with Andrew?

K: I would say so, yes. I guess that “would” would be, what would be the definition of “high quality?” But when you say that in my mind, I’m thinking, we get along well, um, we, uh, share the same values, goals, uh...yeah.

D: On a scale of 1 to 10, what would you say? Like, 1 being maybe a stranger, and a 10 is like the best relationship you could have.

K: Uh, is this on a personal level, or like “10” on a...uh, on a...you have a “10” on a...on a professional level, and “10” on a personal level. Um, what would this “10” be?

D: Both.

K: Okay, it would be 10 on a professional level.

D: Okay.

K: On a personal level, it would more be like a 5.

D: Okay.

K: Because, again, short outside of this office, and then, his personal life I don’t really know too much about.

D: Okay. ‘Kay, last question.

K: Okay.

D: Um, what kind of...I know you know him a little bit on a personal level...

K: Mmhmm.
D: ...um, what kind of personal information do you think is needed...like, you know, outside of work type of information...um, to feel like, maybe it helps the work relationship?

K: Mmm, I see...

D: Or do you even need personal level information at work? Or could it...is it better without it?

K: Yeah, that’s an excellent question. Give me a couple seconds here to think about it.

D: Yeah, it’s a...

K: My general feeling is that we don’t need that.

D: Okay.

K: If you keep it strictly professional, and you never, ever share anything personal...

D: Mmhm.

K: ...um, then I’d be okay with that. But, another part of me feels that, you know, that personal sharing adds to the relationship. Um, it can enhance it...so...what am I really saying here? Um...

D: Makes it maybe more...

K: Mmm, I would say keeping it more professional, generally, is the best.

D: Okay.

K: That there needs to be a little, very little, on the personal level.

D: Okay.

K: Um, the only time, I think, on a personal level, where it enhances...it enhances the relationship is when it comes to, um, explaining your performance at work. So, in other words, if my performance starts to slip for whatever reason, I make more mistakes, or I’m
late, or what have you, understanding maybe what’s going on personally in my life may better explain the professional side.

D: Mmm, okay.

K: And maybe that would be the only situation in which it enhances the relationship.

Short of that, yeah, no, I don’t...I generally feel keeping it professional is fine.

D: Okay. Maybe like...let’s see...so, say this was like the work...work domain, and personal domain here [drawing].

K: Yes, okay. How much to they overlap?

D: Yeah, would it be kind of like...

K: It would be like this, this is work, this is personal, this is the overlap.

D: Oh, okay.

K: So it’s very small.

D: Just a little bit. Okay.

K: Yeah.

D: Okay, we’ve run a little overtime, so I’ll let you go.
Interview with Edward – Employee of Andrew

November 15, 2007
4:10 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.

D: Okay, so tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

E: Well, basically, I’m the controller.

D: Okay.

E: Um, I oversee the accounting department.

D: Okay.

E: Um...

D: Um, how long have you been with the company?

E: I’ve been with the company for 6 years.

D: Six years. Okay.

E: Actually, 7 years.

D: Oh, 7 years. Okay, um...what led you to this type of work? Have you always been in accounting and...?

E: Um, yeah, pretty much. I graduated from UH in accounting...an accounting major...

D: Okay.

E: ...yeah, I’ve been here, in accounting for...almost my whole life.

D: Oh, okay. Um...so what’s a typical day at work like, for you?

E: One word, busy.

D: Busy? Okay.

E: Yeah, it’s busy.
D: Is it, a lot of it, um...well I guess...

E: There’s a whole bunch of stuff involved, like managing the people.

D: Mhmmm.

E: You know, like, the staff....

D: Okay.

E: That’s part of it. Listening to their gripes or whatever they...they have to say. Um...

D: Okay.

E: That’s part of it. The other part is...um, I do the corporate accounting, yeah?

D: Okay.

E: Strictly myself.

D: Okay.

E: So there’s a lot of cutting checks...um, closing the financial statements, doing the budgets, you know, that kind of stuff.

D: Okay.

E: And now, one of my, um, one of the ladies retired, so I’m kind of doing her job, too, so...

D: Oh...you got double the work then?

E: Yeah.

D: Wow...okay, what are some of your experiences with your, um, coworkers...like your peers on kind of the same organizational level as you?

E: By and large it’s been...this company you mean?

D: Yeah.

E: It’s been OK.
D: Okay.

E: Um... Andrew and [removed name], the owners, they always preach, um, teamwork, so we always try to work as a team.

D: Mmm.

E: You know, that’s paramount I think, um...

D: Okay. Um... how long... so you’ve been working under Andrew since you first started with this company?

E: Mmm.

D: Okay, he’s always been your boss through that whole time, 7 years?

E: He’s always been my boss. Actually I met him at another company, where he was the controller and I was kind of like his assistant. This was like... 20 years ago.

D: Wow. So you’ve known him for a long time then?

E: Well, I worked with him for like 2, 3 years, then he... I left, then he... he went... actually he worked... he got to know [removed name], and I guess they formed a partnership eventually, and then he called me.

D: Oh, okay.

E: Yeah... to work as his controller.

D: Oh, okay. So, how long have you known him total, would you say?

E: Oh, I’ve known him since... 1987. So what is that, 20 years?

D: Oh, wow. Okay.

E: But I... I haven’t been in touch with him for 20 straight years.

D: Mmm.

E: But I knew him from ’87.
D: Oh, okay. Okay...how much contact would you say you have with him, average?

E: With Andrew?

D: Andrew, yeah.

E: What do you mean, in terms of how many hours a day?

D: Like interaction time, yeah, or a week, or...say like out of a work week, maybe how many hours?

E: I see him almost everyday.

D: Everyday?

E: Everyday I see him. Some kind of...sometimes we have meetings, but I see him...almost everyday we touch basis.

D: Okay. So would you say, maybe a couple of hours a week, total, of interaction time?

E: At least, at least.

D: Okay.

E: But he’s been busy, yeah, with his graduate work and all that kind of stuff, so...?

D: Yeah.

E: ...it’s been less, but normally, yeah at least two hours a week.

D: Okay. Is it mostly in-person, emails, or...?

E: Usually in-person.

D: In-person, okay. Okay, would you say you know Andrew on a personal level?...Like outside of work kind of stuff?

E: Uh, somewhat.

D: Yeah?

E: Not...
D: Do you folks have lunch together, or do stuff after work or anything?...Like outside of work time?

E: Once in a great while we do.

D: Oh yeah?

E: We do.

D: Would you say you know his family and friends and stuff?

E: Well, I know Cathy, yeah? Cathy is his wife.

D: Oh. Oh, she works here, too?

E: She’s the HR.

D: Oh.

E: You’re gonna interview her next.

D: Oh, really? That’s his wife?

E: Yeah, that’s his wife. And, um, I know his kids somewhat.

D: Oh, okay. Oh, that should be interesting. I didn’t know she was his wife and she’s gonna be like his subordinate to then.

E: Oh, you didn’t? [laughs] That makes for pretty interesting dynamics.

D: Yeah. Um...’kay, what would you say are some positive things about your relationship with Andrew?

E: With Andrew? Positives?

D: Yeah.

E: I can pretty much be honest with him.

D: Okay.

E: And I can tell him kind of how I feel.
D: Okay.

E: Um...yeah, I’m...I don’t hesitate, I don’t, you know, hold back, kind of.

D: Mmmmm.

E: So it’s good. It’s kind of an open relationship.

D: Mmm. Okay.

E: I don’t have to, you know, walk on eggshells around him like that. You know, some bosses, you don’t wanna say anything to, yeah? Cause you’re so afraid what they’re gonna tell you.

D: Yeah.

E: But he’s pretty...pretty, um, easy to talk to. For me anyway.

D: Okay.

E: So that would be the biggest positive.

D: Do you think for some people, he might not be as easy to talk to?

E: Yeah.

D: Yeah?

E: Yeah.

D: Oh, yeah? Why do you think that is?...They’re more intimidated or something?

E: I think that’s part of it. He’s an owner, yeah? He is the owner, and, um, I think that’s one reason. I would think that’s the biggest reason, and another reason is, um, Andrew is very detail oriented. So if you’re gonna go in and talk to him, you gotta get your ducks all lined up.

D: Oh, okay.

E: He’s gonna ask you all kinds of questions.
D: Okay. Uh, what would you say are some negative things, if there are any negative things, about your relationship with...

E: Uh, for me the most negative is, he’s very detailed.

D: Oh, okay.

E: Very detailed, and um...and sometimes, oh, it...that detail creates extra work for me, and I...you know, I don’t have the time sometimes, so gotta do this, this, this...

D: Mmm. Yeah.

E: But that’s...that’s the biggest, I think, negative.

D: Okay....okay, so thinking back, maybe like when you first...oh, you worked with him before this...this company...how was that relationship? Was that kind of similar to this...?

E: Yeah, similar, similar.

D: Oh, yeah?

E: Um...yeah, very similar, except I guess in this situation he’s the final say, yeah?

D: Mmm.

E: Whereas in the other one, he was just a controller, so...

D: Oh, okay.

E: ...but the relationship is similar.

D: Okay, okay. How would you say that kind of developed over time...your relationship with him?...Like, maybe what were some of the significant events, maybe, that, you know, you guys maybe felt that the relationship is better because of that, or not better, or...?

E: No, I think we’ve always had a pretty good relationship.

D: Yeah?
E: I don’t...I don’t...

D: Just kind of, um, maybe slowly, steadily developed?

E: Pretty steady, pretty steady, yeah.

D: Okay. Um, what would you say are some of the reasons behind...sounds like you have a good relationship with him...what would you say are some of the reasons for that?...Like, what contributed to the relationship?

E: I would say probably his personality, he’s just more, um...I don’t know, for some reason I can talk to him easily.

D: Oh, okay.

E: Yeah, I don’t know what it is. He’s just...for me, anyway, he’s more...he’s level headed, yeah? He doesn’t fly off the handle.

D: Okay.

E: Yeah, he’s pretty even tempered, so...

D: Okay.

E: Even...so he pretty much can say...even the bad news, you can kind of talk to him about it. And, you know, you don’t get really apprehensive, or...

D: Oh, okay. Okay. Do you see any difference with your relationship with him versus other people’s relationship with him?...I think you mentioned some people are a little more apprehensive when they have to meet him.

E: Yeah.

D: Is that...?
E: Well, I think...like I said, one of the reasons is because they don’t wanna...you know, because usually when you talk to him, it’s like, when you come out you got more work to do, yeah?

D: Oh.

E: Kind of...

D: Okay.

E: You know, you gotta...why don’t you do this, why don’t you send an email to so and so, why don’t you do this?

D: Mhm.

E: So [unintelligible].

D: Oh, okay, so it’s kinda hesitant to...

E: Yeah, because they pretty much know that he’s gonna ask them to do stuff, and...

D: Oh. Okay.

E: Or he’s gonna call a meeting, and you know, he’s very detailed that’s why. You know, he doesn’t let stuff fall through the cracks. He doesn’t like that.

D: Mhm. Okay. Um...let’s see...what would be the qualities, for you personally, of your ideal supervisor?...The best supervisor you had, the best boss...what kind of qualities would they have?

E: Gee, that’s a good question...I...I...best qualities...well I would say even tempered, being even tempered.

D: Okay.

E: Being rational. You know, not getting upset at, um...people making mistakes and stuff, cause we’re all human, yeah?
D: Mmm. Okay.

E: It’s kind of a understanding.

D: Okay.

E: Um...of course they gotta be intelligent, I think they gotta know what they’re talking about.

D: Mmhmm.

E: They have to be honest, they have credibility.

D: Okay.

E: Oh, and they gotta back you up.

D: Back you up?

E: Yeah.

D: Okay.

E: No matter what, I mean, if you have a conflict with a staff person, maybe, or...

D: Mmhmm.

E: ...and, you know, even though you’re wrong, they at least...

D: They’ll defend you?

E: They don’t embarrass you. Yeah, they don’t...they don’t, um, put you out to hang so to speak.

D: Oh, okay. Okay...what would you say are some of the basic foundations of work relationships? Like, to have a good work relationship, what is...what are some of the necessary things?

E: I think you gotta trust in each other. I think that’s real important that you trust each other.
D: Okay.

E: Uh...that you’re willing to...to be a part of the team. Say somebody’s out, that you’re willing to help out.

D: Okay.

E: Um...and, um, I think you’re more...I think you respect the other person. I think that’s important. You have to respect the other person. You have to, um, you have to have some kind of, um, you know, even if you get into some kind of, um, differences that you have with somebody else, that you don’t...you don’t, um, push it in their face so to speak. You can kind of understand, well I’m correct, but you kind of nice about it.

D: Mmm, mmm. Okay.

E: You know, you don’t create a kind of a...ill will, you know.

D: Yeah.

E: Even though you’re right...

D: Yeah, yeah.

E: ...you know, you’re willing to have the other person save his face sort of.

D: Okay.

E: So you maintain a relationship, yeah? A working relationship.

D: Yeah.

E: You don’t create kinda ill will kind of feelings...bad feelings.

D: Okay. Yeah, I know what you’re talking about, but I can’t think of the word for that.

E: Yeah.

D: Okay, how would you view yourself and Andrew ethnically...or racially?

E: Oh, we’re the same.
D: Japanese?

E: Japanese.

D: Okay. Um...is there anything special, you think, about intercultural relationships in the workplace? If you have two people from similar cultures or different cultures, like...

E: [laughs] Ho!

D: Anything that you noticed, how that affects the work maybe?

E: Gee, I hate to say stuff, but, this all confidential, yeah?

D: Yeah, yeah, it’s all confidential.

E: Well, I think, because we’re Japanese, you know, there’s a certain amount of, um...just, certain things in the Japanese culture, yeah?

D: Mmhmm.

E: Um, I don’t know...you persevere, yeah?...there’s certain things, yeah, you...like you know, you don’t make the other person lose face, you don’t...that kind of stuff.

D: Yeah.

E: I think it actually helps the relationship if you have the same kind of culture, I believe. I mean...

D: Have the same values?

E: Yeah, you know, like, us guys, we all Karate guys, yeah?

D: Oh, yeah?

E: Yeah, so, and even [removed name], even [removed name], Karate.

D: Oh.

E: So they all have, kind of, um...Karate is kind of like, um, based in the Samurai tradition, yeah? So we all kind of believe in that kind of stuff, yeah?
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D: Yeah, yeah.

E: So we all...

D: Oh. You folks still go together...are...you folks go together to the same place?

E: Yeah, well he doesn’t go, but, um, another guy, he’s a teacher and Kyle and I go.

D: Oh, okay.

E: Some other guys go, too.

D: Oh.

E: But, um, yeah, to answer your question, yes. There is definitely some kind of, um, cultural kind of, um...

D: Similarities?

E: Similarities, yeah.

D: Okay.

E: I hate to say that, ‘cause you know, you like to think everybody’s the same, yeah?

D: Yeah.

E: And by and large, you know, we as a company, we try to be that way, yeah? We have all kind of different people.

D: Mmmmm.

E: But, I think culturally there is some differences, yeah?

D: Okay. Um, is there any examples you could think of, like how when there’s different cultures, how does that relationship work? Like...or not work?...Have you experienced, like, in the company, or have you seen something that could be culturally related...maybe conflicts, or...?
E: [laughs] God, I hate to...I’m not racist, you know, I think when I say this, but sometimes when there’s people from other cultures, there not as...there work ethnic is not as good maybe...not as strong.

D: Okay.

E: And to me, you know, it...and I’m not racial, yeah? I’m not, I’m not...

D: Mmm, yeah.

E: But it seems that the Japanese seems to be harder working.

D: Okay.

E: Or...or...or Asians in general, they...they...they work harder it seems. Filipinos like that, yeah? Versus, um, maybe other cultures, to me they’re more laid back.

D: Okay.

E: Yeah, so definitely, there is. I’ve seen it.

D: Would you say that causes problems at work?

E: Sometimes.

D: Yeah?

E: Not major problems, but...but that’s...I don’t know if it’s true in every case, yeah?

D: Mmm.

E: Um, I’ve just seen examples of it, but I don’t know that that’s a general truth...

D: Mmm, mmm.

E: ...you know?

D: Okay. Yeah, I was just thinking, there’s differences between cultures such as concepts of time, and it’s not being racist. There are differences there.

E: And I think Asians, generally speaking, tend to be hard working.
D: Mmm. Yeah.

E: I think it’s just a bias. Not to say other cultures don’t have that, but I’ve seen where other cultures don’t seem to have that...

D: Mmm.

E: More often than I’ve seen it in the Asian culture.

D: Mmm, okay. Uh, okay, I’ll try to keep yours shorter so I can stay on the schedule.

E: Okay.

D: But, um, just a really quick couple of questions. How would you rate your relationship with Andrew? Say, on a scale of 1 to 10. Say, 1 is a stranger and 10 is a awesome relationship.

E: I would say my relationship with him is about an 8.

D: Okay. Eight. Okay, um, do you think personal level knowledge, like outside of...knowing a person kind of outside of work, um, does that help with their work relationship?

E: Sheesh.

D: Is that needed, or is that maybe...you don’t need that?

E: Yeah, I think...I think that helps. I think it helps. I don’t think you need it, but I think it helps.

D: Okay.

E: Because I think if you get along outside of work, you gotta get along at work also, yeah?

D: Mmm.

E: And you tend to be more forgiving, I think.
D: Mmm. Okay.

E: But at the same time, it could hurt, too, though.

D: Mmm.

E: Yeah? If you're good friends, and then they...maybe they slack off, or they...then it becomes a real...I don’t know, that’s kind of a...

D: They say sometimes don’t do business with your friends, yeah?

E: Yup. Yup.

D: The negative side to it. Okay, um, yeah...is there anything that you thought of that you wanted to share?

E: No I think I’ve said enough already. [laughs]

D: Okay.
D: So tell me a little bit about the work that you do.

C: My job title is office manager, human resources.

D: Okay.

C: Um, as an office manager I help, um, the Vice President, COO, um, to pretty much manage the office procedures...

D: Okay.

C: ...you know, so that the office can keep, um, running, I mean, you know?

D: Okay.

C: Yeah, so and when he’s gone, um, you know, he doesn’t have to worry.

D: Mmhmm.

C: So, I take care of pretty much all the supplies, all the office equipment, um, deal with all the outside vendors...

D: Okay.

C: You know, just you’re, yeah, daily procedures that you need to do to keep the office running.

D: Make sure everything’s running.

C: Yeah, that’s what the office manager does.

D: Okay.
C: As far as human resources, right, I manage and take care of all their employee personal records and, and whatever needs they have.

D: Okay, um...have you always been in this, um, field, or area?

C: No.

D: No?

C: I joined the company in July of 2002...

D: Okay.

C: ...as an office manager, HR...

D: Okay.

C: ...and that, and pretty much, that’s when my training started.

D: Oh, okay. That’s the best type! (laughs)

C: (laughs) Yeah. A lot of training on the human resource side was from Andrew, and also, we became members of [removed organization name].

D: Oh, okay.

C: So that’s when I was attending a lot of sessions on human resources, on, um, learning the state employment laws.

D: Oh.

C: So, the what you can and cannot say, what you can do and cannot do, and those things, and...

D: Oh.

C: ...Andrew has a lot of, um, experience and background in human resources, so he was also a very good, you know, um, supervisor, a good teacher.

D: Okay.
C: Mmhmm. Um, office manager work, um, being that I worked in large companies, um, national companies, and large local company, pretty much office manager duties is pretty familiar.

D: Oh, okay.

C: Yeah, the clerical part and things like that I’m familiar with, so...

D: Okay.

C: That wasn’t too painful.

D: You have a lot of experience on that side then.

C: Yeah, it was pretty much, yeah. Part of it was self-taught, or, you know, lot of it is common sense things...

D: Kay.

C: ...cause I like dealing with vendors, and, you know, I don’t mind.

D: Mmhmm. Okay. So you’re here since 2002?

C: Mmhmm.

D: Okay, um, so what’s a typical day at work like?

C: (Sighs)...Okay, when it’s a typical day at work...um, for one thing, it’s very enjoyable coming in to work at [removed company name] because the office is very nice, um, the people that we have are very nice, so, um, a typical day is just, pretty much getting into my office manager things. You know, making sure...everyday I have something going on, like, you know, is today the day to order supplies, or...

D: Okay.

C: ...you know, but, it’s also burning out, um, dousing fires, you know?

D: Oh.
C: Like sometimes....

D: Problems and stuff?

C: Yeah, problems will arise. Well, this copier’s down, or Cathy, I need toner, or, you know, things like that, so...

D: Okay.

C: ...but, other than that, you know, it’s a very nice place to be.

D: Okay.

C: So it’s very enjoyable.

D: Yeah, it seems like it’s very professional here.

C: Mmhmm.

D: From when you first walk in, it’s like, “oh!” (laughs) Um...

C: I didn’t answer that question to well, but, you know, it’s pretty...office manager is a lot of clerical, and human resources is just, you know, if everybody’s files are in order, or I don’t have any, um, employee complaints or anything, it’s pretty much a quiet day on the HR side. (laughs)

D: Oh, okay.

C: Pretty much all caught up, you know.

D: Yeah, that’s a good thing then.

C: Mmhmm. Cause HR also does the hiring, and, and also assists supervisors in the determination of employees...

D: Oh.

C: ...so, if all employees are doing well and we’re fully staffed, then put it this way, um, uh, normal workday is really good, it flows really well. (laughs)
D: Wow.

C: Cause you’re full staffed...

D: Yeah.

C: ...and yeah, and you don’t have to...

D: Runs smoothly.

C: ...do the job search, I mean, applicant search and everything, and, but, yeah.

D: Okay. Okay, so, you were married [referring to Andrew] before...

C: Mhm...

D: ...working here?

C: Mhm...

D: Okay. Um...hmm...what are some of your experiences with your co-workers? Like, people kind of on the same level as you, your peers, organizational level?

C: Um, as far as business experiences?

D: Yeah, or anything at work. How has your experiences been with everyone that you work with?

C: Um...very good, because what I’ve done, what I do, um, also, as an office manager...I kind of extend myself into the departments, like, go beyond my office duties.

D: Uh huh.

C: Um, I supervise our mail courier...

D: Okay.

C: ...um, and he also runs the postage machine. Cause we also mail, um, meter all our mail going out.

D: Okay.
C: So whenever, um, he needs assistance, I become a courier.

D: Oh.

C: I also can run the mail, and if it’s a lot, I’ll take it to the post office, or drop it down in the mail drops here, or whatever.

D: Uh huh.

C: Um, I also, I also assist the other departments, like, if they need filing, or, or, or what else, or if they need things to be whatever, you know, I’ll extend myself.

D: So you work with everybody.

C: Yeah, so my experience with everybody, I think, I hope, um, everybody enjoys working with me because I enjoy working with them, you know.

D: Mmhmm.

C: And that’s pretty much what Andrew expects, you know, because we’re also family member, you know, we, he expects all his employees to put out the 100%, but for family members, he expects us to go beyond that 100% to be like 150% every day, so...yeah.

D: Was there other family members that work here, too?

C: Um, the president also has, um, his children working here.

D: Oh, okay.

C: Yeah, and they, they’re, yeah, very good.

D: Okay.

C: So I also, like, um, we also do receptionist relief. The departments will go and relieve the receptionists, but if the departments are short staffed, I’m up front, too.

D: Wow.
C: So my stuff gets put on hold, because that becomes priority, so I kind of like, yeah...my working experience here is very good, very broad.

D: Wow. That must keep it interesting, yeah? Doing a lot of different things?

C: So right now, too, what I’ve been doing is because our admin assistant who assists the president and two other account execs, um, I’m from 9 to 1 every day I’m an admin clerk.

D: Okay.

C: I’m helping her doing all her filing, and copying things, or mailing things, and then from 1 to 4 or 1 to 5 I’m back in office manager HR.

D: Oh, lot of hats you’re wearing.

C: So...Yeah, so it’s kind of fun. I like to keep busy.

D: Yeah. That’s important I think, though.

C: Mhmmm.

D: Keep it interesting. Kay, um...I don’t know if I should call him your husband, or your boss? (laughs)

C: My boss. (laughs)

D: Okay, your boss. So tell me about some of your experiences with your boss. I guess just at work...work related experiences.

C: Okay, um, well, since he is my husband, um, we have a very good working relationship, because we’ve already said that when we come to work it’s business.

D: Okay.

C: It’s strictly business.

D: Okay.
C: Um, so, um, despite that I’m, you know, I’m his wife, you know, and, and, um, he is my supervisor, still yet, you know, he has to, we always remember, yes, you are my staff, and you know, there’s no special treatment, there’s, everything is fair, you know, and, and that’s what makes it easier to work, you know?

D: Mmm, okay.

C: You know, I look at him as my supervisor and he looks at me as his staff, you know?

D: Okay.

C: And then when we’re at home, it’s like, “Okay can we talk about work?” And sometimes he’s like, “No, we’re not talking about work.” “Okay.”

D: Keep it separate?

C: Keep it separate, yeah. But he’s a very fair, um, um, how should I say...you know, being an owner of the company as well, you know, and everything is by the book, by the laws and very fair.

D: Okay. Okay. How much contact do you have with him during work?

C: Um, when you say contact, if I was work...

D: [unintelligible]

C: Oh. Um...

D: Like in-person, or email...

C: Um...both.

D: Yeah?

C: Yeah.

D: Is it mainly those two?

C: Yes.
D: In-person and email?

C: Mhmm.

D: How many hours would you say, like, in a week, how many hours of interaction would you have at work...during work?

C: Um...

D: An estimate...

C: I would say maybe about two hours a day.

D: Okay.

C: Um, so, yeah, 10 hours a week.

D: Okay.

C: I would say that’s the average because it depends what kind of projects we’re working on. It might be where we have to meet for longer.

D: Okay.

C: You know, proposals come up, on equipment or something where, you know...so it’s varied.

D: Okay.

C: Yeah.

D: Okay, um...what would you say are some of the positive things about your relationship, your work relationship, with Andrew?

C: Um...

D: Like, what stands out for you? Some of the positive things.
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C: Um... he’s very fair. Yeah. Very fair, and very, um... um, he... he empathizes with his staff. You know, he always looks at, um, the entire picture, the whole picture, before he makes a decision.

D: Okay.

C: Mmhmm. And, um, he’s very easy to talk to... and always very professional in business...

D: Okay.

C: ... to everybody, even me. (laughs)

D: (laughs) Yeah, that’s... that’s pretty surprising, because you hear a lot of people, when they talk about how their family works together, and they just... oh, they just get into it at work and stuff, yeah?

C: See with Andrew, too, one thing good about him as, as the boss, and I’m not saying this because he’s my husband, but knowing... being that I worked in other companies...

D: Mmhmm.

C: ... he knows when there’s the right time and the right place to put his guard down, you know, so that’s why he... his... his, um... the way he acts is always professional in business.

D: Mmm.

C: Yeah, you hardly see him, maybe, joking around, or, you know, I mean, he’s not real stern or whatever all the time, you know. He’s a very, how should I say, nice person to talk to, easy person to get along...

D: Okay.
C: ...but, you know...and I think...I...and I think sometimes that’s why his staff are, maybe, um, might not...might be afraid of how to approach him, but you know, it’s like, you know, um, they know that they can come and talk to him at any time...

D: Oh.

C: ...about anything, and you know...

D: Okay.

C: ...yeah, he’s very understanding, and...mhmhm.

D: Okay...Okay. Is there any negative things, or things that you think could be changed in the relationship...work relationship?

C: Mmm...

D: Anything could use work, or...?

C: I’m sorry?

D: Anything that could use some work, or, not work, but, that could be improved?

C: Mmm...I don’t think so. I mean...I’m just looking at, you know, like, if...if there was another person doing my position. It’s hard to say, you know?

D: Mmhmm.

C: But for me. Uh unh.

D: Okay...Okay, um...let’s see...What would you feel are some of the reasons for, um, some of the positive aspects of the relationship? Like, you know how you mention, um, you know, he’s, how he gets along, easy to talk to...with everybody...

C: He’s a very good communicator, too.

D: Good communicator?

C: He communicates very well.
D: Okay.

C: And he’s very detailed and follow through.

D: Okay.

C: That’s what’s good, too. Uh huh.

D: Okay. How would you say your relationship with Andrew at work compares to other staffs relationship with him?

C: Okay, that’s a...that’s one where, I guess because being his spouse...

D: Yeah.

C: ...um...um...

D: It’s gonna be different...

C: Maybe it’s easier for me to approach him?

D: Yeah.

C: Yeah, so, um, when...as, as his spouse and being office manager, HR, using my, as my role, as those positions, you know, I can...I can sometimes tell it like it is to him.

D: Mmm. Mhmmm. Okay.

C: You know, and that’s when, sometimes he will, “Oh!” Take a step back and say, “Whoa! Yeah, I mean, you know, you kind of brought that to light here.” You know?

D: Mmm.

C: Because I’m now an employee...um, maybe, on the outside here, and then maybe another employee might not be able to...to approach him the way how I would say it...

D: Mmhmm.

C: ...being that I am, you know...you know what I mean, yeah?

D: Yeah.
C: (laughs) Yeah, so...

D: Easier to be very open...

C: Yeah, exactly. Yeah. But, you know, um, that’s one thing with Andrew, too, you know, um, even though I’m his spouse, I can’t just barge into his office.

D: Oh.

C: You know, I have to, “Knock, knock. Can I come and ask you a question?” You know, kind of thing?

D: Yeah.

C: It’s like, “Okay.” You know, so...

D: Yeah.

C: You see, that’s the business part.

D: Mmm.

C: That, you know...

D: So that’s kind of similar with everybody.

C: Mmhmm.

D: Everyone has to do that.

C: Mmhmm.

D: Kay, um... let’s see... what do you think are, kind of like, the basic foundations, or requirements for having a good work relationship? What are some...

C: I think it’s attitude.

D: Okay.

C: The positive attitude of individuals.

D: Okay.
C: Um...let's see...um...good relationship, yeah, it’s an attitude...pretty much that’s it. Attitude is, yeah, it covers everything, you know? It’s like, how you look at things, you know?
D: Yeah.
C: How you look at your work, I mean, it’s...it’s...that’s how you’re gonna function everyday.
D: Mmhmm.
C: It’s what you make of it.
D: Yeah, and that’s not just work, that’s like everything...
C: Everything, you know. If somebody gave you a project, and, it was like...you take it, and, you know, you do it the best you can. It’s not like, “Oh, another...”
D: Yeah...”More work?”
C: “...paper I have to type?” You know what I mean?
D: Yeah.
C: So, you know, that’s it. It’s just the positive attitude.
D: Yeah.
C: And your attitude of...yeah.
D: Okay. Uh, how would you view yourself and Andrew ethnically...Or, racially?...Like, how would you view your race or ethnicity?...What do you identify with most?...Is it like, Asian...?
C: Being Japanese?
D: Japanese?
C: Yeah, or Asian.
D: Okay.
C: Mmhmm.
D: Both Japanese?
C: Yes.
D: Okay. Okay, what do you think is special about intercultural relationships in the workplace?...So if you have different...people of different cultures or similar cultures...?
C: I think it teaches us how to...um...how should I say...teaches us how to become a better person as far as, um...um, knowing...knowing many different types of people, because everybody is different, because their lifestyle, their culture, is different...
D: Mmm.
C: ...so we...we learn how to deal with...with all different types of people.
D: Kay.
C: You know, so as far as when, so when it’s time to interact with a different race, you know, it’s not you’re shocked...you’re not shocked, you know? It’s like...you know, so if...even if an African American man was to walk in our lobby, you know, we’re not like [gasp].
D: Yeah.
C: You know, we’re like, we know how to react to and how to...how to interact with him, you know? And I...and I think that’s good, instead of just being pretty much stereotyped, and just dealing, you know, having only Asians working for you or Caucasians, or, you know.
D: Yeah.
C: Cause we have all...all kinds.
D: Would you say this is a pretty multicultural organization?

C: Yes.

D: Yeah?...Okay, how would you rate your relationship with Andrew, say on a scale of...work relationship...from 1 to 10. Like one is if you’re a stranger and 10 is the best relationship.

C: I would say it’s about...um, I would say it’s a 9.

D: Okay.

C: Mhm. But, you know, there’s always room for improvements. But, I would say it’s a 9. I can’t rate it a 10, because, um...mhm...yeah, that would be like...it’s close to a 10 though, because he’s...because he’s so fair and he’s...he’s...you know, he’s, like what I said before, he’s a really good boss.

D: Mmm.

C: So whoever comes into this position will be very lucky.

D: Wow.

C: Yeah, he’s a very good boss.

D: Um, do you feel like racial or ethnic issues can be sensitive in the workplace?

C: It can, but, um...um, how should I say...we...we kind of, um, have policies in our employee handbook, you know, about things like that...

D: Mhm.

C: ...and, um, to be honest, I don’t know, um, if other things are happening with our staff, you know.

D: Mhm.
C: If it is, I’m HR...that they should come and talk to me about it so I can help them to deal with it or address the issue, but we haven’t had issues about it.

D: Okay.

C: And I think because of our multiethnic, yeah, employees that we have.

D: Mmhmm. You think that kind of helps with all that?

C: Uh huh.

D: Okay, I better try to wrap it up here.

C: Okay, I won’t talk as much.

D: No, no. (laughs) That’s all right.

C: (laughs)

D: Good timing actually. Um, it’s kind of hard with this, being his wife, but say, if you can try and think objectively...um, how much personal knowledge, say, like outside of work knowledge, would you say, um, is necessary for work relationship? Or is it not necessary at all?...Like, do you need to know someone kind of on a personal level to have a good work relationship with them, or...

C: I think, um, there’s a time and place for everything, you know? When you’re in your working environment, you know, sometimes it’s necessary to keep the personal experiences or relationships aside.

D: Okay.

C: You know? And you have to deal with your employee, how should I say, on an even...you know, even slate, like, you know...staff to staff, not staff to friend, or staff to spouse.

D: Yeah.
C: So, you know, I don’t know if that answered your question.

D: Yeah, so better to kind of keep it separate...

C: It’s always...it’s best to keep it separate. Um, as far as, um, knowing someone personally, um...I’ve been in...I’ve been in a previous job where, yeah, I mean, my supervisor, um, I kind of...I kind of knew her a little bit personally. I mean, we had a really good relationship, but, you know, we knew where to draw the line.

D: Mmhm.

C: You know, up to how much personal information you know, you know? And try not to favor each other at work.

D: Okay.

C: But, you know, it does...it always helps the relationship, but gotta know where to draw the line when you’re in a business environment and working. Outside of work, you can let your guard down and...

D: Okay...Okay. Um, so, would you say you could have a good relationship, work relationship, without any personal knowledge?...Is that possible?

C: Mmm...

D: I know that’s kind of a general...

C: Yeah, that’s kind of...mmm...sometimes when you...I think it does help the work relationship, because then if you know a little bit of their personal life, it kind of helps you to understand that person more.

D: Mmhm.

C: You know, if a situation arises, you would understand why this person is acting this way or why this person is like that.
D: Okay.

C: Yeah, it gives you more understanding of that individual.

D: Okay...Okay, anything that you thought of, um, in this process that you want to share about work relationships, or anything that you think is important?...Urn...

C: No.

D: No? Okay.
Appendix E. Lancer and Fern Excerpts

Lancer

D: Um, if it’s okay, could you tell me any type of story about Fern?

L: Okay...um [laughs]...let’s see...what kind of story though?

D: Any kind of personal story...um...

L: Oh, okay...so um, Fern has, uh, she has dogs, and a couple of months ago one of her dogs got very sick. And so she had called me early that morning to let me know that her and her husband had to make a decision about what to do with the dog, and...and uh, they needed to do it when the grandson was out of the house, ‘cause the grandson was very, uh, close to the dog.

D: Oh.

L: And I told her, ‘Well, you know, Fern, whatever you need to do, go ahead and do it, and that’s fine, and we’ll just...we’ll just work something out. We’ll figure out your schedule later. You, you know, you have health fairs coming up that could count towards your time, and we’ll just figure it out later.’ So Fern said that was fine, and so she, um...she went ahead and sent the grandson off to school and prepared the dog and took the dog to, um...I believe it was UH. Um, she took the dog to UH to euthanize the dog. And then, um, and then I told her, you know, don’t come back to work, ‘cause it’s not...you know, you’re going to have to process, and go through some type of grieving, so just ahead and go home and we’ll talk more later. So she was really good. She kept me posted. She said, ‘Okay, we just dropped our grandson off. We’re going home to pick up the dog,’ and then, ‘We’re going to be on our way. It’ll take us about an hour to get to the university to drop the dog off,’ and stuff. So she did all those things, and she just kept me
informed all the way through, which, you know, on a not so good day, it's not good to persistently call me, but other than that it's fine! But, you know...and I'm just very appreciative that she thought enough to keep me informed about what was going on and that she didn’t leave me out of the loop, um, so that was, I think that was very considerate of her to do.

_Fern_

D: Yeah. Okay. Um, if you can think of anything, could you tell me a personal story about Lancer? Any kind of...something you remember about her that you could just tell like a short story about?...It could be personal, it could be, like, work related...Um, maybe some event that happened at work or something.

F: Um, I remember once...um, she sent me out to the North Shore.

D: Okay.

F: Um, and...well I decided to go out to the North Shore, but it was a project that we were both working on, and I was all excited. My position was new, and I was really excited about going out to the North Shore to...for the day. And I called...we...our normal practice is to call in to the office to say that we’re...okay, we’re on our way out to the designated area. So it’s checking in, yeah? So I called to check in, but I called to tell them that my truck wouldn’t start that morning cause I had...my battery was dead.

D: Oh.

F: But I was so excited and I was counting on doing this all week. And this...if I could get out to the North Shore would enable me to, um, make a successful project. This was the beginning of a project.

D: Oh.
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F: And so, I went out, started up my truck, and it wouldn’t start. My battery was dead.

D: Oh no.

F: And I panicked, and I thought, “Aw, how am I going to get to do this?”

D: Yeah.

F: I mean, I’m gonna look like a failure. It’s my first day they do the project, the first day of the project, and already I cannot make it. So I call up my neighbor, and I said, ‘My battery’s...’ ...I called my husband and my husband works in town and I live in Wahiawa. I said, ‘Can you help me? My battery’s dead.’ And he’s like, ‘No, I’m all the way over here. How am I gonna help you?’ ‘Well can’t you come and pick me up?’ He goes, ‘And then what, you gotta use the car?’ I’m like, ‘Yeah! And maybe you can start the car for me.’ He was like, ‘No, no, I cannot help you.’ So then I called my daughter. She just woke up. It was like 7 o’clock in the morning. She’s like, ‘Mom, I really tired. I had to work late last night.’ She couldn’t help me. So then I called the office and I tell Lancer, ‘My battery’s dead and I don’t know what I’m gonna do, but I tell you what. I haven’t given up. I’ll call you back later.’ So throughout...anyway, to make a long story short, my neighbor helps me and she lets me borrow this battery pack.

D: Oh yeah.

F: It’s about like this big. You can start your car by yourself, basically. You just plug it on, make sure you get ‘em positive in, you know, the right place...get back in the car, crank it up, and it starts.

D: Oh.

F: So I call in to tell her first of all my battery’s dead. Then I call in to tell her, ‘Okay, I got the battery pack.’ Then for every time I stop, I would call her and tell her, ‘Guess
what? I got it started. Guess what? I got it started.' And she thought it was really funny.

And I think on the third call...on the third call, she said, ‘Okay, well you know what, you can just turn around and go home already.’ [laughs]


F: Cause she’s probably like, ‘What? You gonna call me every time you get your car started?’ But I thought it...to me it was funny. I really don’t know what it was here.

D: Yeah.

F: [laughs] ‘You know that Fern is driving me crazy!’ But I was all the way on the North Shore...and you know I’m used to the North Shore cause that’s my home yeah?...um, but I thought that was funny, did you think that was funny?

D: That’s pretty funny.

F: And...and I think I’m Lancer’s most trying and pesky employee.

D: Oh really?

F: Because I need that one-on-one attention from her. I need to know she’s there for me daily, because why am I doing what I’m doing? Partially...not only to please my clients, but to know that I’m being...I’m being efficient in what I’m doing. Who’s the best person to ask, but your supervisor?

D: Yeah.

F: If she cannot be there for you, to answer even the smallest questions, or for the smallest direction or guidance, in any day, may it be near or far...if I call her from D.C. and say, ‘You know what, I had a bad day here.’ My boss should be able to help me through that.

D: Mmm.
F: Or give me direction. That’s her job. That’s what she gets paid for.
Appendix F. Illustration of Dyads Grouped by Gender Combinations

Female Sup – Female Sub

- Lancer-4.00 & Fern-3.43
- Miss P.-n/a & Ms. Aloha-4.14
- J.T.-2.86 & Cameron-n/a

Male Sup – Female Sub

- Mike-4.57 & Michelle-5.00
- Martin-4.57 & Kristen-4.86

Female Sup – Male Sub

- Wendy-3.86 & Aran-n/a

Male Sup – Male Sub

- James-3.57 & Dexter-4.14
- Andrew-5.00 & Kylo-4.86
- Evan-3.57 & Merle-4.29
- Andrew-4.71 & Edward-4.43

Key =

- Low PE
- Limited PE
- High PE

Notes. PE = Personal Exchange; individuals’ LMX ratings are beside their names.
Appendix G. Illustration of Dyads Grouped By Age Difference

### Similar in Age (≤ 10 Years Difference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th>PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss P.-n/a &amp; Ms. Aloha-4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James-3.57 &amp; Dexter-4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James-4.57 &amp; AI-4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T.-2.86 &amp; Cameron-n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike-4.57 &amp; Michelle-5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl-4.57 &amp; Bob-n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew-4.71 &amp; Edward-4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew-5.00 &amp; Cathy-4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dissimilar in Age (> 10 Years Difference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th>PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancer-4.00 &amp; Fern-3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy-3.86 &amp; Aran-n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan-3.57 &amp; Merle-4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin-4.57 &amp; Carol-n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin-4.57 &amp; Kristen-4.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew-5.00 &amp; Kyle-4.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Low PE
- Limited PE
- High PE

**Notes.** PE = Personal Exchange; individuals' LMX ratings are beside their names.
Appendix H. Exploratory Survey Results

Based on questionnaire data including the Schwartz Value Survey and LMX-7, three sets of relationships were examined. The first examined whether basic individual values (e.g. benevolence, achievement, etc.) were related to quality of leader-member exchange (Table 3). The second attempted to determine whether differences in value scores between leaders and members were correlated with quality of leader-member exchanges (Table 4). The third tested whether differences in value scores between leaders and members were associated with corresponding differences in LMX ratings (Table 4). None of these correlations were found to be statistically significant at the .001 level of significance.

Table 3. Correlations Between Value Scores and LMX Ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Value</th>
<th>Superior LMX Rating (n=13)</th>
<th>Subordinate LMX Rating (n=7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>-.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>-.504</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Correlations Between Differences in Superior-Subordinate Value Scores and LMX Ratings (n=6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Value Difference</th>
<th>Superior LMX Rating</th>
<th>Subordinate LMX Rating</th>
<th>Difference in LMX Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>-.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>-.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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