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Individuals in possession of skills to communicate appropriately and effectively across cultural boundaries will be those in a position of leadership in a global world. Of the total student population in the United States, less than 1.5% chooses to study abroad, and 55% of those who do study abroad opt for less than a semester living in another culture. Preparing students in advance is essential to maximize the limited opportunity to develop interculturally competent communication skills. Despite the ardent pleas of twenty-seven years of research on the topic, students continue to venture abroad with little to no training, expected to gain vital intercultural communication skills largely through unprepared chance experiences.

The pre-departure training program developed for this project attempts to fill a critical gap. Designed utilizing theoretical foundations, the three-day training course provides students with necessary communication and behavioral skills for their sojourn abroad. Intercultural communication competence is considered a vital skill in the 21st century. With a very small percentage of U.S. students participating in the study abroad experience, lack of pre-departure training compromises student ability to develop
appropriate and effective communication; this oversight is, ultimately, negligent and
dangerous to our nation as a whole. The three-day training course provides students with
tools and concepts regarding intercultural communication competence, rhetorical
sensitivity, and specific communication behaviors and attitudes to develop during their
study abroad experience. A multi-method approach, including interactive lectures,
critical incidents, role-play, and cross-cultural dialogues is used in the culture-general
training. Sample needs assessments, a complete three-day training course with abstracts
for training modules and course materials are included in the project. Training is
designed to actively engage the learner, appeal to visual, aural, and kinesthetic learners,
and apply concepts from training immediately. Post-training evaluation is also presented.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

A Global Society

Our world today is vastly different than a mere 20 years ago. Exponential increases in international travel, the technology revolution, increasingly interdependent global commerce systems and economies, along with the growth of multi-national corporations serve as key indicators of globalization. The most recent data available shows a steady annual increase in the number of U.S. American residents traveling abroad (see Appendix A and Appendix B) (ITA, 2007a, 2007b; Kozlow, 2006; Leo, 2006). Inda and Rosaldo (2008) defined globalization as:

An intensely interconnected world—one where the rapid flows of capital, people, goods, images, and ideologies draw more and more of the globe into webs of interconnection, compressing our sense of time and space and making the world feel smaller and distances shorter. (p. 6)

The global society, characterized by motion, mixture, contacts, and linkages is viewed as a process of time-space compression (Harvey, 1989). Travelers currently travel from one side of the globe to the other in a matter of hours, maintaining personal contact via satellite technology throughout the journey. People from around the globe are immediately available through technological advances, and products are packaged by multinational corporations for global consumption versus national consumption.

The pervasiveness and rapidity of transformation and consequent cultural exposure has occurred at an astonishing rate, enabling “increasing numbers of people to reach farther and faster, exchanging information, knowledge, and money like never before” (Rosen, Digh, Singer, & Phillips, 2000, p. 36). National and international
statistics indicate communication technology use, such as cell phones, computers, and social networking systems, has substantially increased in the last 20 years, validating evolution of the global village to a global society as complete (Facebook, n.d.; Kominski & Newburger, 1999; U.S. Census Bureau, 2007, 2009).

McPhail (2002) underscored the communication aspect of this global evolution, emphasizing “international communication will have a greater impact on the future of the planet than exploration and transportation combined” (p. 25). What does this mean? The transition from intranational communication to intercultural communication is poised to profoundly affect our future, with intercultural communication skills viewed as both essential and as the new “global literacy” in the 21st century (Rosen et al., 2000 Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). In the wake of sweeping changes generated by increased international travel, technology, media advances, and global business, cultural exchanges have increased as never before in history. If these cultural exchanges are to result in understanding and successful outcomes, participants in globalization must develop appropriate and effective intercultural communication. Understanding and successful outcomes to intercultural communication, or lack thereof, will critically impact the future of the planet.

Our exposure as a nation to cultures other than our own is further extended by the fact that nearly 30% of the United States’ workforce is composed of minority group members and immigrants, with a persistent increase in numbers of legal and illegal immigrants (Camarota, 2007; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). Data from the United States’ Census (2004) indicated approximately 33.5 million people (or 11.7% of the
United States’ population) are foreign-born; with 78% of the foreign born population arriving from Latin America or Asia. More than 300 languages are now spoken in the United States, and statistics show more than 150 languages present in schools nationwide (Headden & Rodriguez-Bernfeld, 1995; Leslie & Glick, 1991). Copeland (as cited in Copeland & Griggs, 1985) compellingly stated “international no longer means ‘outside the country;’ it can be as close as the hallway” (p. xvii). Intercultural contact has become immediate, necessary, and common.

The necessity for individuals and nations to learn to communicate and cope with one another is the essence of intercultural communication. Samovar, Porter, and McDaniel (2007) stated “this is what intercultural communication is about: dealing with changes in the world’s fabric of social relationships and the challenges of managing the changes at both the international and domestic level” (p. 3). Thus, the imperative exists for training to communicate with other cultures both within and beyond national borders, due to substantial increases in immigration, international interactions, and time-space compression of globalization. Yet, as the world has moved inexorably toward global interconnectedness, consistent calls to assess the mission of higher education with regard to promoting international education and training in intercultural communication skills have gone largely unheeded (Jackson, 2008). A great deal of discussion has transpired regarding intercultural communication skills over the last 25 years; however, the perspective has remained myopic, failing to move beyond discussion into the reality of training students (Bollag, 2003; Brein & David, 1971; Brislin, 1989; Brislin, Cushner,
Cherrie, &Yong, 1986; Byram, 1997; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, Jackson, 2008; Martin, 1989).

A Global Society and Education

Education in the United States has been criticized for its inability to meet the pressing need for globally literate and culturally intelligent citizens. According to Rosen et al. (2000), global literacy is comprised of four constantly evolving interdependent and interrelated forms, with each building a foundation for the next; global literacy “is a state of seeing, thinking, acting, and mobilizing in culturally mindful ways” (p. 57). Peterson (2004) defined cultural intelligence as:

The ability to engage in a set of behaviors that use skills (i.e., language or interpersonal skills) and qualities (e.g., tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility) that are tuned appropriately to the culture-based values and attitudes of the people with whom one interacts. (p. 89)

The terms global literacy and cultural intelligence are virtually synonymous with intercultural communication competence, which will be defined in-depth in the literature review.

Institutions of higher education have been admonished to internationalize education (Brustein, 2007). Without exposure and interaction with dissimilar cultures, U.S. American students are falling behind (Kagan & Stewart, 2004). Internationalization was defined by Tarp (2006) as “international initiatives taken by educational institutions to increase the students’ intercultural understanding and competence” (p. 157). While most institutions of higher education in the United States have added diversity or international course requirements to curricula, Brustein (2007) asserted that these components alone are not enough to prepare U.S. students to be globally competent,
ultimately leaving students with a lack of skills “to address our national security needs, and unable to compete successfully in the global marketplace” (p. 382).

**Study Abroad**

Intercultural communication competence has emerged, undeniably, as a critical global skill (Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006). The more immediate and intimate the contact with cultures other than our own, the greater the need for programs to promote successful communication within those interactions (Triandis, 2004). Individuals capable of competent, appropriate, and effective communication, as well as the ability to manage issues of diversity, will be held at a premium. Individuals capable of such communication skills will possess an important competitive advantage: the ability to emerge as globally literate leaders (Rosen et al., 2000). Study abroad is the definitive answer and international component necessary for preparing our students to engage with other cultures and develop the behavioral skills necessary for interculturally appropriate and effective communication.

Viewed as an invaluable key component, study abroad prepares students to become “global citizens and professionals in today’s diverse world” (Jackson, 2008, p. 349). Highly regarded by executives of global firms, study abroad engenders student knowledge beyond local matters, exposes other cultural perspectives and worldviews, and provides the opportunity for development of intercultural communication skills (Stuart, 2007). Former Secretary of State Colin Powell supported international study as even more critical, correlating those who study abroad as future leaders capable of seeking “joint solutions to problems, and . . . create[ing] lasting partnerships to meet our shared
concerns” (as cited in Open Doors, 2003, para. 2). In a world faced daily with threats of war and terrorism, the imperative for understanding differences and the ability to communicate across those differences is without equal and essential to national security itself. Globalization demands individuals with interculturally competent communication skills, capable of seeking joint solutions across cultural boundaries, ultimately affecting world peace.

Intercultural knowledge and understanding ultimately arise out of tensions created when “different systems of knowledge confront each other” (Wurzel, 2004, p. 2); this type of understanding cannot be obtained through cognitive learning alone. The difference between intellectual versus practical study abroad was highlighted by Byram and Feng (2006) as “progression from gaining an encyclopaedic knowledge to conceptually constructing interculturalism and empathy in experiencing a different culture” (p. 4). While intercultural contact itself may not produce behavioral change, it does provide the opportunity for authentic interaction, an activity producing intercultural communication competence when combined with prior theoretical training.

The opportunity for student study abroad is vital, necessary for successful careers, essential for understanding the global perspective, imperative to a peaceful world, and without substitute (Peck, 2005; Samovar et al., 2007; Stuart, 2007; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). Sanford J. Unger, President of Goucher College in Baltimore, asserted the position that, without knowing another culture, a student is not considered educated (as cited in Stuart, 2007, p. 19). Higher education without an international component is no
longer viewed as sufficient to distinguish United States’ students as educated (Kagan & Stewart, 2004; NAFSA, 2003).

Initial findings from a 10-year study of learning outcomes for student study abroad (the GLOSSARI project) emphasized the positive outcomes of study abroad: improved academic performance upon return to individual home campuses; higher graduation rates; and improved knowledge of cultural practices and context (Sutton & Rubin, 2004). The significance of context, specifically cultural context, relates to knowledge of cultural setting, interactions with others, and individual reactions (Redden, 2010). The ability to understand intercultural context cannot be acquired through pure cognitive learning; it must be experienced to be understood.

Statement of the Problem

The future of the United States depends, at least in part, on its ability to communicate effectively and appropriately across cultures in a global society. U.S. American insularity, global ignorance, and monolinguisum have been cited as impediments to both American innovation and its future leadership ability (Bollag, 2003; Stuart, 2007). Former Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, stressed U. S. Americans “cannot lead a world we don’t understand,” and further endorsed “making study abroad what it must become: a routine part of higher education” (as cited in NAFSA, 2003, p. 3). What then, is the problem? Government officials agree on the importance of study abroad, educators and intercultural experts agree on its significance, and NAFSA, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, has been promoting study abroad since its inception in 1948. The problem is that, while officials nod in the direction of
study abroad decade after decade and research over the last 27 years affirms the need for
student pre-departure training to maximize success in the endeavor, only 1.4% (or
241,791 students) of the total U.S. student population studies abroad (see Appendix C).
A large percentage does so with little to no pre-departure training. The United States is
falling behind.

Over twice as many international students study in the United States (3.5% or
582,984 students) (see Appendix D and Appendix E) compared to the number of U.S.
American students who study abroad (1.4% or 241,791) (NAFSA, 2009; Open Doors,
2008a). These statistics apply only to international students studying in the United
States; other countries around the globe also host international students. However, the
percentage of students from the United States studying abroad remains the same: a mere
1.4% of the total student population studies abroad. Jason Fenner, research analyst for
the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, stated the U.S. is “pretty far
behind other countries in study abroad” (as cited in Stuart, 2007, p. 17).

To further clarify the problem, of the 1.4% of U.S. students who do study abroad,
55% of the students chose short-term study abroad programs (2 to 8 weeks, summer or
January term abroad) (see Appendix F). Three types of study are available to students:
short-term, mid-length (one semester, and one or two quarters), and long-term (a full
academic year) (Open Doors, 2008b). The progressive trend has been for shorter periods
of time spent in the study abroad experience (see Appendix G). Consequently, time for
cultural interactions during the shortened study abroad experience is further limited due
to time constraints. Restricted study abroad experiences take on additional critical
importance because “the undergraduate years may be the only opportunity for individuals to gain the experience of living in another culture” (Bennett, Bennett, & Landis, 2004, p. 6).

With 1.4% of the total U.S. student population studying abroad, and 55% of those students in short-term programs, students must be prepared in advance of their departure with training necessary to develop interculturally competent communication behaviors. It is difficult to speculate on the reasoning behind student choice of shorter study abroad periods; a paucity of research exists on the subject. However, most universities and programs charge the same tuition for a semester abroad as they do for a semester at the student’s home university or college, as well as provide credits for courses taken abroad (Rooney, 2002). One might surmise that, without adequate pre-departure preparation, the anticipated stress of adapting to a dissimilar culture is daunting, and perhaps influences student preference to remain abroad for shorter periods of time in the familiarity of Western European culture. Redmond (2000) stated “the greater the difference [the greater the dissimilarity between cultures], the more one might expect problems in developing and maintaining relationships, meeting social needs, communicating effectively, and in general adapting to the culture” (p. 153). Study abroad for 2 to 8 weeks fairly precludes each of these issues due to the brevity of the stay. While 2 to 8 weeks provides time for exposure to another culture, there is less need to adapt to dissimilarity due to the short length of stay, less time to establish relationships, interact with the members of the host country, and develop intercultural communication competence. The United States is falling behind.
Statistics presented by the Institute of International Education (2008) illustrated the tendency for most U.S. students to choose Western Europe as a study abroad destination (the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and France were the top four destinations of students) (see Appendix G). While there has been a recent increase in the number of students choosing to study in China and India, the numbers remain relatively low. International students from India and China account for 26% of all international students in the United States (see Appendix H). The disparity in number of U.S. students choosing China or Pacific Rim countries presents a major discrepancy in educating students for cultural and business interactions. With only a small percentage of study abroad students choosing to study in Asian countries, we are in danger of becoming woefully ignorant of Asian cultures in comparison to other cultures. India and China are developing economies, representing 26% of the international students studying in the United States; however, only 7% of the total U.S. students are studying in India and China. Study in Eastern countries must be encouraged, as the numbers are unmistakably disproportionate (see Appendix H). The United States is falling behind.

**Rationale**

If a goal of study abroad is to develop intercultural communication competence and a global perspective, 2 to 8 weeks provides insufficient time to accomplish that objective. With the evolution and expansion of shorter-term study abroad, it is imperative not to blur “the distinction between education abroad and educational tourism” (Woolf, 2007, p. 503). Byram (1997) distinguished the difference between a tourist and a sojourner. A tourist travels to destinations wishing cultures to remain
unchanged; to experience a destination or culture, but ultimately to remain fundamentally unchanged by them. A sojourner, as distinguished from a tourist, produces effects on a culture through interaction, and, in turn, is affected through confrontation of questioned beliefs, behaviors, and meanings (Byram, 1997). Ideally, students are sojourners. They participate in study abroad to fundamentally change.

Thus, there can be little reservation to the logic of pre-departure preparation in advance of the actual experience itself. In support of pre-departure training, Paige, Cohen, Kappler, Chi, and Lassegard (2009) stated “quite simply, if language and culture were easy to learn, everyone would be fluent in another language and competent in another culture. Clearly this is not the case” (p. 1). Most students do not do well in study abroad situations without the benefit of pre-departure training; unable to maximize the educational opportunity, they remain unaware and unreflective (Vande Berg, 2007). As Vice-President of Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer of the Council on International Educational Exchange, Vande Berg (2007) asserted that, without the intervention of pre-departure training (at a minimum), United States students who study abroad are unable to cope well on their own, prone to behavior such as:

Avoiding meaningful contact with locals, traveling through their experience in groups of other withdrawn and culturally marginalized U.S. students, using English whenever possible, and complaining about the inferior teaching they receive: Too many U.S. students fit the profile. (p. 394)

Such behavior ultimately represents a loss to students in terms of the study abroad experience itself, the reputation of the institution they may represent, and to our nation as a whole.

NAFSA (2003) recognized five key barriers to U.S. study abroad:
1. a lack of leadership on the part of senior campus officials,
2. a lack of incentives for faculty members to become involved,
3. rigidity in curriculums,
4. a lack of preparation for students leaving to study abroad, and
5. assistance when they return. (Bollag, 2003, p. A34)

The focus of the current project will address one of the five recognized key barriers to U.S. student study abroad: poor preparation. Once a student has crossed any hurdles interfering with involvement in a study abroad program (e.g., lack of money, leadership, curriculum problems, lack of involvement by campus officials or faculty), the lack of pre-departure training most directly hinders students during international educational sojourns. Most of the research regarding pre-departure training and success has been targeted at business executives and expatriates, however, those studies can generalize to students dealing with some of the same issues (Adler, 1997; Kaweewong, 2002; Kohls, 2001; Lipp, 1991; Luenemann, 1991; Rosen et al., 2000; Schwarz, 1993; Tung, 1982). The multitude of potential benefits to be derived from study abroad (e.g., developing intercultural communication competence, learning second language skills, and developing a multicultural, diverse, and global perspective) are directly impacted by a lack of pre-departure training (Martin, 1989). To adapt and integrate socially, students must have training targeted to meet more than their immediate needs (i.e., housing transportation, insurance, visas). Students require awareness and knowledge of how cultures differ, training in application of intercultural skills, and training in communication behaviors, so when they do arrive in their host countries, they are already prepared with behavioral and communication skills to utilize and hone during their sojourn abroad.
Statement of Purpose: The Imperative for Student Pre-departure Training

Studies have addressed the lack of pre-departure training for executives and expatriates and ensuing consequences that generalize to student study abroad (Copeland & Griggs, 1985; Harris & Moran, 1987; Tung, 1982). Research has shown that lack of pre-departure training results in the premature return of as many as 20% to 50% of expatriate U.S. executives (Copeland & Griggs, 1985; Jack & Stage, 2005; Kohls, 2001). In developing countries or countries with distinctly dissimilar cultures, the early return figure soars as high as 70% (Copeland & Griggs, 1985). The cost to U.S. businesses can run upwards of $2 billion in direct costs and that figure has unquestionably increased in the ensuing years (Copeland & Griggs, 1985, Morris & Robie, 2001). However, the cost to companies is measured not only in dollars, but in indirect costs such as wasted effort and damaged reputations (Schwarz, 1993). Although some executives do not return early, they are considered ineffective in their job performance due to their inability to culturally adapt. As many as 30% to 50% of all U.S. executives are affected by what is termed burn out (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991). This, too, can be generalized to students. With already limited opportunity to develop intercultural communication competence due to time constraints and shorter study abroad programs, the possibility also exists for damage to scholastic or institutional reputation, and loss to national reputation.

Considerable research investigates various aspects of intercultural training and success abroad in terms of interacting competently with other cultures (Brislin, 2008; Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Daspit, 1994; Hussey, 1999, Kaweewong, 2002; Lipp, 1991;
Luenemann, 1991; Rosen et al., 2000; Schwarz, 1993). While many studies generalize to student study abroad; none of them is specifically designed for students who may face different problems and challenges than executives or expatriates. Executives sent abroad may be accompanied by family members available to lend emotional support; and may live on salaries commensurate with the local economy or even receive additional income as a stipend for being based abroad. Students, however, frequently sojourn in a more solitary fashion, often struggling financially to make ends meet. Add emotional and financial concerns to the student study abroad experience, with no training in how to cope with a dissimilar culture and the endeavor may be destined for failure. While business executives strive to adapt to living in a culture other than their own, a retinue of associates may be available to assist them; students may often find themselves isolated. Byram and Feng (2006) noted that students traveling to fundamentally dissimilar cultures often find themselves living “in isolation, on the margins of the society in which they reside” without a sense of community other than fellow countrymen who may be involved in similar study abroad experiences (p. 2). Isolation defeats the goal of an international education, which is to directly engage with individuals and cultures other than one’s home culture (Pederson, 2010). Isolation or socializing solely with members of one’s home culture fails to significantly increase global awareness, understanding, or intercultural communication competency.

Pre-departure training is designed to assist students by providing knowledge and communication skills to promote appropriate and effective interaction with the host culture, provide information to cope in a dissimilar culture, and aid the student in
maximizing a limited opportunity. Training is vital to the student study abroad experience, and profoundly affects the intercultural experience and level of understanding garnered from the experience. Pre-departure training provides skills vital for development of intercultural communication competence.

All students have been socialized by their own culture to view the world, make attributions, and communicate in specific ways. For those students with limited intercultural experience or without a basic understanding of what culture entails, communication with members of the host country and other cultures may be negatively affected and misunderstandings may occur. A critical analysis of 25 years of cross-cultural training (CCT) research for expatriates conducted in 2006, examined the need for training, deficiencies in past research, typical training components and delivery, theory related to training, and how training affects performance (Littrell, Salas, Hess, Paley, & Riedel, 2006). Past definitions of failure concentrated on expatriate early return, high turnover rates, delayed productivity, and relationship disruption between expatriates and host nationals (Baumgarten, 1995; Bennet, Aston, & Colquhoun, 2000; Bhagat & Prien, 1996; Rahim, 1983). One of the major analytical findings of the 2006 analysis was the addition of measurements in defining expatriate failure to include: inability to adapt, lack of skills to communicate and interact effectively, and inability to establish relationships with host nationals (Littrell et al., 2006). These findings are analogous to behaviors and skills called for in student and sojourner pre-departure training over the past 27 years (Landis & Brislin, 1983; Martin, 1989). The focus of the current training program is to maximize the United States’ student study abroad experience through theoretically based
training and to elucidate behaviors and skills identified as critical communication skills in research over the past quarter century.

Students departing for study abroad without the benefit of training lack knowledge and skills to employ upon arrival in their host country, leaving them deficient at the outset. Consequently, student preparation prior to study abroad emerges as a critical factor in advancing appropriate and effective communication and behaviors during the experience. As statistics presented by the Institute of International Education (2008) indicated, short-term study abroad is the fastest growing demographic; therefore, student participation in pre-departure training is even more imperative in promoting student interaction with host nationals due to time constraints. Research has stressed the importance of interaction in sojourning (Brein & David, 1971; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Landis & Brislin, 1996; Morris & Robie, 2001).

This thesis project is written from a communication perspective with theoretical frameworks regarding culture, rhetorical sensitivity, and instructional communication guiding the training project. Explanation for specific choice of each of these theoretical frameworks will be provided and discussed in depth in the literature review and methods sections. Inclusion of rhetorical sensitivity theory and utilization of specific Thai communication behaviors make this training program distinct. Programmatic research has found the theory of rhetorical sensitivity as both foundational and critical to intercultural communication effectiveness (Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006).

In 2005, I participated in a lengthy interview of Dr. Richard Brislin, one of the foremost authorities in the area of intercultural training, and the author of 25 books
regarding intercultural communication. Brislin commented on the lack of pre-departure training for students, noting that, while there were some strong programs, a paucity of training exists at many community colleges, colleges, and universities (R. W. Brislin, personal communication, April 8, 2005). Brislin attributed part of this problem to the fact that many resources are now being absorbed with administrative tasks, visas, and paperwork post-September 11.

Brislin stated that good training links its methods to the goals of the program and the goals of the participants (R. W. Brislin, personal communication, April 8, 2005). For students, this means facilitating cultural understanding and effective communication, preparing the student to realize the full potential of their study abroad experience, and providing students with awareness, knowledge, and skills to interact with host nationals regardless of the length of their study abroad experience. The objective of this thesis project is training to facilitate student communication skills to assist and enable development of globally literate citizens, capable of critical thinking and intercultural sensitivity. The United States must not fall behind in educating our students.

This project is organized into the following chapters: (a) introduction; (b) literature review; (c) training methods (justifying content and methods); (d) training program (three-day training, including needs assessment and post-training evaluation); and (e) discussion and implications.
Chapter 2

RESEARCH AND REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

This literature review examines definitions and theoretical foundations associated with culture and cultural awareness, cultural variability and theoretical frameworks, and culture and communication. Components associated with intercultural communication competence, rhetorical sensitivity, and teachable Thai communication behaviors will be examined as isomorphic; and together form the foundation of training to develop effective and appropriate communication. Pre-departure training is proposed to maximize the student study abroad experience, as well as meet the demands for communication skills required in a global world. Each of the theories presented is vital and pertinent to this training project. The particular combination and use of these theories sets this training apart from previous training projects.

While more information is presented in the literature review than will be used in the proposed training program, anyone preparing to utilize this pre-departure training project should possess a conceptual foundation before teaching. Therefore, this literature review is comprehensive in its presentation. Theoretical foundations discussed in the literature review will be the same theoretical foundations found in the proposed three-day training program.

Culture and Cultural Awareness

Development of a training program to advance effective and appropriate communication among people from diverse cultures first necessitates a clear understanding of culture. We all live in a culture, yet the definition of culture itself
proves elusive. In the face of a variety of approaches, perspectives, and studies, scholars display unique points of view on the definition of culture.

Research by anthropologists Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) in the early 1950s sought to identify the existing number of definitions regarding culture. Kroeber and Klukhohn (as cited in Martin & Nakayama, 2000) “categorized and integrated about 150 definitions of culture” (p. 56). Ting-Toomey and Chung (2005) claimed the anthropologists identified more than 160 definitions; while Samovar et al. (2004) listed 164 definitions by the anthropologists. Neulip (2003) claimed the anthropologists found “300 definitions of culture, none of which were the same” (p. 18). The controversy regarding how many definitions exist and what culture entails extends to the present with scholars endorsing individual and perspectives compatible with their respective fields of study. As Gudykunst (1997) noted, “there are many definitions of culture, but to date no consensus has emerged on one definition” (p. 327). In sum, the plethora of cultural definitions accentuates the adjectives used by many researchers in speaking of culture: elusive, complex, multidimensional, dynamic, and, most emphatically, difficult to define.

Despite the multitude of cultural definitions, similarities exist in the definitional components of culture. Several definitions point to shared norms, beliefs, and values of a culture, while other similarities point to culture as learned behavior handed down from generation to generation (Lustig & Koester, 2010; Samovar et al., 2007; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005; Tubbs & Moss, 2008). The use of metaphors proves an excellent tool in comparison of cultural norms, beliefs, and values. A metaphor is defined as “a more subtle comparison in which a rhetor refers to one thing in terms of something it is not”
Knutson (2004) noted “metaphors contain assumptions and evaluations about reality in ways that prescribe appropriate behavior among members of a culture sharing the language” (p. 150).

Hall (1989) used the metaphor of a submarine in referring to culture, learned behaviors, and habitual responses, stating “ways of interacting gradually sink below the surface of the mind and, like the admiral of a submerged submarine fleet, control from the depths” (p. 42). Ting-Toomey and Chung (2005) utilized the iceberg metaphor in defining culture, referring to popular culture as the easily visible part of the iceberg:

While beneath the surface and beyond sight exists the intermediate level of culture (consisting of symbols, meanings and norms); the deep level of culture (consisting of traditions, beliefs, and values) with universal needs being the deepest and most basic level of culture. (p. 27)

Fong (2004) asserted that culture and cultural identity have “have become umbrella terms that subsume racial and ethnic identity” (p. 6), while Jackson and Garner (1998) consolidated a number of definitions from various sources and emphasized that culture is “perpetuated by a consolidated group of individuals connected by ancestral heritage and a concomitant geographical location” (p. 44). Komin (1990) defined culture as being:

The end product of a society [and] generally refers to the total patterns which make a society distinct. On the other hand, culture also serves as a framework for shaping and guiding thought, actions and practices as well as the creativity of its members. (p. 683)

Culture affects how individuals act, react and communicate.

Knutson (1994) summarized the various definitions of culture by suggesting six common characteristics:

1. Culture is learned through our interactions with other members of our culture. Human beings are not born with culture.
2. Culture provides rules for appropriate and acceptable behavior in the form of values, beliefs and norms. Cultures identify desirable behavior for their members.
3. Culture provides a means of organizing and classifying our environment in distinctive ways. Culture structures daily life.
4. Culture gives meaning and reality to one’s existence. It provides a way of “seeing” the world.
5. Culture is transmitted and passed on from generation to generation giving consistency and tradition to the group. Cultural change takes place relatively slowly.
6. The common code of culture is language as employed in rituals, education, institutions, politics, religion, and myths designed to condition people. (p. 3)

In light of the intensity and rapidity of recent technological change, cultural exposure, and globalization, Zuckerman (2005) defined culture as “a range of expectations of enacted behaviors, beliefs, and ideas, and their resulting material creations, shared by a group of people who may or may not be confined to a limited geographic area” (p. 15). Zuckerman’s definition of culture reflects the essence of globalization, which is characterized by motion, mixture, contacts, and linkages. Sacramento, considered the most diverse city in the nation according to research, and our nation as a whole are more diverse than at any other time in history (Stodghill & Bower, 2002). Therefore, when we interact with people from other cultures at home or abroad, we are dealing with "a range of expectations of enacted behavior, beliefs and ideas” (Zuckerman, 2005, p. 15). The next part of Zuckerman’s (2005) definition “and their resulting material creations” reflects the hypothesis posited by Broome (1991) regarding development of a third culture between cultural participants. No two people attach the same meaning or response to specific words or stimuli, so material creations can be envisaged as the relational culture created between two or more people. The breadth of Zuckerman’s definition can be found in this portion of the definition; not limited to
behaviors, beliefs, and ideas, material creations include creations that occur as a result of those behaviors, beliefs, and ideas. For example, a piece of art is a material creation and a product of culture; a piece of Shaker furniture is a material creation resulting from culture; a cross is a material creation of Christian culture. The final part of Zuckerman’s definition, “shared by a group of people who may or may not be confined to a limited geographic area” suggests the inclusion of those who work or interact with others in a virtual environment via computer, video call, or social networking group. The virtual interaction between cultures (e.g., multinational corporations doing business with people they may never have seen, virtual chat rooms, Facebook social networking) is highlighted in this portion of the definition. The combination of these two definitions of culture provides a comprehensive and synergistic definition of culture in a global world, and will be utilized for this project (Knutson, 1994; Zuckerman, 2005). The summary of cultural characteristics by Knutson (1994) is reminiscent of the iceberg metaphor of culture and aspects of culture that lie beneath the surface. Zuckerman’s (2005) cultural definition reflects globalization and the influence of technology in prompting cultural change at a pace never before experienced. Cultures are bombarded and influenced by technological advances and the immediacy of the Internet and global media, with the prospect of more rapid cultural change ever present. The combination of Knutson’s cultural characteristics and Zuckerman’s definition of culture fully inform and encapsulate the concept of culture.

Norms, beliefs, and values are fundamental terms to understand in any discussion of culture, as they ultimately affect behavior and communication. Norms refer to a set
underlying assumptions or rules for appropriate behavior within a culture. Norms are behaviors that go largely unquestioned, the unspoken rules of how individuals are expected to act. These are “expectations that people have of one another and themselves” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 27); norms are predictable patterns of appropriate behavior within a “given interaction scene” (Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005, p. 32). Lustig and Koester (2010) provided an example of norms governing shopping expectations in two different countries, France and the United States. In France, the norm is to greet the shopkeeper or sales clerk upon entering a store, and then begin to shop. To do otherwise is considered rude and impolite. In the United States, however, the norm is to enter a store and immediately begin shopping. Considered annoying when a sales clerk hovers too closely, sales clerks in the United States are expected to be more invisible except when help is requested. Additional examples of cultural norms are how students are expected to interact with teachers in the educational sphere and how cultures regard quiet or silence. For example, in Thailand, “teachers seldom encourage students to express their opinions in class” (Knutson, 2004, p. 153); in United States’ classrooms, students are encouraged to speak up. In fact, loquaciousness is such a norm in the United States, students reticent to express themselves are considered problematic. In Thailand, quiet is considered a virtue (Knutson, 2004). In Japan, the complexity of silence is conveyed as a way of talking itself, linked to credibility and as consideration of the others’ ideas (Samovar et al., 2007). Many Scandinavian countries similarly value quiet. In Finland, “verbal communication is to be used sparingly and, when done, should be worthy of others’ attention, about something not obvious to others” (Carbaugh, 2005, p. 122).
Norms regarding quiet or silence in the United States could be considered at the other end of the spectrum in comparison. In the United States, the norm is to fill the quiet with words. Evidence of the discomfort many U.S. Americans feel as a result of imposed quiet is manifest in the awkwardness many feel when riding in an elevator with strangers, even though the ride itself is for a relatively short period of time.

Beliefs lie deeper than norms in a culture, and refer to “a basic understanding of what the world is like or what is true or false” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 27). Beliefs are shaped by an individual’s culture. Beliefs can be linked to religion, events, and experiences; they are “a set of fundamental assumptions or worldviews that people hold to their hearts often without question” (Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005, p. 33). Usually an emotional component is evident with beliefs; beliefs advocate an individual or a culture’s worldview, especially if attached to questions of religion, the meaning of life and death, traditions, rituals, and even time and space. To communicate with an individual from a dissimilar culture with no understanding of their beliefs may lead to a breakdown in communication, or failure to communicate.

Values are defined as deeply held and shared perceptions “of what ought to be, not what is” (Martin & Nakayama, 2000, p. 63). Deeply held core concepts, according to Rokeach (1979), values “serve as standards or criteria to guide not only action, but also judgment, choice, attitude, evaluation, argument, exhortation, rationalization, and, one might add, attribution of causality” (p. 2). This could apply to concepts such as freedom or independence, or topics that deal with values such as good and evil, moral and immoral, ugly and beautiful (Samovar et al., 2007). Values are generally learned early in
life through a variety of inputs and sources such as “family, proverbs, media, school, church, state, etc.” (Samovar et al., 2007, p. 131). Sources such as proverbs and fables are generally considered important within cultures for the exposition of cultural values to individuals. Often, when an individual crosses boundaries between cultures “what is perceived as good or correct in one culture is seen as bad or incorrect in another” (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994, p. 54).

Cultural values vary around the world. Behavior considered valuable and appropriate in one culture may be seen as improper in another culture. Individual freedom, for example, highly valued in the United States, contrasts with the number one cultural value in Thailand, social harmony. In the United States, children are taught to be themselves, to express themselves, and to be self-oriented. It would not be considered unusual in a public setting in the United States to find individuals speaking loudly, oblivious of the effect on others nearby. In Thailand, the value of social harmony influences the individual to focus on others, a receiver orientation. Kreng-jai is a value that signifies the “desire to avoid at all costs creating discomfort or annoyance for other people” (Knutson, 2004, p. 152). Cultural values ultimately guide thoughts, actions, and communication within any given culture. Cultural norms can be seen as the rulebook for appropriate behavior based on the cultures values.

Two examples of how values can affect communication and behavior are represented in the following sayings. A maxim in the United States asserts “the squeaky wheel gets the grease.” In other words, it is considered appropriate behavior in the United States to speak up as much as one feels necessary to accomplish something. The
more noise an individual makes, the more quickly that individual may be noticed and attended to. In Japan, however, an old adage states “the nail that sticks out gets hammered down.” This saying encapsulates Japan’s cultural value of conformity and community; an individual does not want to squeak or stand out from the crowd, an individual usually endeavors to fit in communally. Cultures vary in desired characteristics and values, and “values are often offered as the explanation for the way in which people communicate” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 88).

Individuals may be unaware that they have been socialized by their own culture to view the world, make attributions, or even communicate in specific ways. In using fish as an analogy to culture, Hofstede (2001) stated “the last thing the fish will discover is water; it finds out about water only when it has landed on the fishmonger’s cart” (p. 380). Culture is to humans as water is to fish; individuals are so accustomed and habituated in their culture most do not realize its presence, until they are out it. Without an understanding of culture and what it entails, communication is affected and misunderstandings occur. This point is illustrated by Hall (1990), a leading pioneer in the field of intercultural communication who stated “culture is communication, and communication is culture” (p. 186).

What does this suggest? It means that culture defines and mediates communication interactions; and conversely, interactions are mediated by culture. In order to communicate competently across cultures, establish good interpersonal relationships, as well as understand and interact effectively, one must first be aware of the existence of cultural differences. Awareness is a critical foundational step to intercultural
knowledge and intercultural training (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Byram, Nichols, & Stevens, 2001). Byram et al. (2001) defined awareness as “an ability to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices, and products in one’s own and other cultures and countries “(p. 7). Without the benefit of pre-departure training, sojourners might be unable to recognize others’ cultural perspectives through which to view communication events, considerably hindering the experience as a whole. The concept of awareness opens the door to knowledge through recognition of a myriad of perspectives. Awareness of multiple perspectives provides the sojourner with comparison and contrast, both elements of analysis according to Bloom’s taxonomy, which will be discussed in detail in the methodology chapter of the project. Analysis leads to higher cognition and constructed knowledge. Knowledge of specific differences enables increased sensitivity in communication interactions and can result in increased intercultural communication competence and skills (Knutson, 1994).

Awareness of cultural differences is vital to intercultural pre-departure training. Without the inclusion of cultural awareness, Brislin and Yoshida (1994) considered the chances for success of any training as very unlikely; in fact, awareness is viewed as the initial step in the intercultural training process. Lack of awareness may lead to ineffective or inappropriate interactions, or may ultimately escalate communication interactions into conflict. Ting-Toomey and Chung (2005) referred to awareness in effective intercultural communication as a “mutual alertness” (p. 38) state. The four different aspects to awareness in intercultural communication are shown in Ting-Toomey and Chung’s intercultural difference alertness model in Figure 2.1.
Ting-Toomey and Chung (2005) explained that, during an intercultural communication interaction, there are four possible outcomes when bringing dissimilar values into a conversation. If a gaffe is made during an episode of conversation and both parties are mutually aware, the parties involved can choose to clarify, apologize, or let a misunderstanding remain. The level of cultural awareness at the other end of the spectrum is “the mutual obliviousness state” in which both parties are “unaware that the seeds of intercultural discord have been sown” (p. 37). The outcome of the mutual obliviousness state being that both parties involved realize something has gone wrong, but are at a loss as how to recover the situation. In the model, it is possible for one intercultural communicator to realize an error has been made, while the other communicator remains oblivious to the error. Ting-Toomey and Chung asserted that this results in “one-sided attention” with one person “experiencing more and more frustration, [while] the other conflict party is still paying no attention to the existing intercultural problem” (p. 38). The necessity for awareness in intercultural communication
interactions is emphasized in Ting-Toomey and Chung’s model: mutual awareness of
cultural communication, values, and behavioral differences may aid in avoidance of
intercultural misunderstanding. Training for sojourners prior to departure would lead to
more effective and appropriate interactions and, ultimately, less misunderstandings and
potential conflict.

Cultural Variability and Theoretical Frameworks

The initial step in understanding and communicating with people from other
cultures lies first with awareness and understanding of one’s own culture (Brislin &
Yoshida, 1994; Daspit, 1994; Kaweewong, 2002; Martin, 1989; Parnell & Vanderkloot,
1989; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). In other words, before cultural variability and
competent communication interaction can be understood, individuals must understand
communication in terms of their own culture. Most individuals are unaware they have
been socialized into a culture, so the logical first step to understanding is the ability to
recognize one’s own cultural norms, beliefs, and values.

Using assorted dimensions and frameworks of cultural variability enables
recognition of differences. Knowledge and understanding of cultural variability
“allow[s] students to conceptualize differences and similarities . . . in ways that can be
applied when interacting with people from a variety of cultures and/or ethnic groups”
(Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Wiseman, 1991, p. 275). A pre-departure training
program designed to teach appropriate and effective communication across cultures
necessitates a thorough examination of cultural differences. Consequently, cultural
dimensions and values will be explored utilizing the theories, frameworks, and research
of: (a) Edward T. Hall’s (1989) high and low-context; (b) Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov’s (2010) cultural dimensions; and (c) Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) value orientations.

**High and Low-Context**

Hall (1989) viewed cultures as differing on a continuum ranging from high to low-context. Situations and communication events are contextual and “what a man chooses to take in, either consciously or unconsciously, is what gives structure and meaning to his world” (p. 89). Context impacts communication and communication effectiveness. Hall emphasized that “in less complex and fast-moving times, the problem of mutual understanding was not as difficult, because most transactions were conducted with people well known to the speaker or writer, people with similar backgrounds” (p. 90). Hall stated “that meaning and context are inextricably bound up with each other” by what an individual chooses to pay attention to during interactions, ultimately affecting communication outcomes (p. 90). Hall’s work is not only the most repeatedly cited work in intercultural communication, but the concept of high- and low-context is one of primary importance (Gudykunst, 1997). Cultures vary within the high- and low-context continuum and “norms for verbal behavior, as well as subsequent perceptions associated with these norms, vary from one culture to the next” (Kim, Aune, Hunter, Kim, & Jung-Sik, 2001, p. 386).

The communication and behavioral patterns indicated in Table 2.1 summarize key differences between high and low-context cultures. Individual predispositions and self-construals vary within cultures along the high and low-context continuum. So, while no
one individual displays each of these differences, they can be generalized across high and low-context cultures.

Table 2.1

*High and Low-Context Communication Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High-Context</th>
<th>Low-Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect verbal style</td>
<td>Direct verbal style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less talk, fewer words</td>
<td>Verbally profuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is contained in covert messages (i.e., tone, posture, distance), the physical context or internalized in the person</td>
<td>Information is contained in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message; the message is contained in the words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal verbal style</td>
<td>Informal verbal style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal reticence</td>
<td>Verbal assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>Talkativeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not interrupt</td>
<td>Tendency to interrupt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks in silence</td>
<td>Thinks aloud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understated or animated tone</td>
<td>Matter-of-fact tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest, reserved reactions</td>
<td>Forceful, overt, and reactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social harmony and selflessness</td>
<td>Individualism and personal recognition is valued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group affiliations are important and stable</td>
<td>Group affiliations are fluid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiral logic</td>
<td>Linear logic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchies</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivistic values</td>
<td>Individualistic values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomacy before truth</td>
<td>Truth before diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High-context cultures value indirect communication, less talk, fewer words, and nonverbal over verbal messages. Hall (1989) defined high-context communication as “one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message” (p. 91). High-context communication is a sort of “fill in the blanks . . . verbal shorthand” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 110) type of communication. For example, Hall observed in high context communication fewer words are needed in conversation because “a high-context individual will expect his interlocutor to know what’s bothering him, so he doesn’t have to be specific” (p. 93). High-context cultures use covert messages (e.g., tone, posture, and distance); reactions are reserved; group affiliations, authority and group identity are obvious and important; and time is less structured and more flexible (Knutson et al., 2002). Additionally, social harmony, group loyalty, and selflessness are characteristic of high-context cultures (Hall, 1989; Knutson et al., 2002; Lewis, 2005; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005).

Low-context cultures, on the other hand, often display behaviors at the opposite end of the continuum where “the mass of information is vested in the explicit code” (Hall, 1989, p. 91). Explicit and direct communication is exhibited and valued in high-context cultures, and the communication message is contained in the words themselves with little emphasis on contextual cues. Use of nonverbal messages is not as explicit or
important, and verbal communication and its profuseness most clearly characterize low-context cultures. The United States is considered an example of a low-context culture.

Group affiliations are not deemed as important in low-context cultures and as a result, bonds between people are more fragile and “the extent of involvement and commitment to long-term relationships is lower” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 112). In low-context cultures individualism and personal recognition are emphasized over group affiliations (Knutson et al., 2002). In low-context cultures individuals may have many groups or affiliations to which they belong (i.e., clubs, gyms, business organizations, religious affiliations); however, they tend to be more transient and disposable, with group members moving easily in and out of these groups. While long-term relationships are commonly limited in low-context cultures, in high-context cultures, groups are more static and can be life-long affiliations (Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988). Friendliness does not indicate an intimate relationship in low-context cultures, individual reactions are on the surface and time is highly structured.

Without adequate preparation and frameworks with which to understand how cultures vary, sojourners may be unable to communicate competently across cultures, thus minimizing the value of international experience. The argument for study abroad and its correlation to and imperative for developing global leaders and citizens requires effective and sensitive intercultural communication (Kagan & Stewart, 2004; NAFSA, 2003; Samovar et al., 2007). Harris and Moran (1987) summarized how cultures can differ using the high and low-context paradigm, and emphasized how communication can be affected in the following:
Unless global leaders are aware of the subtle differences, communication misunderstandings between low and high-context communicators can result. Japanese [high context] communicate by not stating things directly, while Americans usually do the opposite—“spell it out.” The former is looking for meaning and understanding in what is not said—in the nonverbal communication or body language, in the silences and pauses, in relationships and empathy. The latter places emphasis on sending and receiving accurate messages directly, usually by being articulate with words. (p. 25)

**Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions**

The theory of cultural dimensions presented by Hofstede (1980) provides another approach to understanding communication patterns between and among cultures. In an extensive 6-year, social scientific research project, involving 116,000 individuals from over 50 countries, Hofstede originally derived four dimensions of cultural variability from collected data: (a) power distance, (b) individual-collectivism (from small to large); (c) masculinity-femininity; and (d) uncertainty avoidance (from weak to strong). In the late 1980s, based on research by Michael Bond (1988) citing a Western bias in the uncertainty avoidance dimension, a fifth dimension was adjoined: long-term versus short-term orientation. This dimension, later renamed *Confucian work dynamism*, led Hofstede (2001) to observe the complete grip culture has on individuals. In explanation of the Western bias of the uncertainty-avoidance dimension, Hofstede related that:

> One unfortunate consequence of our dealing with constructs is their definition contains of necessity an element of subjectivity on the part of the definer. . . . We will always be subjective, but we may at least try to be “intersubjective,” by pooling and integrating a variety of subjective points of view from different observers. (p. 2)

In other words, even when trying to be objective, each individual views the world through individual perspective and cultural worldview; and, it is through a variety of viewpoints from diverse observers that a more complete whole may be defined.
Recently, a sixth dimension has been included by Hofstede et al. (2010), expanding the dimensional model again, based on Misho Minkov’s (2009) exploration of the world values survey. The sixth dimension added to Hofstede’s original model is indulgence versus restraint (Hofstede et al., 2010). Each of the dimensions (power distance, individual-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term versus short-term orientation, and indulgence versus restraint) will be examined in detail.

Each of these dimensions serves as a means of cultural comparison, not necessarily definitive classifications. The research by Hofstede et al. (2010) referred to central tendencies of national cultures. No one culture would be fully defined by these dimensions, as variations within cultures occur due to a variety of factors as mentioned previously, such as self-construals, socialization, predispositions, and so forth. In other words, national central tendencies are mediated by individual behavior and preferences, personality orientations, and individual values that may differ from a nation’s dominant central tendency (Gudykunst, 1998; Kaweewong, 2002; Kim et al., 2001; Reisinger & Crotts, 2009). These national dimensions impact intercultural communication, as the “approach is based on the assertion that people carry mental programs or ‘software of the mind’ that is developed during their childhood and is reinforced by their culture” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 113).

*Power distance* is defined as “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 61). Cultures vary across the power distance
dimension in acceptance of how status inequalities are viewed: are they considered “good or bad, right or wrong, just or unjust, or fair [and] unfair” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 114)? As an ideal, the United States Declaration of Independence (1776) declared “that all men are created equal.” However, cultures vary in perception of equality with respect to who is regarded as superior due to aspects such as “wealth, age, gender, education, physical strength, birth order, personal achievements, family background, occupation, or a wide variety of other characteristics” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 114).

The U.S. is considered a low power distance culture; personal achievement and equality are highly valued, and authority is something to be questioned (Gudykunst, 1997; Komin 1990). In contrast, individuals from high power distance cultures accept differences in status, venerate authority, and view power inequalities as a basic societal fact (Gudykunst & Lee, 2002). The cultural dimension of power distance can affect communication in unexpected ways. Korea is a high power distance culture, which adheres to hierarchical authority and deferential behaviors. In 1997, a Korean Air flight to Guam crashed because both the co-pilot and engineer were hesitant to correct the Captain regarding an error and failed to communicate the error before it was too late (Gladwell, 2008). Even though both the co-pilot and engineer were cognizant of the error, within the hierarchy of the cockpit, and the power distance dimension of the Korean culture, communication was affected with tragic consequences.

The dimension of power distance also influences the success of a student studying abroad. If a student traveling from a low power distance culture (such as the U.S.) to a high power distance culture (such as China, Russia, Mexico, or India for example), is
unaware of the variance between cultures, communication misunderstandings will most
certainly occur. Accustomed to a more informal atmosphere, students from low power
distance cultures such as the United States approach teachers as basic equals. Students
are commonly invited to question a teacher, express disagreement, and the educational
process is relatively student centered (Hofstede et al., 2010). The educational process in
high power distance cultures is much more structured and formal. Teachers are treated
with “respect or even fear [with an] educational process that is teacher centered”
(Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 69). In high power distance cultures strict order is imposed in
classrooms and, generally, the “teacher initiates all communication. . . . Students in class
speak up only when invited to; teachers are never publicly contradicted or criticized and
are treated with deference even outside school” (Hofstede et al., 2010 p. 69). This is a far
cry from practices in U.S. classrooms where students rate teachers in classroom surveys
and online. Students studying abroad must be aware of different expectations in varying
cultural dimensions prior to their study-abroad experience (see Appendix J).

*Individualism and collectivism*, the next dimension in which cultures vary, can be
seen as the degree to which “the interests of the individual prevail over the interests of the
group” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 91). Individualist cultures are typified by nuclear
families, personal identity and preference, and an “I” mentality. Hofstede et al. (2010)
noted that “neither practically nor psychologically is the healthy person in this type of
society [individualistic] supposed to be dependent on a group” (p. 91). While
individualistic cultures do hold membership in a variety of groups, the number and
variety of groups (or in-groups) generally persist in a constant state of flux, perpetually
changing with life transitions (e.g., social, professional, religious, and familial). While in-groups may exert a specific amount of behavioral influence at specific points in time, that influence is mediated due to continual change in group membership. Consequently, individualistic cultures display less emotional investment or attachment to groups in comparison to collectivist cultures (Gudykunst, 1997). The value of individualism is seen as central to United States values; children are raised to be autonomous, base decision-making on individual choice, desire personal achievement, self-realization, and be assertive (Knutson et al., 2002; Knutson, Hwang, & Deng, 1999).

In contrast, collectivist cultures are marked by interdependence in which “the interest of the group prevails over the interest of the individual” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 90). Lustig and Koester (2010) noted this as “a ‘we’ consciousness, with an emphasis on belonging” (p. 117). Hofstede et al. (2010) described a definitive distinction between “we” groups (in-groups) and “they” (out-groups) in collectivist cultures. In-groups refer to “groups of people about whose welfare one is concerned, with whom one is willing to cooperate without demanding equitable returns, and separation from whom leads to discomfort or even pain” (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988, p. 75). Stated more strongly:

The “we” group (or in-group) is the major source of one’s identity and the only secure protection one has against the hardships of life. Therefore, one owes lifelong loyalty to one’s in-group, and breaking this loyalty is one of the worst things a person can do. (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 91)

Group affiliation bears strong influence over individual behaviors and maintenance of harmony within groups is emphasized (Gudykunst, 1997; Knutson et al., 1999). The quest for harmony involves the maintenance of face in collectivist cultures.
Face may be seen as a metaphor for self-identity or worth—that part of the individual which is privately held, yet publicly displayed (West & Turner, 2004). Ting-Toomey is credited with the development of face negotiation theory (FNT), but the concept of face is often seen as originating in China. Chinese communication endeavors to maintain social harmony through maintenance of face, as well as focus on the relational aspect of communication (Knutson et al., 1999). As Ting-Toomey (1988) clarified in FNT, “the concept of face is about identity respect and other-identity consideration issues within and beyond the actual encounter episode” (p. 73). Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) explained other-identity consideration issues as those dealing with complimenting, compliance gaining, politeness, requesting, embarrassment, apology, shaming, decision-making, and conflict behavior. Individual face is vulnerable and, in uncertain social interactions, can either be enhanced or threatened (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). The set of communication behaviors used to regulate, support, or challenge another’s social dignity is referred to as facework (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

Gudykunst (2004) noted that in China, “face is not an ‘individual thing,’ but rather it is linked to others in individuals’ social networks” (p. 285). Face in China and other Eastern and high-context cultures involves collective mutual respect, maintenance of deep and enduring friendships, and behaviors that emphasize co-operation (Chan, 1998). These cultural values would be in keeping with the view held by Ting-Toomey and Chung (2005) along with numerous other scholars, that culture frames the concept of face. Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) asserted that the independent-self (individualists) tend to use more self-oriented face saving strategies and approval-seeking interaction
strategies. Conversely, collectivists (interdependent-self) tend to use more other-oriented, face-saving, face-honoring, non-impositional, and “other-face approval-enhancing interaction strategies” in communicating (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998, p. 191). While the concept of face crosses all cultural boundaries, the cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism is seen as an integral and foundational facet with respect to how individuals “relate to each other and the way face is enacted [emphasis added]” (West & Turner, 2004, p. 448). The way in which the concept of face can affect intercultural communication is illustrated in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2

*The “I-Identity” versus the “We-Identity” Facework Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“I-Identity” Facework</th>
<th>“We-Identity” Facework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self-Face Maintenance”</td>
<td>“Relational/Group-Face Maintenance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self</td>
<td>Interdependent Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face Threats</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Self-Esteem”</td>
<td>“Social Self-Esteem”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Approval”</td>
<td>“Ingroup Approval”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Boundary”</td>
<td>“Relational/Ingroup Boundary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Credibility”</td>
<td>“Group-Based Reputation, Status”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face-Defending Moves</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self-Face Protection”</td>
<td>“Ingroup-Face Protection”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self-Face Restoration”</td>
<td>“Self-Face Proactive Moves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Situational Accounts”</td>
<td>“Dispositional Accounts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face-Attacking Moves</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Direct Mode”</td>
<td>“Indirect Mode”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Verbally Explicit Style”</td>
<td>“Verbally Understated Style”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Nonverbal Explicitness”</td>
<td>“Nonverbal Nuances”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face-Honoring Moves</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self-Face Enhancing Mode”</td>
<td>“Self-Effacing Mode”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Satisfying Personal Goals”</td>
<td>“Satisfying Ingroup Goals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Person-Based Power Resources”</td>
<td>“Positional-Based Power Resources”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dominating/Controlling”</td>
<td>“Avoiding/Obliging”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Solution-Closure”</td>
<td>“Relational-Smoothing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Solution Compromises”</td>
<td>“Relational Concessions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facework Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Persuader-Centered”</td>
<td>“Listener-Centered”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Substantive Gains”</td>
<td>“Facework Gains”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Honor and Dignity”</td>
<td>“Ingroup Honor and Dignity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Substantive Effectiveness”</td>
<td>“Facework Appropriateness”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Gudykunst (1997) cited individualism-collectivism as “the major dimension of cultural variability isolated by theorists across cultures” (p. 330). In fact, the individualism-collectivism dimension is viewed by many scholars as “by far the most **
important attribute that distinguishes one culture from another” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 117). Hofstede’s (1980) cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism is isomorphic to Hall’s (1989) concept of high and low-context cultures; all high-context cultures are collective; and all low-context cultures are individualistic (Deng, 1992; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Knutson et al., 2003).

Deng (1992) stressed the duplicate nature of the Hall (1989) and Hofstede (1980) frameworks in comparing high and low-context with individualism-collectivism:

For example, individualistic, or low-context cultures indicate a preference of direct and overt communication style, confrontational and aggressive behaviors, a clear self-identification, and a priority of personal interest and achievement. Collectivistic, or high-context cultures, manifest a preference of indirect and covert communication style, an obedient and conforming behavior, a clear group identification, and a priority of group interest and harmony. (p. 38)

For students studying-abroad, the individualism-collectivism dimension plays a crucial role in the educational sphere. There are differences not only in expected classroom behaviors, but in the very purpose of education itself, with individualistic cultures viewing education as a life-long process or “how to learn,” and collectivist cultures focusing more on “how to do” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 119) (see Appendix K). Training is required prior to departure for students to recognize cultural variance in the classroom. For example, individualistic cultures expect and even encourage, students to be verbally expressive, ask questions, and openly disagree with teachers. An individualistic student striving to excel will speak up with answers individually. Conversely, students from a collectivist culture may hesitate to speak up in the presence of a teacher, and feel more comfortable participating and answering questions in groups in order to save face. Without adequate preparation, a student from the United States
may enter an educational environment in a collectivist culture and communication misunderstandings occur due to incorrect expectations of appropriate behavior. A student must know when it is considered culturally appropriate speak up and when to remain silent in another culture’s learning environment. Not only can the reputation of the student be harmed along with the name and reputation of the school or university he or she is representing, but the learning experience itself may be hindered. For example, one leading intercultural educator tells high-context students to “speak up” when visiting low-context cultures. He gives the opposite advice to low-context students visiting high-context cultures: “shut up” (Dr. T. Knutson, personal communication, September 10, 2010).

Hofstede et al.’s (2010) third dimension, masculinity-femininity, indicates differing behaviors considered masculine or feminine in traditional and modern societies. The labeling of this dimension has proved problematic, creating confusion by assigning behaviors to roles labeled as male and female. Socialization by culture, not biology, determines specific behaviors, norms, and roles. Utilizing the labeling of this dimension, behaviors such as assertiveness, competition, material acquisition, and toughness have been attributed to males; and behaviors such as nurturing, modest behavior, cooperativeness, caring, and quality of life issues to females. As Kaweewong (2002) emphasized, both sexes can “possess both gender roles; it is just the matter of degree” (p. 26). In other words, this dimension is viewed as the degree to which assertiveness, competition, acquisition of material goods, and individual career values, among others, dominate a society, over behaviors such as modest behavior, cooperativeness, nurturing,
caring, and concern regarding quality of life issues (Kaweewong, 2002; Luenemann & Knutson, 1993). To place emphasis on the behaviors rather than biology, this dimension will be referred to as *assertiveness-nurturing*. Gudykunst (1997) noted that, while cultures higher on the assertiveness index “emphasize differentiated sex roles, performance, ambition, and independence” cultures low on the assertiveness index “value fluid sex roles, quality of life, service, and interdependence” (p. 332). According to the characteristics of this dimension, the U.S. is ranked as an assertive culture.

The assertiveness-nurturing dimension also impacts the educational realm. Students from the United States who study abroad are familiar with a competitive educational environment and expect to be singled out or praised for achievement. In cultures ranking higher in the nurturing dimension, weaker students are praised in an effort to support and encourage them. Assertiveness in the classroom is often ridiculed and “excellence is something one keeps to oneself [because] it easily leads to jealousy” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 160) (see Appendix L).

Hofstede et al.’s (2010) fourth dimension is labeled uncertainty avoidance and runs on a continuum from weak to strong. *Uncertainty avoidance* is defined as “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations” (p. 191). Hofstede et al. noted that “extreme ambiguity creates intolerable anxiety,” that uncertainty is a subjective experience, and “feelings of uncertainty are acquired and learned” (p. 189). Cultures high in uncertainty avoidance (UA) seek to lower the possibility of ambiguity by seeking structure through specific rules and rituals. Rules provide structure and facilitate certainty by providing benchmarks from which to
predict communication and other behaviors (Kaweewong, 2002). Members of cultures high in UA avoid conflict and confrontation, restrain emotion, avoid competition, and deem deviant behavior as unacceptable (Gudykunst, 1997).

The United States is a culture considered low in uncertainty avoidance, a culture that embraces the newest and most recent. In fact, in marketing, the phrase “new and improved” will motivate consumers to try something innovative or novel. Cultures low in UA are more open to change, dissent, display of emotions, taking risks, and they find conflict and aggression acceptable (Gudykunst, 1997). Low UA cultures such as the United States regard individual achievement as beneficial and due to individual ability (Lustig & Koester, 2010).

The uncertainty-avoidance dimension can be observed as it relates to education and its relationship to United States’ study abroad students. Classrooms in diverse cultures are structured more or less rigidly and naïve students may be unaware of dissimilar scholastic expectations. German culture, higher on the UA dimension than the United States or Great Britain, values highly structured classrooms. According to research by Hofstede et al. (2010), students from low UA cultures feel they should be rewarded for accuracy (i.e., there is one right answer). On the other hand, British students, ranked lower in UA than students from the United States, anticipate being rewarded for originality in learning situations, and consider there may be many answers versus one right answer (Hofstede, 2010). Educational circumstances in the classroom also vary across the UA dimension in terms of intellectual debate or disagreement. High UA cultures avoid conflict and competition and discourage intellectual disagreement or
debate in the classroom. Low UA cultures consider disagreement and debate as stimulating exercises and an open exchange of ideas (see Appendix M).

Forgas and Bond (1985) found the UA dimension suggests the existence of a Western bias. To clarify the basis of this bias, Western social behaviors seek to structure the unknown and value absolute truth; while Eastern philosophy is more relative and focused on virtue. Further analysis of Hofstede’s four cultural dimensions by Hofstede and Bond (1988) using the Chinese value survey (CVS) found correlation with three out of four of Hofstede’s (1980) original dimensions: integration (whether an individual considers it more important to be an integral part of a group or whether it is more important to be an individual) corresponds with individualism-collectivism; human-heartedness (whether an individual finds it necessary to be aware of others, socially conscious, “kind, forgiving and courteous” compares to assertiveness-nurturing; and moral discipline (“characterized by the need to be moderate, cautious and adaptable”) correlates to power distance (Posirisuk, 2004, p. 3).

However, “the fourth CVS dimension was not correlated with the fourth IBM dimension: uncertainty avoidance had no equivalent in the CVS [emphasis added]” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 236). Hofstede’s model was, thus, extended to include the fifth dimension, originally called Confucian work dynamism. This dimension refers to the search “for virtue or goodness of character,” with Western philosophy seeking truth (or certainty) and Eastern philosophy seeking virtue (or knowing how to live). The Confucian work dynamism dimension was found to be correlated with economic growth,
and, beginning in 1991, Hofstede renamed the dimension long-term versus short-term orientation (LTO). The LTO dimension is defined as:

The fostering of virtues oriented toward future rewards—in particular, perseverance and thrift. Its opposite pole, short-term orientation, stands for the fostering of virtues related to the past and present—in particular, respect for tradition, preservation of “face,” and fulfilling social obligations. (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 239)

To reiterate, the LTO dimension correlated with economic growth, and values sustaining economic and entrepreneurial activity. Values associated with long-term orientation are persistence (perseverance), ordering relationships by status and observing this order (reflecting a stable hierarchy), harmony, thrift, having a sense of shame (which supports interrelatedness through sensitivity to social contacts), and a stress on keeping one’s commitments (Hofstede, 2010). The emphasis on interrelatedness, shame, and keeping one’s commitments points to the suggestion of relationship importance. Values associated with short-term orientation are protecting one’s face, respect for tradition, adaptiveness, and a more myopic view of doing the right thing at the moment (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 244) (see Appendix N). The need for predictability is answered by tradition in LTO cultures, there is a sense of order and commitment. Short-term orientation and low UA cultures place less importance on relationships and, therefore, require more rules and laws to create predictability and individual responsibility. Short-term orientation cultures value leisure, focus on “the bottom line,” shift loyalties according to needs, value universal guidelines, and value cognitive and analytical thinking and achievements (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 251) (see Appendix O).
Hofstede et al. (2010) proposed a new dimension of cultural variance based on analysis of research using the world values survey (WVS) (World Values Survey Organization, 2007). This dimension endeavors to address determinants of happiness across cultures. According to this dimension, there are “predictors of happiness at the national level, and they address: perception of life control and importance of leisure as a personal value” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 281). The *indulgence-restraint* dimension is defined:

*Indulgence* stands for a tendency to allow relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life and having fun. Its opposite pole *restraint* reflects a conviction that gratification needs to be curbed and regulated by social norms [emphasis added]. (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 281)

Open societies tolerant of a wide range of alternatives and behaviors are termed *loose* societies and identified as indulgent in this dimension, while societies identified as restrained are termed as *tight* societies, predominated by formality, permanence, strong values, and group organization (Hofstede et al., 2010). A parallel is drawn between indulgence and national wealth, and restraint with poverty. This dimension appears flawed in that it fails to consider the overall aspect of religion, which defines behaviors in wealthy nations and poverty-stricken nations, making it impossible to generalize indulgence to wealthy nations. For example, Saudi Arabia, a wealthy and Islamic nation, does not allow for tolerance of a wide variety of behaviors by virtue of its religion; yet, according to this dimension, it would be considered a happy indulgent nation. The United States, considered a wealthy nation, accepts a wide variety of religions and tolerates a wide range of behaviors. The United States would also be considered an indulgent nation according to this dimension. How can Saudi Arabia be considered an
indulgent nation when the female population is oppressed and there is low tolerance of a wide variety of behaviors? Behaviors and wealth cannot be generalized to fit the key differences indicated by this dimension. Overall, the first five of Hofstede’s (2001) dimensions have stood the test of scrutiny with some minor adjustments. The sixth dimension proposed by Hofstede is seen requiring further development due to the reasons explicated above (see Appendix P and Appendix Q).

**Value Orientations**

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) value orientations delineate the next taxonomy for cultural variance, suggesting there are five universal questions all cultures must answer; and which, in turn, shape and guide cultures by their preferential set of answers. The answers to the following questions “reflect a shared perception of what ought to be, not what is” (Martin & Nakayama, 2000, p. 63). Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck proposed all cultures seek answers to five universal questions, and are clarified in as falling along a range of variations:

1. What is the character of innate human nature? *(human nature orientation)*
2. What is the relation of humankind to nature? *(and supernature)*? *(man-nature orientation)*
3. What is the temporal focus of human life? *(time orientation)*
4. What is the modality of human activity? *(activity orientation)*
5. What is the modality of man’s relationship to other men? *(relational orientation)* (p. 11)

The five value orientations and their postulated range of variations are clarified in Table 2.3.
Table 2.3

*The Five Value Orientations and the Postulated Range of Variations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Postulated Range of Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Nature</td>
<td>Evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man-Nature</td>
<td>Subjugation to Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony with Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery over Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being-In-Becoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Lineality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaterality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* From Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961, p. 12).

Answers to these basic questions can again be seen as falling on a continuum. Some would say that Americans see human nature as evil, extending from Puritanical religious influences, while others see the United States as a mixture of good and evil (Kaweewong, 2002; Kohls, 1996; Martin & Nakayama, 2000; Samovar et al., 2004).

In the man-nature orientation, the United States is most decidedly oriented to conquering nature, or mastery over nature. From its earliest history as colonists and immigrants in a new land, to westward expansion, building dams and cutting through mountains for highway construction, the mindset of the United States is one of dominance over nature. Adler (2002) noted this orientation stating, “other examples of North Americans’ dominance orientation include astronauts’ conquest (dominance) of space . . . [and] perhaps most controversial today, biotechnology and genetic programming” (p. 25). Contrasting the United States’ mindset of dominance over nature, Thailand stands at the opposite range of value orientations viewing themselves as subject
to nature (Knutson, 1994). Knutson (1994) emphasized this Thai attitude when stating “their prevailing attitude toward the environment is one of passive acceptance . . . this value contributes to a nonchalance displayed by Thais when facing seemingly insurmountable problems” (p. 7). In other words, rather than bending nature to their will, Thai philosophy is one of accepting nature.

The United States’ orientation to time looks to the future, aspiring to build a better tomorrow and ensure a positive future for generations to come. The old adage “if at first you don’t succeed, try, try again” illustrates the quest for a tomorrow superior to the present. In contrast, cultures such as China and Japan venerate the past with respect for elders and high esteem for tradition. While the United States values future time, and China and Japan value a past orientation, Thai culture values the present. Knutson (1994) stated that, while U.S. Americans view time as progressing along a straight line, Thais perceive time as more flexible, with time viewed “as a series of cycles with recurring phases” (Knutson, 1994, p. 7). Living occurs in the present, not at some point in the future.

The value orientation of activity is expressed in three modes: being, being-in-becoming, and doing. Doing is the orientation that most dominates United States culture. The value system of the United States stresses action, getting the job done, and multi-tasking. It is interesting to note how these three modes of activity, when translated to the classroom, become yet another cultural awareness issue for students who study-abroad. U.S. American classrooms reward students who speak up immediately, while those more reserved or reticent are considered withdrawn, difficult, or problematic. Other cultures
may consider it negative for a student to answer immediately, without first taking time to reflect on a question. Visitors to the United States frequently comment with amazement on the high degree of activity. In the United States, if an individual fails to remain busy, the individual may be considered lazy.

As Samover et al. (2007) discussed, the final value orientation proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck was relational, and “concerned with the ways in which people perceive their relationships with others” (p. 157). This value orientation ranges on a continuum from authoritarian to individualism, and considers how social relations range hierarchically (vertical), to lineality (horizontally). This value orientation is closely related to Hofstede’s (1980) power distance dimension.

In summary, theoretical frameworks explaining cultural variation suggest a multitude of ways individuals are socialized and come to possess distinctive beliefs, values, norms, and social practices (Lustig & Koester, 2010). There is no universal interpretation for cultural behaviors. Individuals are socialized by the mental programming of their culture to communicate and interact in specific ways. The initial awareness of how cultures differ results in a starting point for communicating across cultures, and for learning skills to communicate competently, appropriately, and effectively in a global world.

Culture and Communication

As with the definition of culture, dozens of definitions of communication exist in scholarly literature. West and Turner (2004) viewed communication as “a social process in which individuals employ symbols to establish and interpret meaning in their
environment” (p. 5). As a process, communication is visualized as “dynamic, complex and continually changing” (West & Turner, 2004, p. 5). Martin and Nakayama (2000) cited communication as *symbolic* (words have an agreed upon meaning, with meanings conveyed both verbally and nonverbally) and as a process that is negotiated through layers of meanings simultaneously through an individual’s senses. According to Neulip (2003), communication has eight properties, it is: a process, dynamic, interactive and transactive, symbolic, intentional, contextual, ubiquitous, and cultural.

Even when individuals share the same culture, navigating the road of communication competently presents challenges. While words may have an agreed upon meaning that may be transmitted verbally and nonverbally, meaning is not necessarily transmitted. When individuals negotiate meaning across cultural dimensions and values, even more pitfalls are discovered. Students sent to study abroad without pre-departure training substantially reduce their chances for communicating competently and building the skills necessary for global literacy. Communication misunderstandings between dissimilar cultures inevitably occur even when communication participants are aware of differences. Sending students abroad with no intercultural communication training presents a situation akin to throwing a non-swimmer into a swimming pool without a life preserver. A student without adequate training can drown in the study abroad experience without proper tools to keep above water.

Against the backdrop of varied perceptions, beliefs, symbolic meanings, values, and contexts, intercultural communication challenges students. Competent intercultural communication does not just happen; only through acquisition of knowledge, application,
and skill refinement will students be prepared to communicate competently in a global
world (Gudykunst, 2004). Martin and Nakayama (2000) stated “culture influences
communication; and culture is enacted through communication” (p. 79). The training
program proposed in this project is intended to take study-abroad students through four
levels of intercultural communication competence proposed by Howell (1982): (a)
unconscious incompetence, (b) conscious incompetence, (c) conscious competence, and
(d) unconscious competence. The complexity of intercultural communication is modeled
in Figure 2.2.
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Figure 2.2. A contextual model of intercultural communication (Neulip, 2006, p. 25).

**Intercultural Communication Competence**

Today’s global world necessitates intercultural communication competence. The
importance of communicating effectively and appropriately cannot be overestimated.
Experience has shown that failure to anticipate or understand communication issues may
result in verbal and nonverbal political blunders, costly business errors, and personal
embarrassment, ultimately leading to communication ineffectiveness. Failure to
understand cultural differences may have grave consequences, and knowing what to do in
a dissimilar cultural context or situation may be just as important as knowing what not to do. Lustig and Koester (2010) stated “cultural differences create dissimilar meanings and expectations in the communication process” which require “greater levels of communication skill” (p. 65). The ability to adapt communication and display flexibility emerges as critical; especially in the study-abroad milieu where a major objective is learning to interact competently in a global society. The goal of intercultural communication competence requires creating communication interactions perceived as fulfilling objectives appropriately “to the context in which the interaction occurs” (Posirusuk, 2004, p. 26), and “effective to the extent that participants are able to minimize misunderstanding” (Posirusuk, 2004, p. 25). Learning to communicate appropriate and effectively is analogous to language learning. One can possess the vocabulary of another language, yet be ignorant of grammar rules and how to put the words together. Similarly, one can have knowledge of another culture, but be ignorant of cultural values and norms, resulting in misunderstandings, conflict, and simply making mistakes faster. Just as scholarly debate abounds regarding the definitions of culture and communication, an equally dynamic debate prevails regarding what constitutes intercultural communication competence (ICC) (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Gudykunst, 2004; Knutson et al., 2002; Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006; Lustig & Koester, 2008; Martin & Nakayama, 2000; Posirisuk, 2004). As with the definition of culture, “scholars conduct their research with different assumptions about how to conceptualize ICC . . . with different goals about the desired outcomes; [thus] ICC . . . has several definitions” (Posirisuk, 2004, p. 24).
Two views regarding the nature of competence are envisaged by Gudykunst and Kim (1997), one that “suggests competence is ‘within’ the communicator, and the second suggesting competence is ‘between’ the communicators” (p. 252). While the first view involves individual “capacity or capability” according to Kim (1991, p. 263), the second view involves process and interaction. The first view, within the communicator, suggests individual intercultural communication skills, which include managing “cultural differences and unfamiliarity, inter-group posture, and the accompanying experience of stress” (Kim, 1991, p. 259). The concept involving interaction and process between communicators, involves appropriate and effective responses between communicators. Appropriate communication is defined as “the degree to which the exchanged behaviors are regarded as proper and match the expectations generated by the insiders of the culture” (Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005, p. 17), as well as fulfill interaction contextual objectives (Posirusuk, 2004). Communication is viewed as effective to the degree that misunderstandings between participants have been minimized (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Posirusuk, 2004). Intercultural communication competence involves creating communication in which two or more people “attach the same meaning to messages” (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, p. 269).

The view of ICC as a process between communicators is supported by many scholars (Gudykunst, 1991; Knutson & Posirsuk, 2006; Kohls, 1987; Martin, 1989; Wiseman, 2002). Kohls (1987) viewed the process of obtaining ICC through performance of specific skills to attain specific objectives. Wiseman (2002) distinguished ICC as an interactive process coordinating verbal and nonverbal behaviors
to accomplish both personal and social goals, and to conform to the expected norms of a communication situation. Wiseman (2003) stated that this interactive process “involves . . . knowledge, motivation, and skills to interact effectively and appropriately with members of different cultures” (p. 208). Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) are acknowledged as the first scholars to isolate these three components (knowledge, motivation, and skills) considered foundational to ICC. Each of these components is identified separately, or wholly as a group in numerous studies (Gudykunst, 2004; Knutson et al., 2003; LeRoux, 2002; Lunemann, 1991; Martin, 1989; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). Components of ICC, congruent with rhetorical sensitivity, each of which will be discussed in further detail in the literature review, include: mindfulness, flexibility, empathy, sensitivity, and tolerance for ambiguity among others (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Broome, 1991; Gudykunst, 2004; Kohls, 2001; Knutson, 1994; Knutson et al., 2003; Komin, 1990; Lustig & Koester, 2010; Martin, 1989; Samovar et al., 2004).

Knowledge is “an awareness or understanding of requisite information and actions to be culturally competent” (Wiseman, 2002, p. 211). According to Gudykunst and Kim (2003), knowledge requires “awareness and understanding of what needs to be done in order to communicate appropriately and effectively” (p. 275). Consequently, knowledge skills should include conscious learning of general and specific information about people and cultures, linguistics, communication rules, an openness to delivery of information in a variety of ways, knowledge of variations in verbal and nonverbal language, proxemics and time, and context (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Martin & Nakayama, 2000) and the “normative expectations governing interaction with members
of the other culture” (Wiseman, 2002, p. 211). Knowledge of specific differences enables increased sensitivity in communication interactions and can result in increased ICC (Knutson, 1994). Preparation (or attainment of cultural knowledge) “helps to make people aware of what makes other societies unique” and knowledge enables competence (Lueneman, 1991, p. 4). Knowledge, however, is only one component on the pathway to ICC, individuals must also have motivation and the necessary communication skills to manage the affective and emotional aspects of interacting culturally.

Martin (1989) noted that students involved in international study abroad programs were more successful in their experience when they acquired cultural knowledge of their host country prior to their departure. Pre-departure training for students enabled them to gain knowledge in cultural expectations of their host country, cultural communication variables, and a variety of strategies encompassing aspects of effective intercultural communication (Martin, 1989). The pre-departure training proposed by Martin correlates to the concept of knowledge perceived by researchers as contributing to ICC (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Knutson, 2004; Martin & Nakayama, 2000; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005; Wiseman, 2002).

Motivation or application, a critical aspect of ICC, is known variously as the affective or emotional component (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Lustig & Koester, 2010; Neulip, 2003; Samovar et al., 2004). Motivation is “the set of feelings, intentions, needs, and drives associated with the anticipation of or actual engagement in intercultural communication” (Wiseman, 2002, p. 211). While motivation in this sense is associated with feelings and drives, application is also associated with a
set of behaviors, which can be learned to apply in response to feelings and drives in a competent manner. Feelings are the affective or emotional states individuals encounter when communicating with someone from another culture (e.g., feelings such as excitement, anxiety, relaxation, uncertainty, or confusion) (Lustig & Koester, 2010). Anxiety, perceived social distance, attraction, prejudice, and ethnocentrism are feelings which may interfere with ICC (Kassing, 1997; Wiseman, 2002). Ethnocentrism is defined as:

The notion that one’s own culture is superior to any other. It is the idea that other cultures should be measured by the degree to which they live up to our [U.S. American] cultural standards. We are ethnocentric when we view other cultures through the narrow lens of our own culture or social position. (Nanda & Warms, 1998, p. 6)

Lustig and Koester (2010) clearly delineated between feelings and intentions as motivating factors for engaging in intercultural communication. If an individual enters into a communication interaction bringing emotional prejudices, attitudes, stereotypes, or negative judgments of another’s culture it will hinder ICC. Individuals must be aware of alternative behaviors to apply in such situations. Stereotypes are defined as “a generalization about a class of people, objects, or events that is widely held by a given culture” (Tubbs & Moss, 2008, p. 49). Brislin and Yoshida (1994) referred to stereotypes as examples of categorization that are “oversimplified generalizations made with regard to specific groups of people. For example . . . reserved British . . . friendly but loud Americans . . . emotional Italians . . . rigid Germans” (p. 42). While all individuals categorize to a degree, stereotypes go beyond generalizing and are “the products of

1. They act as a filter, influencing information processing by allowing only perspectives consistent with those already held;
2. they create cognitive biases by assuming that all culture-specific information applies to all individuals from a cultural group;
3. they prevent successful communication “because they are oversimplified, exaggerated, and overgeneralized;” and
4. they are resistant to change. (p. 322)

Stereotypes may be unconscious and impede seeing people as individuals, instead of seeing them as the category to which they belong. Intentions however, are the choices one makes that impact communication interactions. For example, “intentions are the goals, plans, objectives, and desires that focus and direct . . . behavior” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 70). Intentions are conscious choices individuals bring to intercultural interactions. Feelings and intentions, both motivating factors in intercultural interactions will be referred to as applications in the proposed training program of this thesis project. How one intentionally applies knowledge of cultures, combined with emotional factors and choices, will directly affect ICC skill development.

For the purpose of clarity, Gudykunst (2005) defined sojourners as “visitors who travel to another culture to reside for a period of time (e.g., a few months to several years), but do not intend to reside permanently in the host culture” (p. 420). Gudykunst stated that, while all sojourners are strangers to whatever culture they are visiting, they are physically close by virtue of being in another culture and, yet, a quality of remoteness remains. The physical closeness of an unfamiliar culture and the emotional distance
induced by cultural variance and dissimilar values create uncertainty and anxiety for strangers.

According to anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory, strangers in unfamiliar situations or communication interactions may question how to act, question how the other will respond, or question how a message will be perceived across cultural barriers. Uncertainty is reduced by information-gathering, enabling prediction of alternative behaviors. Gudykunst (2005) noted that, if uncertainty exceeds an individual’s maximum threshold, interactions with host nationals are ineffective and adaptation to a dissimilar culture will fail. This is generally due to an individual becoming paralyzed by uncertainty, fearful to venture out due to unknown factors. Gudykunst extended the research of Berger and Calabrese (1975), which theorized individuals reduce uncertainty as a central motive of communication. Awareness of self and environment in social interactions enables communication and relationship development (Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Littlejohn, 2002). Therefore, uncertainty must be reduced and/or managed to enable effective communication.

Anxiety, the emotional counterpart to uncertainty in this theory, is the paralyzing factor affecting individual motivation to participate in intercultural interaction. Anxiety may cause the individual to withdraw or isolate rather than interact with the unfamiliar. Anxiety management skills enable growth and adaptation, emotional stability, well being, and effective and competent interactions with host nationals. Four needs must be met before individuals can begin to communicate competently with host nationals according to Gudykunst (2005): (a) the need for predictability, (b) the need for a sense of group
inclusion, (c) the need to diffuse anxiety, and (d) the need to sustain self-conceptions (a sense of self-respect, or feeling of worthiness). Once the needs for predictability, group inclusion, security, and self-confirmation are met (Turner, 1988), individuals are more motivated to interact with host nationals. AUM theory stresses behavioral skills to collect information to increase predictability.

Fulfilling these needs however, by no means implies that ICC is automatic; it means a hurdle has been crossed and the door to communication competence opened. According to the three components proposed as fundamental to ICC (knowledge, motivation/application, and skills), the final component requiring definition is the skill component. Wiseman (2002) contended that, if an “interactant is lacking any one of these conditions, the likelihood of communication is significantly diminished” (p. 211).

The skills component of ICC has also been referred to as a set of behaviors and skills (Martin & Nakayama, 2000; Wiseman, 2002). Wiseman (2003) defined skills as “the actual performance of the behaviors felt to be effective and appropriate in the communication context. . . . [These skills] can be influenced through education, experience, and guided practice such that we can all learn to be competent intercultural communicators” (p. 196). For the sake of simplicity, even though some of the skills to be elucidated are behaviors, which can be developed, they will be referred to as skills.

As anxiety and uncertainty are interrelated according to Gudykunst (1991), effective communication skills are those skills directly related to reducing both uncertainty and anxiety:

Reducing and/or controlling anxiety [the emotional component] requires at least two skills: becoming mindful and developing a tolerance for ambiguity.
Reducing uncertainty minimally requires three skills: empathy, behavior flexibility, and the ability to reduce uncertainty itself (the first two skills, however, are necessary to develop the third. (p. 117)

Reducing anxiety and uncertainty for students traveling abroad assumes critical importance as a learned skill. While some students may travel in groups abroad, others sojourn to universities and learning institutions as individuals. Students will be encountering situations and learning environments different from what they may have expected. Classes may be conducted in a different fashion than instruction in the United States, assessments and academic expectations inside and outside the classroom may be different, and interacting with the host nationals will be dissimilar (Carter, 2004). Skill training provides students with tools to decipher and engage in communication that may be outside of their contextual norms. The concept of mindfulness proposed by Langer (1989) is an aspect of communication competence which will facilitate a reduction in anxiety and uncertainty.

The concept of mindfulness (Langer, 1989) produces a consciousness of process versus results; and considers the concept of context as dynamic versus static. Mindless communication is automatic, categorized, habitual, and outcome oriented in nature (Langer, 1989). Mindless communication is phatic communication; an individual interacts, but “treat[s] information as though it were context-free—true regardless of the circumstances” (p. 3). Langer (1989) referred to this type of communication as “entrapment by category” which limits contextual signals to penetrate the consciousness and alternate views of the world consequently largely discarded. Mindless
communication is thoughtless, concerned with self and outcome, and in a sense, ethnocentric in nature.

Mindfulness, however, is process-oriented, allowing for changing circumstances and interpretation of individual contexts rather than narrow categories. Langer (1989) delineated between mindlessness and mindfulness stating “just as mindlessness is the rigid reliance on old categories, mindfulness means the continual creation of new ones” (p. 63). Mindfulness as part of a process allows for different perspectives, a range of responses, less polarization, (by being open to different responses) and enables change. To summarize, mindfulness is composed of three aspects: (a) creation of new categories, (b) openness to new information, and (c) openness to different points of view (Langer, 1989). Again, it is on the process of communication, not its outcome, that mindfulness is directed; individuals must be mindful of one’s behavior, and mindful of the situation (or context) at hand (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997; Kaweewong, 2002; Langer, 1989). Mindfulness contributes to a student’s ability to think outside the box in intercultural encounters and communication. Mindful communication links with rhetorical sensitivity theory in that both are process, other-oriented communication rather than results oriented communication.

The importance of being open to new perspectives is essential for bridges of understanding to be built across cultures (Parnell & Vanderkloot, 1989). Openness to new perspectives and mindfulness can be directly correlated to flexibility, which is cited by numerous scholars as a central characteristic of ICC (Gudykunst, 1991; Komin, 1990;

The notion of adaption, change, and creativity inherent in the definition of optimal competence is central to communication flexibility. The flexible communicator is one who is able to perceive the boundaries of a particular context and devise communication alternatives that transcend situational constraints. (p. 19)

A flexible communicator is sensitive to contextual and situational constraints and able to respond accordingly. While examining the ability to interact competently across cultures from a foreign language standpoint, Byram et al. (2001) stated the focus should be on intercultural competence as a necessity, “whether a different language is present or not” [emphasis added] (p. 5). Byram et al. equated the components of intercultural competence with the saviors: knowledge “of social groups and their products and practices in one’s own and in one’s interlocutor’s country, and of the general processes of societal and individual interaction” (savoir is the French infinitive for the verb “to know”); skills of interpreting another culture, cultural practices, and interaction (savoir comprendre, savoir apprendre/FAIRE—which is to know how to understand, and to know how to do); and lastly, attitudes, which can be correlated to flexibility, “curiosity, and openness, readiness to suspend belief about other cultures and belief about one’s own . . . the ability to ‘decentre’ (savoir etre—to know how to be)” (Byram et al., 2001, pp. 5-6). The saviors are congruous with the concepts of knowledge (savoir), motivation or application (savoir etre), and skills (savoir apprendre/FAIRE).

Flexibility is routinely cited by scholars and intercultural experts as a characteristic central to ICC (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Broome, 1991; Gudykunst, 2004; Hammer, 1989; Jackson, 2008; Kaweewong, 2002;
Kohls, 2001; Knutson, 1994; Knutson, 2003; Knutson & Posirusuk, 2006; Knutson et al., 2003; Komin, 1990; Lustig & Koester, 2010; Martin, 1989; Samovar et al., 2004; Triandis et al., 1988; Wiseman, 2002). Mindful behavioral flexibility results in the ability to gather information and adapt messages to the specific context. Successful interactions with strangers comprise four components of communication adaptability:

1) The requirement of both cognitive (ability to perceive) and behavioral (ability to adapt) skills; 2) Adaptation not only of behavior but also interaction goals; 3) The ability to adapt to the requirements posed by different communication contexts; and 4) The assumption that perceptions of communicative competence reside in the dyad. (Duran, 1983, p. 320)

These components reinforce the notion of ICC as dynamic, contextual, and requiring elements of knowledge, application, and skills to be effective and appropriate.

Gudykunst (2004) emphatically stated that:

If we know what can be done to improve the chances for effective communication, have the skills to do what needs to be done, and choose not to adapt our communication, we have to take responsibility for misunderstandings that occur as a result [emphasis added]. (p. 267)

An example of behavioral flexibility in intercultural communication episodes is presented in Table 2.4. Triandis et al. (1988) researched interactions between individualist (low-context) and collectivist (high-context) individuals, and how flexibility functions as a critical component in cultural understanding and development of long-term relationships. Flexibility is suggested as a key component to be included in cross-cultural training models. While no one culture or individual fits precisely into the following categories, recognition of the cultural differences may ultimately provoke communication flexibility between dissimilar cultures. Table 2.4 can be considered as applying to individuals on a continuum in order to account for self-construals.
Table 2.4

Low-Context and High Context Communication Adaptation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Context/Individualists (LC)</th>
<th>High-Context/Collectivists (HC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To communicate more effectively with high-context individuals, recognize:</td>
<td>To communicate more effectively with low-context individuals, recognize:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group memberships predict behavior</td>
<td>Behavior cannot be predicted accurately from group memberships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When group membership changes, individual behavior changes</td>
<td>Individualists are proud of individual accomplishment and say negative things about others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC comfort in vertical, unequal relationships</td>
<td>LC preference for horizontal, equal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC view of competition as threatening</td>
<td>LC view of competition as non-threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on harmony and in-group cooperation</td>
<td>Arguments emphasizing harmony and cooperation are not persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face (public self-image) and preservation of face in interactions is emphasized</td>
<td>Long-term relationships are limited and friendliness does not indicate intimate relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism and the person being criticized are not separate, and confrontation is avoided</td>
<td>Relationships are maintained when more rewards are received than costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality in initial interactions</td>
<td>Others are not respected on the basis of position, age or sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow HC guide in disclosure of personal information</td>
<td>Outgroups are not viewed as highly different from ingroups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Traindis et al. (1988).

Flexibility implies empathy and sensitivity. If an individual is not “other-oriented” and process-oriented, rigidity in communication is suggested rather than
flexibility. Empathy as a process was defined by Lustig and Koester (2010) as “the ability of individuals to communicate an awareness of another person’s thoughts, feelings, and experiences” (p. 74). Empathy was regarded by Bennett (1979) as “the imaginative, intellectual and emotional participation in another person’s experience” (p. 418). Empathy is a process composed of interrelated cognitive, affective, and communicative aspects; an individual strives to understand from another’s perspective, affectively seeks to experience the emotions of the other, and then attempts to communicate that understanding verbally and/or nonverbally (Gudykunst, 2004). Neulip (2003) maintained the difficulty of completely empathizing with dissimilar others is because of differences in ideas, beliefs, and styles of communication, among other differences. Consequently, the relational view of empathy proposed by Broome (1991) offered an attempt to consider the perspective of another by providing a relational approach to empathy versus a reproductive approach. Broome stated, “in order for empathy to have intercultural validity, it must be seen as a part of the communication process itself, and thus it may be influenced by variables in that process” (p. 240). Communication in the relational view is dynamic, with empathy going “beyond the individual to the creation of shared meaning during the interpersonal encounter” (Broome, 1991, p. 240). Shared meaning between dissimilar others is developed, during the transactional communication event, and what emerges reflects a third culture, “a merging of each individual’s construction of the other” (Broome, 1991, p. 242). The emergence of this third cultural suggests the essence of relational empathy (Broome, 1991).
The model in Figure 2.3 illustrates the processes of relational empathy and creation of shared meaning. To reiterate, this dynamic process seeks not to reproduce but create shared meaning, producing the third culture.

Figure 2.3. Model of relational empathy (Neulip, 2003, p. 287).

Relational empathy is consistent with behavioral flexibility and mindfulness, and requires intercultural sensitivity and decentering of individual ego to achieve. Intercultural sensitivity, defined by Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) encompasses (a) understanding the differences in behaviors when interacting with high and low-context cultures, 2) open-mindedness in cultural encounters, and 3) flexible behavior when confronted with dissimilar norms of another culture.

Jackson (2008) cited intercultural sensitivity as the primary assumption which underpins the developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) and stated “those who acquired higher levels of intercultural sensitivity and sociopragmatic awareness went beyond superficial observations of differences in the host culture and displayed more
empathy for others” (p. 349). In other words, individuals were able to build relational bonds with strangers and not be mere observers of persons and cultural differences. Interculturally sensitive individuals are open to new categories by being other-oriented.

The possibility exists for individuals to possess both the knowledge and motivation necessary for ICC, yet lack the requisite skills. Study abroad affords students the opportunity to maximize residence in a host country by honing ICC communication skills in authentic interactions and contexts. Students are not mere observers, but participants, utilizing knowledge of ICC components and applying them in interactions. An analogous situation outside the educational field would be someone who wants to be an actor. The individual can acquire a script so one has knowledge of the play at hand, and seek to apply the knowledge in performance, but without practice in moving about in a specific context or scene and becoming comfortable with knowledge, words and actions, the actual performance will likely be incompetent. There is a distinction between knowing and doing. The purpose of study abroad is to utilize cognitive knowledge, enable student application, and put the combination into skills refinement in the host environment. The conundrum is that students must have knowledge of requisite communication skills prior to their study abroad experience in able to improve them.

Returning once more to components of ICC seen as teachable communication skills, Koester and Olebe (1988) developed the Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence (BASIC). The BASIC skills are an extension of research by Ruben (1976) and Ruben and Kealey (1979), and are considered universal behaviors that can be generalized across cultures to facilitate ICC and relationship development. These
general patterns of behavior correlate to mindfulness, sensitivity, flexibility, and openness. The eight categories of behaviors illustrated in Table 2.5, include display of respect, orientation to knowledge, empathy, interaction management, task role behavior, relational role behavior, tolerance for ambiguity, and interaction posture. Considered culture-general behaviors, these behaviors generally appear across cultures; however, “the way each culture teaches its members to exhibit these actions is culture specific” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 72). *Culture general* “refers to specific theories or themes that are commonly encountered in cross-cultural interaction regardless of the cultures involved” (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994, p. 37).
Table 2.5

*The Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Competence (BASIC)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Behaviors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display of Respect</td>
<td>The ability to show respect and positive regard for another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to Knowledge</td>
<td>The terms people use to explain themselves and the world around them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>The capacity to behave as though you understand the world as others do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Management</td>
<td>Skill in regulating conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Role Behavior</td>
<td>Behaviors that involve the initiation of ideas related to group problem-solving activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Role Behavior</td>
<td>Behaviors associated with interpersonal harmony and mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Ambiguity</td>
<td>The ability to react to new and ambiguous situations with little visible discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Posture</td>
<td>The ability to respond to others in descriptive, nonevaluative, and nonjudgmental ways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* From Lustig and Koester (2010, p.73).

Thus, BASIC skills serve as a guide to behaviors considered appropriate and effective; they are skills an individual would actually engage in that would determine ICC, versus “internalized attitudes or . . . projections of what might [be done]” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 72).

1. *Display of respect* varies across cultures; however, general *respect* “is shown through both verbal and nonverbal symbols . . . and increases the likelihood of
a judgment of competence” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 72). Examples of verbal displays of respect (by no means intended as a comprehensive list) are concern for the other, attention to politeness rituals, and use of titles. Examples of nonverbal display of respect would be appropriate use of eye contact, use of space and time, and facial expressions (Lustig & Koester, 2010). A display of respect in the United States would be to look someone in they eye while speaking. In many other cultures, the same behavior would be considered rude.

2. **Orientation to knowledge** “refers to the terms people use to explain themselves and the world around them. A competent orientation to knowledge occurs when people’s actions demonstrate that all experiences and interpretations are individual and personal rather than universally shared by others” (Lustig & Koester, 2006, p. 73). Orientation to knowledge correlates to the concept of creating new categories and open mindedness and moves away from cognition that categorizes and stereotypes. For example, “the Japanese are so rude. When the train comes they just push their way on in front of you without waiting their turn!” This behavior is not considered rude in Japan, as trains are extremely crowded at rush hours. In fact, there are employed individuals at train stations whose job it is to stand at the train doors and push as many people in as possible before the doors close.

3. **Empathy** is the capacity “to behave as if one understands the world as others do” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 74). As stated previously regarding empathy
and ICC, it is both physically and psychologically impossible to put oneself in the shoes of another, therefore, one can only respond to “the emotional context of another person’s experience” (Lustig & Koester, 2006, p. 75).

Bennett (1998) proposed “The Platinum Rule” (p. 213) utilizing empathy as a key concept in replacing “The Golden Rule.” The Golden Rule states “do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” The Golden Rule implies similarity. Due to cultural differences, similarity cannot be assumed and there are multiple realities across cultures; therefore, the Platinum Rule, proposed by Bennett (1998), states “do unto others as they themselves would have done unto them” (p. 213). It is through empathy, “we at least can be aware of how others would like to be treated from their own perspectives” (Bennett, 1998, p. 213).

4. Interaction management, the skills required by participants in a communication interaction, indicate conversational turn taking (both verbally and nonverbally), as well as how to begin, maintain, and end conversations competently. Peterson (2004) noted features of communication interaction patterns across various cultures. In the United States, individuals in small groups commonly take turns in speaking, while other cultures may use an interrupting style (speaking over one another) or halting style (providing conversants the opportunity for consideration of what another has said) (Peterson, 2004).
5. Task role behavior refers to behaviors “that contribute to problem-solving activities, for example, initiating new ideas, requesting further information or facts, seeking clarification of group tasks, evaluating the suggestions of others, and keeping a group on task” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 75). Again, there are behaviors linked with culturally appropriate behaviors resulting in ICC. For example, a number of factors come into play with task role behavior, such as: where does the culture stand in terms of power distance? What is recognized as appropriate for individual versus group contribution? Is the American tendency to target the outcome of an encounter versus the relational aspect, something to be considered in a specific interaction?

6. Relational role behavior “concerns efforts to build or maintain personal relationships with group members” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 75). For individualistic cultures with ever-changing group memberships, this specific skill may be challenging. ICC requires greater emphasis on others than some individualistic cultures are accustomed to outside the nuclear family (core family members). Examples of “competent relational role behaviors include harmonizing and mediating conflicts between group members, encouraging participation from others, general displays of interest, and a willingness to compromise one’s position for the sake of others” (Lustig & Koester, 2010, p. 76). Compromising one’s position for the sake of others’ in individualistic societies requires attentiveness to other-orientation.
7. Tolerance for ambiguity “concerns a person’s responses to new, uncertain, and unpredictable intercultural encounters” (Lustig & Koester, 2006, p. 76). Gudykunst (1991) defined tolerance of ambiguity as implying “the ability to deal successfully with situations, even when a lot of information needed to interact effectively is unknown” (p. 119). An individual’s “tolerance for ambiguity influences the amount and type of information one will attempt to gather about strangers” (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997, p. 269). Tolerance of ambiguity, a major factor in the ability to reduce anxiety, is considered a key determinant of communication effectiveness and ICC. Individuals have a natural preference for predictability, and knowing what to expect puts people at ease. Tolerance of ambiguity is congruent with Hofstede’s (1980) uncertainty avoidance dimension. Examination of tolerance for ambiguity, as a behavioral skill in terms of the study abroad training perspective, seeks to provide students with tools to utilize during the sojourn abroad and development of ICC. Classroom procedures, assignment expectations, and classroom communication interaction with students and faculty may be quite different than what transpires in U.S. classrooms. Intercultural communication skills are not innate, and students will need to develop mindfulness, empathy, sensitivity, and flexibility to communicate appropriately and effectively.

While Koester and Olebe (1988) identified universal or BASIC skills as integral to ICC, a constructivist approach was posited by Bennett (1986) through development of
intercultural sensitivity. Bennett and Bennett (2004) stated culture is both objective and subjective in nature. Accordingly, objective culture “refers to the institutional aspects of culture, such as political and economic systems, and the products of culture, such as art, music, cuisine, and so on” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 150). The subjective aspect of culture refers to the worldview held by individuals in a culture, and is externalized through behaviors. Bennett and Bennett defined diversity based on this subjective cultural perspective, as:

Cultural differences in values, beliefs, and behaviors learned and shared by groups of interacting people defined by nationality, ethnicity, gender, age, physical characteristics, sexual orientation, economic status, education, profession, religion, organizational affiliation, and any other grouping that generates identifiable patterns. (p. 150)

Bennett and Bennett noted that, while the term diversity has fallen into some disrepute in the U.S., it is increasingly recognized internationally as both a mindset and a skill set critical to international effectiveness.

As individuals possess multi-layered and diverse cultural personalities, the use of culture generalizations (research-based predominant tendencies occurring at various levels of abstraction in a culture) are recommended (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) is based on the assumption that increasing cultural sensitivity develops as an individual’s “experience of cultural difference becomes more sophisticated, [and] one’s competence in intercultural relations increases” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 152). In other words, constructivism, cognition, and individual experience are the theoretical underpinnings guiding individuals along a continuum ranging from ethnocentric stages of experience to ethnorelative development
and intercultural sensitivity. Bennett and Bennett (2004) proposed individual growth in cultural sensitivity through six stages of development: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration. These stages are illustrated in Figure 2.4.

![Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity](image)

*Figure 2.4. The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 153).*

Each of the following cognitive steps in this model represents specific attitudes and behaviors to cultural differences. Ethnocentric stages (denial, defense, and minimization) are those where one’s own culture is experienced as central to reality; ethnorelative stages (acceptance, adaptation, and integration) are stages in which “one’s own culture is experienced in the context of other cultures” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 153). Ethnocentric behaviors can be considered as avoidance behaviors and ethnorelative behaviors considered as seeking behaviors. While linear in construction, progression through the model proposed by Bennett and Bennett (2004) is a “circular, self-referential process” (p. 150). Bennett and Bennett suggested a constructivist and relational approach toward culture, citing respect for diversity as “demonstrating understanding and appreciation for the different beliefs, behaviors, and values of varying subjective cultures. Such understanding and appreciation can provide access to the
differing cultural experience of others and enable mutual adaptation” (p. 150). The ethnocentric and ethnorelative stages of the DMIS model are elucidated as follows:

1. **Denial**: one’s own culture is experienced as the only real one and separation is maintained by psychological avoidance or physical isolation. Individuals in the denial stage display disinterest characterized by behaviors of indifference, cultural ignorance, observational naivety, and “superficial statements of tolerance” (Paige, Jacobs-Cassuto, Yershova, & DeJaeghere, 2003, p. 469). Kaweewong (2002) cited the following as an example observational denial, “Tokyo is not at all different from New York” (p. 42). Denial results in latent ethnocentrism. Refusal to acknowledge difference, or constantly staying within one’s own in-group as a sojourner represent two examples of denial; one cannot experience another culture if one is not in it.

2. **Defense**: polarization of “us” and “them,” “we and “they,” “superior” and “inferior.” Cultural differences are denigrated and exemplified in the following statements: “Haven’t they ever heard of using an ice cube?” “Everything in America is bigger and better. Did you see how tiny their cars are?” “If that guy got any closer, he’d be standing on top of me while he spoke.” Individuals at this stage are threatened by differences and closed to change. Defense may be interpreted as arrogance.

3. **Minimization**: “The final stage of ethnocentrism represents the most complex strategy for avoiding cultural difference” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 155). Minimization involves refusing to look past the surface to see cultural
differences. Individuals feel more comfortable by expecting similarities and trivializing differences, demonstrated by the following, “people are the same everywhere. Everyone wants the same thing for their families.”

4. **Acceptance**: accepting “the equal but different complexity of others” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 155). In other words, growth in sensitivity leads to acceptance of cultural difference as important; there are equally valid viewpoints. Progression from avoidance to acceptance is cited as “the essence of ethnorelativism” and begins an individual’s “reconfiguration of worldview into cultural contexts” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 155). Acceptance of cultural difference does not necessarily imply agreement, rather curiosity and respect for another culture. Paige et al. (2003) clarified the acceptance stage as cultural relativism; “one culture is not inherently better or worse than another” (p. 471).

5. **Adaptation**: “occurs when we need to think outside of our own cultural context” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 156). This can be correlated to Langer’s (1989) concept of mindfulness and the concept of flexibility (Broome, 1991; Gudykunst, 2004; Kohls, 2001; Knutson, 1994; Knutson et al, 2003; Komin, 1990; Lustig & Koester, 2010; Martin, 1989; Samovar et al., 2004). Lack of mindfulness and flexibility deny the possibility of taking the perspective of another culture. This shift in behavior occurs when an individual has become sensitized to the point that knowledge moves behavior into action that feels appropriate (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Development to
the point of adaptation enables a repertoire of behaviors suitable to a variety of contexts. More than one worldview is perceived, and the capacity to shift in and out of contextual perspectives facilitates communication behavior to suit the context. Kaweewong (2002) noted that adaptation is formative, rather than judgmental or evaluative. Thus, adaptation is a circular, on-going, constructive process. Paige et al. (2003) noted that adaption brings empathy and pluralism, enabling the individual to switch frames of reference, utilize alternate ways of thinking, and communicate and interact more effectively.

6. **Integration:** By the time an individual has reached the integration stage, he or she is “generally bicultural or multicultural in their worldviews” (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 157). Surprisingly, integration may generate problems with cultural identity issues for some. However, Bennett and Bennett (2004) noted intentional flexibility enables identities to move easily in and out of two or more cultures. Persons at this stage of development “transcend the cultures of which they are a part. They see themselves as ‘in process’” (Paige et al., 2003, p. 472).

Jackson (2010) stated the DMIS model holds special relevance for study abroad students in that it “posits that ethnorelative worldviews have more potential to generate the attitudes, knowledge and behavior that constitute intercultural competence and facilitate adjustment” (p. 40). The DMIS assumes a social construction of identity; through contact and interaction with strangers, knowledge of differences and similarities are encountered and experienced, ultimately changing an individual. Awareness,
understanding, and sensitivity are developed, mindsets adjusted, new categories for understanding created, and new behaviors employed. Each of these factors is identified with ICC. Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) emphasized this very point, stating:

To be effective in another culture, people must be interested in other cultures, be sensitive enough to notice cultural differences, and then also be willing to modify their behavior as an indication of respect for the people of other cultures. (p. 416)

Students who study abroad without training about how to interact with other cultures are virtually set adrift to fend for themselves in arenas they cannot intuitively comprehend. Students who study abroad and fail to venture outside their national companions, lose the opportunity to learn about host nationals, develop ICC, and cultivate a global perspective.

In summary, ICC is composed of behaviors such as openness, tolerance, mindfulness, flexibility, empathy, and sensitivity; it enables appropriate and effective communication in distinct contextual interactions. Consequently, misunderstandings are minimized and communication is generated to meet the expectations of a specific culture (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Broome, 1991; Gudykunst, 2004; Knutson, 1994; Knutson et al., 2003; Kohls, 2001; Komin, 1990; Lustig & Koester, 2008; Martin, 1989; Posirusuk, 2004; Samovar et al., 2004; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). The theory of rhetorical sensitivity, which has been shown to be isomorphic with the behaviors listed immediately supra, is ideally suited for training in skills to implement the cultural progression indicated by Bennett and Bennett’s (2004) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity.
Rhetorical Sensitivity

All individuals are bound by the culture of their socialization; to reiterate Hofstede’s comment, “culture’s grip on us is complete.” United States’ students, therefore, are inherently bound by culture-based assumptions during initial communication interactions with individuals from other cultures. Conceptualizing competent communication persists as a critical component for any training program aimed at student communication; this thesis project proposes a pre-departure training program utilizing the theory of rhetorical sensitivity. While focusing on the process of message transmission and how individuals think about the messages they send, rhetorical sensitivity (RS) is receiver-oriented communication, implying skills congruent with ICC (Knutson et al., 2003).

Kim (2001) emphasized that:

A fundamental problem in American communication research is that it takes [as] universal what is essentially a culture-specific phenomenon . . . unless an international dimension is introduced, American communication research may remain blind to its culture-bound assumption and limitations. (p. 3)

Kim found no panacea applicable to all intercultural communication episodes; every culture possesses specific contexts and behaviors (e.g., what is considered respectful, polite, and competent communication patterns). The theory of rhetorical sensitivity may be useful in solving this dilemma though, introducing an international dimension useful for communicating in both culture-general and culture-specific contexts. Rhetorical sensitivity theory reflects a culture general stance; however, it can be utilized to teach students the importance of adapting communication behaviors in both culture-general and culture-specific contexts.
While considered impossible to teach a pre-departure course that can ensure ICC as an outcome; the theory of rhetorical sensitivity presents ICC concepts that can be generalized across cultures, thus providing students a foundation upon which to build communication competence in praxis. One of the chief tenets underlying the study abroad program is to prepare U.S. American students to become competent communicators in a global world. Rhetorical sensitivity theory has consistently been shown to encompass tools correlated with improved cultural understanding and ICC (Hart & Burks, 1972; House, Dallinger, & Kilgallen, 1998; Knutson et al., 2003; Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006; Ting-Toomey, 1988).

Having previously defined the conceptual framework of ICC, it is essential to return to the two views of competence put forth by Gudykunst and Kim (1997), which suggest the concept of competence as emerging from within the communicator, or as a result of communication between communicators. The theory of rhetorical sensitivity can be correlated as employing both of these concepts: competence from within the communicator (achieved as a result of being rhetorically sensitive), which, in turn, results in competent communication between communicators. To fully understand how rhetorical sensitivity encompasses both of these functions, the theoretical perspective of rhetorical sensitivity will be examined and clarified.

Darnell and Brockriede (1976) formulated three categories of communicators within the concept of RS: nobles selves, rhetorical reflectors, and rhetorical sensitives, suggesting a continuum with noble selves at one end, rhetorical sensitives at mid-point, and rhetorical reflectors at the opposite pole of noble selves. Noble selves are persons
who “see any variation from their personal norms as hypocritical, as a denial of integrity, as a cardinal sin” (Darnell & Brockriede, 1976, p. 176). The noble self will “stick to their personal ideals without variation and without adapting or adjusting to others” (Littlejohn, 2002, p. 107). Knutson et al. (2003) described noble selves as inflexible communicators, whose maintenance of personal goals and objectives is more important than message adaptation and source-oriented expression. In other words, noble selves view themselves as more important than the message sent; noble self communication is egocentric, and as a cultural mode of communication considered ethnocentric in nature. Research has shown a greater prevalence of noble self-communication characteristics in low-context (individualistic) cultures versus high-context (collectivistic) cultures (Hall, 1989; Hart, Carlson, & Eadie, 1980; Knutson et al., 2003; Posirisuk, 2004). As the value of individualism is central to United States culture and direct communication is valued, students may be unaware of their own communication style as noble selves. Focusing on the low-context/individualism and high-context/collectivism frameworks once again, serves to underscore possible misunderstandings and misattributions when cultural rules for communication do not consider the message receiver. Noble-self behavior directly hinders and interferes with ICC. Gudykunst (1998) stated that:

To resolve . . . misunderstandings, obviously one of the people involved must recognize that the differences in [communication] styles are creating the problem, try to interpret accurately the other person’s messages, and then shift her or his style of speech. (p. 159)

Unfortunately, “obvious” is not always apparent, thus misunderstandings with high and low-context and direct-indirect differences occur (Gudykunst, 1998). As Tannen (1979) stated, “in seeking to clarify, each speaker continues to use the very strategy which
confused the other in the first place” (p. 5). Effective communicators must be adaptable and receiver-oriented not only to overcome misunderstandings, but to be aware of the cultural other.

*Rhetorical reflectors* were defined by Darnell and Brockriede (1976) as analogous to chameleons, changing self to suit the communication situation, and consequently “having no Self to call their own, for each new situation they present a new Self” (p. 178). On the rhetorical sensitivity continuum, rhetorical reflector would be considered the polar opposite of the noble self. Knutson et al. (2003) stated rhetorical reflectors have such an intense concern for the receiver’s requirements they adjust “themselves to the wishes of other” (p. 64). This type of communicator is frequently found in high-context cultures in which the preservation of harmony and face are considered paramount objectives (House et al., 1998). Rhetorical reflective communication was viewed by Posirisuk (2004) as indirect, impersonal, and inclusive of more qualifiers such as “‘maybe,’ ‘somewhat,’ ‘perhaps,’ and ‘probably’” (p. 37). Ancillary use of qualifiers enables smoothness and harmony in conversation, allowing the other to reflect the conversation of the receiver without disagreement. However, this may also result in ineffective communication, as the rhetorical reflective may be incapable of expressing personal thoughts, ideas, or needs (Posirisuk, 2004). Kaweewong (2002) viewed rhetorical reflectors as those who “defer to the wishes of others” (p. 39); once again, rhetorical reflectors may defer to the point where one is capable of losing themselves.
Rhetorical sensitives are considered the most competent communicators, located on the continuum between the extremes of noble selves and rhetorical reflectors; rhetorical sensitives moderate the polar extremes between noble selves and rhetorical reflectors (Hart et al., 1980). It is the level of communication competence achieved by rhetorical sensitives, which enables combining “concerns for self and others with a situational perspective” (Knutson et al., 2003, p. 64). Kaweewong (2002) clarified rhetorical sensitives as individuals who can deftly “adjust their communication behavior suitable for different situations; but can maintain their own principles” (p. 39).

Rhetorically sensitive individuals exhibit communication skills and behaviors associated with ICC: contextually aware individuals open to new ideas and categories (mindful), conscious of creating shared meaning, empathic and sensitive, and among other skills, possess a tolerance for ambiguity. The rhetorically sensitive individual possesses the flexibility and skills directly correlated to intercultural communication competence. Hart et al. (1980) cited five components of a rhetorically sensitive individual: acceptance of personal complexity, avoidance of communication rigidity, interaction consciousness, appreciation of the communicability of ideas, and tolerance for invention searching.

Acceptance of personal complexity views the individual as having “a complex network of selves” (Hart et al., 1980, p. 2). This component could be correlated to an awareness of the various dimensions of personality, role behaviors, communication predispositions, and cultural values each individual possess. The concept also includes the viewpoint that only some part of that “network of selves” is “present in any interpersonal exchange” (Hart et al., 1980, p. 2). This component implies an awareness
of self, and the capacity within an individual to choose the appropriate contextual self. The ability to make this differentiation is compatible with the components of ICC, as previously put forth through a substantial description of knowledge, motivation, and skills.

Rhetorically sensitive individuals avoid rigid and stylized communication. This concept is equally compatible with components of ICC. The elements of empathy, flexibility, co-ordination of verbal and non-verbal behaviors, and contextual knowledge of appropriateness and effectiveness, encourage fluid versus rigid communication styles. In the words of Hart and Burks (1972), rhetorical sensitivity is “an undulating, fluctuating entity” (p. 91). Flexibility is not only conduct characteristic of RS, but effective intercultural communication (ICC) demands it (Knutson et al., 2003). Furthermore, the rhetorically sensitive person, according to Hart and Burks “deals with the most slippery of intellectual stuff, the values, attitudes, and philosophical pre-dispositions of others” (p. 91). Awareness and flexibility required for rhetorical sensitivity are congruent with ICC components.

Compatible with ICC concepts, interaction consciousness focuses awareness, mindfulness, an understanding of context and actions, and the process of communication rather than the outcome. Interaction consciousness is also compatible with the concept of competence emerging from within and between communicators (Broome, 1991; Gudykunst & Kim, 1997). In commenting on the identical nature of Hall’s high and low-context schema with Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, Deng (1992) succinctly elucidated key differences in communication behaviors:
For example, individualistic, or low-context cultures indicate a preference of direct and overt communication style, confrontational and aggressive behaviors, a clear self-identification, and a priority of personal interest and achievement. Collectivistic, or high-context, cultures manifest a preference of indirect and covert communication style, an obedient and conforming behavior, a clear group identification, and a priority of group interest and harmony. (p. 38)

ICC is achieved within and between communicators through constant adaptation and creative transformation by rhetorical sensitives.

*Appreciation for the communicability of ideas* is displayed by rhetorically sensitive individuals who realize “that even some of our most prized feelings, should sometimes *not* be communicated, even though it might temporarily salve the psyche to do so” (Hart et al., 1980, p. 2). Hart and Burks (1972) defined this component as distinguishing “between all information and information acceptable for communication” (p. 76). Appropriateness directly correlates with the knowledge and skills components of ICC; awareness, understanding of communication rules, context, sensitivity, and normative expectations. Appreciation for the communicability of ideas enables interaction competence.

*Tolerance for inventional searching* speaks to the very essence of the rhetorically sensitive individual. It also links directly to the skills component of ICC. Mindfulness (Langer, 1989) encompasses inventional searching in creation of new categories and openness to new information. Mindfulness additionally pertains to the process of being aware of more than one perspective, as does empathy. Flexibility in thinking and communication allows for alternatives and adaptation in light of perceived boundaries. Littlejohn (2002) emphasized that “cultures communicate in different ways, but all forms of communication require a shared code, communicators who know and use the code, a
channel, a setting, a message form, a topic, and an event created by transmission of the message” (p. 194). Tolerance for inventional searching enables communicators to search for alternative channels and codes to transmit messages. Creation of shared meaning is essential when communicating across cultures, languages, values, communication rules, and so forth. This is clearly a cognitively complex sphere. Posirisuk (2004) linked cognitive complexity and inventional searching to rhetorically sensitive communication in that it “involves the notion that sophisticated communicative conduct in situations requires differentiated understanding of other’s perspectives and motivational dynamics (p. 40). To reiterate, rhetorically sensitive individuals possess communication skills and behaviors associated with ICC: they are contextually aware, open to new ideas and categories (mindful), conscious of creating shared meaning, empathic and sensitive, and among other skills, possess a tolerance for ambiguity.

Compatibility of Thai Communication with ICC and RS

The theory of rhetorical sensitivity has been the basis of a systematic program of research seeking to identify teachable characteristics of ICC, utilizing Thai communication behaviors (Knutson, 1994, 2000, 2004; Knutson et al., 2003; Knutson, Komolsevin, Datthuyawat, Smith, & Kaweepong, 2007; Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006; Knutson, Vivatananukul, & Hwang, 1995). Knutson and Posirisuk (2006) noted specific Thai communication behaviors “may yield specific operational definitions for teaching intercultural communication effectiveness” (p. 206).

Based upon the preceding identification and comparison of specific components of ICC and RS, the two terms are clearly linked. The isomorphic relationship existing
between RS and ICC has been demonstrated (Knutson et al., 2003). Further observation by Knutson et al. (2003) asserted “the Kingdom of Thailand serves as a unique laboratory for the search of behaviors associated with effective intercultural communication. Thai communication patterns display the flexibility associated with rhetorical sensitive and rhetorical reflective people” (p. 66).

To explain some of the flexibility required in Thai communication, in the English language there is one form “I” used as the first pronoun; in Thailand there are up to 17 forms for the first person pronoun. In the English language there is one word “you” as the second person pronoun; in Thailand, there are up to 19 forms of the pronoun. Selection of the proper pronouns depends on adapting communication to meet the context of the communication episode, and selection is defined by such variables as “relative politeness, intimacy, and status of those involved in conversation” (Knutson et al., 2003, p. 67).

The Thai communicate within an intricate and complex communication system to ensure just the right amount of politeness is used in a specific situation. For instance, “if an individual wanted to translate the word ‘eat’ into Thai, a choice would have to be made between using the following words:

- *gin* (everyday word, slightly informal)
- *tahn* (everyday word, slightly formal)
- *rap-bpra-tahn* (very formal)
- *chan* (when talking about monks)
- *savoey* (when talking about the King and the royal family). (Into Asia, n.d.)
Thailand, a nation known for its hospitality, and excellence in service, is also known as Land of the Smiles, Thailand is also a nation known for its diplomatic acumen. Insight into the country’s communicative diplomacy is illuminated by Fieg (1989):

Lacking America’s economic and military might, Thailand has had to resort to a different weapon in order to preserve her freedom—an astute diplomacy, which has juggled and balanced interest and discerned the ebb and flow of international relations with remarkable sophistication and consummate skill. (p. 8)

The population of Thailand is approximately 66 million people in an area the size of Texas, which by comparison, has a population of approximately 24.8 million people (Central Intelligence Agency, n.d.). The city of Bangkok has a population of 9 million people, with that number swelling to between 15 and 20 million people daily during the work day (Thailand Tourism Guide, n.d.). Comparatively, the population of New York City is approximately 8.4 million people. Why are these statistics important? Because the foremost national value in Thailand is social harmony, in a densely populated country where frustrations may easily peak, communication is considered extremely polite and diplomatic.

Social harmony and relationship are characteristics that dominate Thai culture and the Thai language. For example, the metaphor of heart and mind expresses two distinctly different worldviews in Thailand and United States culture. Knutson (2004) noted “the metaphor of the heart takes on great importance to an understanding of the Thai worldview; the heart and mind are one” (p. 151). In fact, there are over 1,000 Thai phrases that allude to jai, which refers to both heart and mind (Knutson, 2004). In Thailand, the heart and mind are one, accounting for the firmly held worldview, and
national value of social harmony, along with an emphasis on smooth and interpersonal relationships (Knutson, 2004).

The Thai worldview stands in juxtaposition to the United States worldview of heart and mind as two separate entities. The reference is often made in the United States that one is thinking with their heart and not their mind. The United States’ worldview is less relational and more task-oriented; in general, one sets out to accomplish a task and must ensure that feelings do not get in the way. Individuals have often heard the adage, “don’t take it personally, it’s just business.” In other words, while business predominates over interpersonal relationship in United States culture, relationship predominates over business outcome in Thailand and other high-context cultures. This relationship is particularly pronounced in Thai communication behaviors, as heart and mind are not dichotomous. The heart-mind connection of jai enables cultural thinking that puts the others’ perspective into focus rather than perspective on self. In communication behaviors, this could be considered as a form of diplomacy in being ever mindful of another’s perspective in communicating. The heart-mind metaphor serves to highlight the dichotomy between Eastern and Western worldviews: Westerners value categories, while “Easterner’s are more likely to emphasize relationships” (Nisbett, 2003, p. 45).

Thai communication has been revealed as receiver-oriented, flexible, rhetorically sensitive communication isomorphic with intercultural communication competence. Therefore, five specific Thai communication behaviors suggest tools to facilitate and develop ICC: nam jai, kreng jai, jai yen, bunkhun, and mai pen rai. Nam jai literally means “water of the heart” and is an attitude of helpfulness given without expectation. It
refers to the ability for sincere compassion and empathy to flow from the heart, inferring communication behaviors that are open, sensitive, empathetic, and result in eliminating uncertainty and anxiety in communication interactions (Kaweewong, 2002; Posirusuk, 2004). Knutson (2003) noted nam jai as a behavior which “seldom allows Thais to see strangers as threatening or suspicious” (p. 67).

Fieg (1989) defined kreng jai as “the desire to be self-effacing, respectful, and extremely considerate as well as the wish to avoid embarrassing others or intruding upon them (p. 43). The diplomacy of kreng jai can be seen in conflict avoidance and consideration of face, as well as other-orientation. As a behavior, kreng jai is projected through considered communication that is appropriate and effective to the communication context. Striving to be respectful, considerate, and avoid embarrassment to others in intercultural communication can ultimately only serve to optimize opportunities. While the Thai concept of kreng jai may seem extreme to U.S. Americans due to cultural variation, the goal of appropriate and effective intercultural communication requires individuals to minimize misunderstandings or maximize similarity in the ways messages are interpreted (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997).

Knutson et al. (2003) noted “the Thai desire for smooth interpersonal relationships can be seen in the Thai expression jai yen, . . . the talent of remaining calm and in control of one’s emotions even during difficult situations” (p. 67). Jai yen has also been defined as “the capacity to restrain emotions and keep interpersonal relations on a smooth, even keel” (Fieg, 1989, p. 41). Social harmony is again reflected in this Thai communication behavior as it considers the importance of politeness and consideration of
face. Again, restraining emotions and tempers can be viewed as diplomatic behaviors since motivation to interact with an angry person is affected. *Jai yen* is displayed in ICC and RS behaviors through mindfulness, flexibility, tolerance for ambiguity, and appropriate and effective behavior.

*Bunkhun* is defined as an attitude that is reflected in behaviors; literally, it is the reciprocity of kindness. This behavior has been described as a psychological bond that exists between two persons based on the value of gratitude. A grateful relationship between two people exists when one person helps another out of kindness and sincerity, and the receiver of the goodness remembers, with readiness to reciprocate the kindness. Gratefulness and the attitude of reciprocity is not bound by time or distance (P. Dhattuyawat, personal communication, October 11, 2010). This communication behavior projects itself through empathy, sensitivity, and awareness of the other’s perspective. Bennett’s (1979) concept of empathy and the “Platinum Rule” which stresses using the other person’s perspective as a frame of reference, “Do unto others as they themselves would have done unto them” is reflective of the Thai communication behavior of *bunkhun* (p. 422).

The communication behaviors represented by the term and attitude of *mai pen rai* are situational orientation, context, and display of flexibility. Literally translated, *mai pen rai* is “it doesn’t matter” or “never mind.” This communication behavior takes into consideration how individuals react to unavoidable events, placing the other first. Mindfulness, flexibility, empathy, anxiety management, and harmony, along with
individual face are maintained by through this communication behavior, representing
intense other-orientation, diplomacy, and ICC.

While this is by no means an exhaustive list of Thai communication behaviors,
these behaviors serve to illustrate the point: components of ICC have been identified and
correlated with RS; and RS has been shown to have an isomorphic relationship with ICC.
Thai communication behaviors (TCB) have been shown as exhibiting characteristics
compatible with ICC and displaying receiver-oriented characteristics of RS. A triangular
training concept is proposed as foundational to the proposed training for students
studying abroad. Each component discussed, ICC, RS, and TCB are isomorphic and
contribute to developing and facilitating appropriate and effective communication. The
concepts serve as a framework to obtaining that goal; each concept informs and supports
the other in subtle, yet distinct ways. Therefore, the triangular foundation illustrated in
Figure 2.5 below will be used as a core concept in preparing students during pre-
departure training.

Figure 2.5. Triangular foundation.
The argument for pre-departure training is based on proven consequences: lack of preparation directly effects student learning and adaptation; without training, statistics indicate students will not maximize an already limited opportunity for study abroad, will not capitalize on the opportunity to develop appropriate and effective communication skills, and may fail in their experience due to emotional and adaptation issues. Intervention in the study abroad experience in terms of pre-departure training is necessary to maximize the opportunity for adaptation and communication skill development. Training proposed in answer to the aforementioned issues will encompass the following: theoretical underpinnings of adult learning and social learning theory and their significance to training design, elements for inclusion in training design and justification for their inclusion, and the initial needs assessment for training participants.

**Adult Learning Theory and Training Design**

Training designed for adult learning is differentiated from teaching younger learners (or children), due to a different set of theoretical assumptions about learning; specifically, the relevance of learning, role of the learner’s experience, level of self-direction, and the individual’s orientation to learning (Beebe, Mottet, & Roach, 2004). Pedagogy is referred to as the “art and science of teaching children” (Beebe et al., 2004, p. 303); while andragogy, derived from the Greek words aner meaning adult, and agogus, meaning guide, is defined as “the art and science of helping adults learn” (Knowles, 1976, p. 16). Knowles (1976), one of the fundamental theorists of adult
learning, indicates different assumptions implemented by the andragogue and the pedagogue in facilitating training. These differences are clarified in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

*Training Differences Between Andragogue and Pedagoge*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andragogue Assumptions</th>
<th>Pedagoge Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners are self-directing human beings</td>
<td>Learners are dependent personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training is a process of self-development through collaborative inquiry</td>
<td>Training is a process of transmitting content; it is doing something to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of teacher is that of facilitator and resource to self-directed learners.</td>
<td>The role of teacher is that of transmitter of content, and controller of rewards and punishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is enhanced by intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Learning will not occur without extrinsic motivators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on establishing a climate conducive to learning (warmth, mutual respect, trust, informality)</td>
<td>Satisfaction with a climate of coldness, formality, competitiveness, one-way communication, and teacher dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages learners in assessment of learning needs and goals</td>
<td>Determines learning through needs-assessment in which learners have no part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages learners in formulating personally meaningful learning goals</td>
<td>Formulates learning goals for learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops experiential learning sequences (learner-oriented)</td>
<td>Develops plan for transmitting units of content (teacher-oriented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages learners in self-directed inquiry</td>
<td>Selects learning material to transmit content most efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages learners in a mutual process of evaluation based on performance criteria</td>
<td>Evaluates learners on the basis of normative criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Knowles (1976).
In comparing the assumptions of andragogy and pedagogy, some cultural implications clearly apply, especially in terms of classroom or training behaviors. However, this training program is designed specifically for U.S. students preparing to study abroad, so there is no obvious conflict in utilizing andragogy versus pedagogy. The trainer/facilitator must be cognizant however, to any cultural differences in classroom composition in the event modifications in training delivery must be addressed. Students from cultures high in Hofstede’s (1980) power distance dimension will be more comfortable learning with the assumptions of the pedagogue. Having clearly defined the differences between andragogy and pedagogy, it is interesting to note the term pedagogy is still most commonly used in referring to training methods. Therefore, the term pedagogy will be used in discussion of the pre-departure training project with the assumptions of andragogy applied.

Training and Design Methods

Training is defined by Beebe et al. (2004) as “the process of developing skills in order to more effectively perform a specific job or task” (p. 5). The concept of intercultural training is broader in nature; concerned not with a specific task, but multiple tasks and issues, such as learning about culture, behaviors to increase intercultural communication competence, anxiety reduction, flexibility, and so forth. Brislin and Yoshida (1994) defined intercultural communication training as “formal efforts designed to prepare people for more effective interpersonal relations when they interact with individuals from cultures other than their own” (p. 3). Cross-cultural training is defined by Littrell et al. (2006) as “the educative processes used to improve intercultural learning
via the development of cognitive, affective and behavioral competencies in diverse cultures” (p. 356). Brislin and Yoshida (1994) noted that intercultural training places more emphasis on communication and interpersonal interactions while cross-cultural training refers more strongly to adaptation and adjustment issues; however, the terms intercultural and cross-cultural training are often used interchangeably in training, with “communication issues involving interactions among people” in both types of training (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994, p. 3). For the purposes of this thesis project, the term intercultural training will be used.

Students preparing to study abroad are adult learners who bring their life experience with them; therefore, trainers must consider relevant training, and begin with “what their trainees already know” (Beebe et al., 2004, p. 28). Often underemphasized in intercultural training, the needs assessment should be considered the first imperative in any training program (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994). Baumgarten (1995) noted “identification and analysis of training needs into training goals” (p. 209) begins at this particular juncture in the training cycle. Training needs determine training goals, and ultimately the choice of methods used to present training. Effective training will link its methods to the goals of the program and the goals of the participants. To prepare training for student sojourn abroad however, an adequate needs assessment of students’ intercultural experience, awareness, cultural understanding, and communication competency levels proves requisite prior to training design.

Research on developing needs analyses for intercultural communication training targeted at business executives or task objectives is prevalent, while similar research for
student study abroad remains scarce. Baumgarten (1995) suggested training needs analysis for international business staff as composed of three interrelated components: “organizational analysis, job/task analysis, and person analysis” (p. 210). These components can be generalized to a student needs analysis by focusing analysis on educational institutions at home and in the host country, academic and teaching expectations at home and in the host country, and person analysis in terms of cultural awareness and experience. Concentrating on the intercultural and communication skill levels of individual trainees allows the needs analysis to determine gaps or specific needs requiring attention during training. This personalizes training for students, providing personal significance. The needs assessment ensures relevant training compatible with the sophistication and experience level of individual students. Hiler and Paul (2005) cited teaching for usefulness as one of the elements intended for active and adult learning. Personal significance and providing functional behaviors as tools for communicating across cultures form the very essence of pre-departure training, ensuring students will be fully engaged in the learning process.

Brislin and Yoshida (1994) suggested four different methods commonly used in preparation of a needs assessment: observational methods, interviews, key consultation, and questionnaires using a Delphi procedure. While these four methods are considered the best methods for use in preparation of a needs assessment, training for university students is affected by time constraints. Access to students during the semester prior to their departure may be limited. To plan pragmatically for pre-departure training, a needs assessment has been designed utilizing true and false questions in conjunction with open-
ended questions (see Appendix R). The questionnaire is a combination of true and false questions, and two open-ended questions. The questionnaire serves as a broad baseline and provides feedback as a general diagnostic of student cultural awareness. Two true and false questions are associated with the DMIS, and student answers to these specific questions will provide insight to their intercultural development prior to training. There is also one question related to face, which will indicate any understanding of high and low-context culture. The two open-ended are more specific and depending on size of the training class can be specifically addressed. They also provide information that can be utilized in further research. The two open-ended questions serve two purposes: research has shown that students who define their study abroad goals prior to departure tend to be more successful (Mikk et al., 2009), and issues which concern the student most about study abroad can be addressed during training. As the questionnaire is used during subsequent training programs, data will continue to be collected which can serve to further clarify research between training and study abroad success. The questionnaire will be posted on the internet at Survey Monkey (http://www.SurveyMonkey.com), along with the Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA) questionnaire (see Appendix S).

The PRICA, an instrument developed by Neulip and McCrosky (1997) is a Likert-type scale that reports high validity and reliability in determining intercultural communication apprehension (Kim & Goldstein, 2005; Neulip & McCrosky, 1997; Neulip & Ryan, 1998). Use by researchers has found the PRICA capable of predicting favorable study abroad outcomes by examining levels of intercultural communication
apprehension (Kim & Goldstein, 2005). A questionnaire with answers demonstrating the levels of the students’ intercultural development according to DMIS stages is included in the appendices for trainers utilizing this project (see Appendix T) (Bennett, 1998). Completion of these two questionnaires no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled training date will enable the trainer to adjust any material or exercises according to student needs (i.e., previous intercultural experience or apprehensions) that may be addressed in training.

Regardless of specific student needs, scholars emphasize a variety of elements as essential for inclusion as core components in the intercultural training course. While the core components tend to remain essentially the same, the names of the components tend to change slightly (Baumgarten, 1995; Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Fowler, 2006; Gudykunst, 2004; Jack & Stage, 2005). Martin (1989) declared it critical for students to gain knowledge in the cultural expectations of the host country, communication variables, contextual application of cultural variables, and a variety of strategies encompassing aspects of effective intercultural communication. Hofstede, Pederson, and Hofstede (2002) proposed the categories of awareness, knowledge, and skills for intercultural training; while Jack and Stage (2005) opted for the terms insight, motivations, capabilities, real-world practice, and accountability. The four-step training approach proposed by Brislin and Yoshida (1994) included cognitive, behavioral, and experiential learning techniques in the areas of awareness, knowledge, emotions, and skills.
While each researcher or scholar views a slightly different yet extremely similar approach to training, the distinctive difference lies in whether or not intercultural training is theoretically based. Theoretically based training has proven to result in easier absorption of material by trainees and its generalization to new contexts (Bhawuk, 1998; Triandis, 2002). The current training project is based on theoretical frameworks of cultural variance (high and low-context, and collectivism-individualism) AUM theory, rhetorical sensitivity theory, and incorporates components of ICC and Thai communication behaviors. Three categories of culture-general information are proposed: knowledge (awareness and cultural variance), application (utilizing specific ICC communication behaviors), and skills (refining communication skills utilizing rhetorical sensitivity and specific Thai communication behaviors).

Landis and Bhagat (1996) noted that “trainers from a pedagogical background include all three goals—cognitive, behavioral, and affectual—in their objectives, add why as well as how in both culture-specific and culture-general foci, and use both intellectual and experiential approaches” (p. 7). This training program, focused on knowledge, application, and skills, will be taught incorporating adult learning theory, which presents concepts in cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains and includes experiential training methods relevant to the learner’s needs. As indicated previously, adult learning theory facilitates learning versus creating an environment in which students are “the passive recipients of knowledge” (Stoner, 2006, p. 1).

Lustig and Koester (2010) clarified cultural knowledge as cognitive information that can be classified as culture-general or culture-specific. *Culture-general* information
provides a framework for understanding the intercultural communication process and assists in sensitizing individuals to differences in patterns and rules of interaction across cultures (Lustig & Koester, 2010). Brislin and Pederson (1976) defined culture-general topics such as “self-awareness and sensitivity training that allow one to learn about himself as preparation for interaction in any culture” (p. 6). The training presented is primarily culture-general in nature; aimed at improving communication and facilitating interactions by providing knowledge, application, and skills to develop appropriate and effective communication skills (Bloom, 1956). For example, the interactive training contains one assignment for student host country awareness, but time constraints limit the training to culture-general information, with a focus on tools to develop appropriate and effective communication skills. In a semester-long program, there would be time for inclusion of more culture-specific training. The program will stress the necessity of locating culture-specific information prior to departure through Internet or published sources.

As mentioned previously, the needs assessment identifies the training goals and objectives, with objectives defined as what one wants to achieve as a result of training, or the outcome of the training (Baumgarten, 1995). Objectives should be observable, measurable, attainable, and specific (Beebe et al., 2004). A variety of training methods are available for intercultural training and choice of training method is dependent on specific objectives. Social learning theory is argued as a basis for choosing training methods due to learning acquisition and productivity in two ways: first, reinforcement and reward of appropriate behaviors; and second, modeling the behavior of others.
According to social learning theory, “there are two main forms of modeling: symbolic and participative” (Baumgarten, 1995, p. 217). Symbolic modeling is comprised of hearing about, or reading about behavior; and observational (or participative) modeling is activity in which the observer actually practices the behavior (Baumgarten, 1995). Especially well suited as a training method associated with intercultural training, participative behavior, experiential in approach, allows for modeling of behaviors through structured activities, simulations, or role-plays. Students are consequently able to practice a simulated situation they will most likely encounter in communicating with dissimilar others across cultures. This is also congruent with the model of engaged learning presented by Stoner (2006) in which dialogue (symbolic) intersects with experience (participative), resulting in observing and doing, or modeling behaviors. Adult learning principles dictate that the more involved the learner is with the learning process, contributing and doing, the more the adult learner is engaged and learns (Stolovitch & Keeps, 2002). Some of the methods available for intercultural training are listed in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2

**Methods for Use in Intercultural Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Specific Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>Role playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed instruction</td>
<td>Cultural assimilator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expositive instruction</td>
<td>Lectures (area briefing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio/visual presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity training</td>
<td>T-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior modification methods</td>
<td>Drill-and-practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field experiences</td>
<td>Field Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignments to micro-cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings with experienced international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff or key consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>On-line training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line support during sojourn abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blogs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Baumgarten (1995).

**Training Methods**

This training program will include a combination of simulations (role playing and instructional games), programmed instruction (cultural assimilators), expositive instruction (lectures and reading assignments), and behavior modification methods (modeling). Simulations will be utilized in modules that initially introduce students to the problems of communicating across cultures, taking them out of their comfort zone.
Cross-cultural dialogues will also be used. The purpose of cross-cultural dialogue role-plays is to introduce students to unseen cultural differences lurking beneath the obvious meaning of words, potentially creating misunderstandings. Cross-cultural dialogues and critical incidents stimulate reflections and exchange of ideas, in resolution of the problems presented. Cross-cultural dialogues also introduce students to conceptualizations of how individuals project their sense of norms onto individuals from other cultures. Role-plays and dialogues enable students to practice making observations and practice cultural awareness. Cultural assimilators use critical incidents to encourage student contemplation of cultural assumptions they take for granted in to intercultural interactions. There has been a history of success using cultural assimilators in training programs (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). Critical incidents allow training participants to practice how to resolve misunderstandings that will inevitably occur between individuals from different cultural backgrounds. Critical incidents are relevant to trainees and have human appeal to absorb their interest in the training; they also generalize to situations the students will inevitably find themselves in during their sojourn abroad. Critical incidents help to sensitize students in advance, so they will have greater knowledge of appropriate and effective behaviors, a reference point to draw from when they find themselves in similar situations abroad. Expositive instruction is necessary to convey concepts students may be unfamiliar with; however, lectures are kept to a 15 to 20-minute time frame, and during that time-frame are designed to be interactive with students throughout the lecture. Questions and anticipated responses are built into the lecture training modules. Modeling of appropriate and effective communication behaviors is applied through group work,
which is then presented to the whole class. Modeling is especially effective in modules related to adapting communication. The goal of this training is to present information and follow the lecture segment with a training module that will immediately allow students to apply the concepts, helping them to internalize the information.

Providing the opportunity to apply and internalize the information provided and the specific choice of exercises in the training are designed to promote collaborative work and critical thinking. While some of the exercises have the students break into dyads, the majority of work is done in groups of three students, and their findings then presented for whole class discussion. Campbell (2004) stated “knowledge is learned in a social manner—that is we learn by dialogue and interaction with others” (p. 267). Collaborative learning provides students with the opportunity of exploratory talk about concepts, providing the opportunity to further internalize the information.

The training is designed using Bloom’s taxonomy as foundational in organizing the learning objectives for units/modules. Inclusion of components of Bloom’s taxonomy encourages students to play an active role in-group collaboration, transitioning from passive learners to engaged and critically thinking participants. Given critical incidents (as one example) students dialogue together to come to an understanding of what cultural variations may be present and how they can adapt communication in response. This provides students with skills to take on their sojourn with them, versus just telling them what to do. They are engaging with ideas and utilizing them immediately. Thus, the trainer/facilitator is guiding student thought processes and Bloom’s taxonomy moves the student through stages of knowledge and comprehension, to application of knowledge,
analysis, and synthesis (Bloom, 1956). Synthesis is evidenced in communication adaptation, and, finally, evaluation in comparing and contrasting aspects of ICC, RS, and Thai communication behaviors to determine appropriate and effective communication within a given context.

Almost every exercise is done in dyad or groups of three and then debriefed as a class. The facilitator’s role in debriefing an activity is very important to completion of the activity and ensuring learning objectives have been met. It is important to ask questions to check on the reasoning behind student understanding of concepts (Paul & Elder, 2006). Debriefing through asking questions is viewed as essential for developing ICC and gaining insights. Mikk et al. (2009) endorsed using the “description-interpretation-evaluation model” (p. 122) in debriefing exercises and activities. The emphasis on interpretation is stressed before moving on to evaluation. The goal of this approach is to help students develop multiple interpretations and recognize of how their emotions are connected to their own interpretations (Mikk et al., 2009). The following steps and questions are suggested in Table 3.3 below.
Table 3.3

*Analysis with the Description-Interpretation-Evaluation Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the object/situation/content in concrete terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened in the interaction/experience/situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was said? What did you see? What did you feel at the time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think of possible explanations for what you observed or experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the spoken words and actions mean to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What adjectives would you use to explain the experience or situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to find at least three interpretations of the interactions or occurrence. What cultural information have you used to produce these interpretations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate what you observed or experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What positive or negative feelings do you have about the experience or situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How might you have felt if you were a member of the host culture and held the dominant values and beliefs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* From Mikk et al. (2009).

While the rare university or college will require a semester-long preparation course prior to departure abroad, such preparation remains the exception rather than the rule. One of the major challenges in presenting a pre-departure training program involves time constraints. Unless campus leadership, administration, or those in a position of authority recognize the importance of pre-departure training, training will essentially remain an afterthought. Brislin and Yoshida (1994) suggested a minimum of three days training. Beebe et al. (2004) noted decisions about training content should be considered simultaneously with time constraints. For the purpose of this thesis project, a three-day
training period has been designed. The point should be made that training should not be considered a one-time event, but instead considered a life-long venture, a process, a cumulative approach in a global world. This training is intended as that first step for students entering into the global environment.
Chapter 4

TRAINING PROGRAM: A PRE-DEPARTURE COURSE TO PROMOTE SUCCESS IN U.S. STUDENT STUDY ABROAD

The following is not intended as a script, but as a training syllabus for the trainer based on the foundation of knowledge found in the literature review. Each day of training includes training objectives for the day, the name of each learning unit or module (these terms are used synonymously), time of module, an abstract of the activity, and any materials needed for teaching the module. Specific teaching modules are found in the appendices and are referenced throughout the training syllabus.

Day One

Topic: Knowledge—Culture and Cultural Variance

Introduction of Day One Training Objectives

At the end of day one training, students will be able to:

- Define culture and recognize its components. (Unit 1-5)
- Distinguish frameworks across which cultures vary. (Unit 1-6)
- Integrate the model of intercultural sensitivity as part of the study abroad experience. (Unit 1-8)
- Analyze stages of cultural development and communication differences. (Unit 1-7, Unit 1-9, Unit 1-10)

Unit 1-1: Registration

Time: 9:00-9:10 a.m.

Activities: Students register their attendance in training and receive their nametags, which includes the name of their host country. Ten minutes will allow time for any students who may be late in arriving, as well as establish a positive atmosphere while students get settled. Coffee, water, and donuts will be provided for students at the beginning of the day.
Materials: Student roster
Nametags
Refreshments

Unit 1-2: 9:10-9:20
Activity: Why are we here?

• Introduction of training and self and/or other trainers.
• Establish credibility.
• Why are we here?
• What are your expectations of the training? (Write on flip chart)

Materials: Flip chart
Markers
Binders at each desk/or chair for students to pack their “tools for the trip” in.

Unit 1-3: Course Syllabus (see Appendix U)

Time: 9:20-9:40 a.m.
Activity: Review of the training syllabus enables participants to see the subject matter emphasized in training. Review of the syllabus as a whole class also allows for student input, questions, and mutual understanding.

Materials: Course syllabus

Unit 1-4: Getting to Know You (see Appendix V)

Time: 9:40-10:30 a.m.
Activity: Participants should be comfortably seated in the seats of their choice by this point. The training facilitator will make comments similar to “Before we get started with the first training module, I’d like to ask everyone to
leave their belongings where they are and move two seats over to the left.”

Students will then be asked to leave their belongings in their original locations, and anyone sitting in the front of the room will be asked to move to the back of the room. (Set up of the training room will determine the general movement of students). At this point the facilitator/s will ask the students if everyone is comfortable. Why or why not? It’s the same room and the same chairs. Any variety of questions may be asked such as the following: “Is there a problem? You want your books and familiar things? Out of your comfort zone? Not as you planned it?” The point being made by this exercise is that things will be slightly different from the moment students arrive at their destination. Nothing will be quite as anticipated, and this is just the beginning of learning to adapt and be flexible. The facilitator may also make the point again; the training they are about to engage in is active learning intended to actively engage them in the process of learning. Students will then be put into dyads and one person asked to interview the other dyad partner for introduction to the entire class. One person in each dyad will be given an index card with instructions regarding the exercise. The other dyad partner remains unaware of the instructions. Some interviewers will receive the index card with instructions and some of those being interviewed will receive instructions. The objective of the exercise is to introduce unexpected constraints in communication with others. The focus of the exercise is on
what takes place during the exercise of interviewing, not in performance of the actual exercise itself. The exercise serves as an icebreaker and promotes active learning, peer interaction, and interface with training concepts at the outset of the training session.

Debrief activity with the whole class utilizing the description-interpretation-evaluation model (see Table 3.3) as a guide for debriefing.

Materials:
- Flip chart and/or chalkboard
- Markers and/or chalk
- Index cards

Unit 1-5: Lecture: What is Culture? (see Appendix W)
Time: 10:30-10:50 a.m.
Activity: The facilitator will use the comments generated by the preceding student activity to acknowledge how individuals act, react, and communicate differently due to cultural differences. As individuals, we are all born into a culture and socialized by it, without realizing its existence, but what is culture? Before entering into a discussion of how to communicate successfully across cultures, students must understand what constitutes culture.

Break: 10:50-11:00 a.m.

Unit 1-5: Exercise: The Iceberg Metaphor (see Appendix X)
Time: 11:00-11:30 a.m.
The iceberg metaphor, often used by scholars in explanation of the various layers of culture, aptly expresses there is always more beneath the surface than meets the eye in initial examination (Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). “The Iceberg Metaphor” allows students to analyze and differentiate the cultural concepts of values, beliefs, and norms through direct application.

Activity: Groups of three students will collaboratively fill in the handout “Identifying Aspects of Culture.” The exercise will be followed by whole class discussion.

Suggested reflection questions:

- Were some items hard to place? Why?
- Did you want to place some of the items above and below? Why
- How can these beliefs and values affect communication by people who hold dissimilar views?
- Can any of these be taken for granted when interacting with another culture?
- How do you know how cultures vary without studying every culture? Is there a way to have a general idea of what to expect?

Materials: Handout (see Appendix Y)

Questions: 11:30-11:35 a.m.

Are there any questions or comments so far?

Unit 1-6: 11:35-12:00 p.m. (see Appendix Z)

Activity: Lecture: Frameworks for Cultural Difference
The facilitator will expand on the concept of knowledge of one’s own culture, as a primary requisite for competent communication with people from other cultures (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Martin, 1989; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005). Awareness enables student recognition of how United States culture has shaped students’ lives, enabling consciousness of individual values and biases. Awareness is positioned as the initial step in cultivating sensitivity to cultural others and context (Pederson, 1988). Training utilizing theoretical frameworks has proven more successful in assisting students to conceptualize differences and similarities among various cultures (Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Wiseman, 1991).

Materials: Flip chart or chalk board

Markers or chalk

Handout: Framework Fill-in (see Appendix AA)

During the introduction write on flip chart or chalk board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Context</th>
<th>Low-Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectivistic</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debrief: Questions and Comments?

Lunch: 12:00-12:30 p.m.

Unit 1-7: 12:35-1:00 p.m.

Activity: Cross-Cultural Dialogue: A Question for Miss Yoshikawa

(see Appendix AB)

Two students will self-select to read a short dialogue in front of the
class. Each student will have a copy of the actual dialogue to accommodate visual learners, and to assist in analyzing the conversation following its presentation. The student copy of the dialogue will not include the interpretations visible in the Appendix AB. Students will break into dyads and discuss the dialogue, followed by whole class discussion.

Materials: Dialogue Hand-out

Flip chart and/or chalkboard

Markers and/or chalk

Unit 1-8: Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

Time: 1:00-1:30 p.m.

Activity: Interactive Lecture (see Appendix AC)

Materials: This training module continues by explaining development intercultural awareness and competence as a process. Development of intercultural sensitivity enables growth through awareness and sensitivity to difference and context.

Handout: DMIS model fill-in (see Appendix AD)

Unit 1-9: Can You Differentiate the Stages? (see Appendix AE)

Time: 1:30-2:00 p.m.

Activity: Collaborative Activity
Students will self-select into groups of three and collaborate on the stages of the DMIS model, identifying various stages based on a variety of statements. Students will then come together as a whole class and debrief.

**Material:** Handout

**Answer Sheet (see Appendix AF)**

**Break:** 2:00-2:15

**Unit 1-10: Am I that Different? —Critical Incident (see Appendix AG)**

The purpose behind this activity is to analyze and synthesize the day’s information using the cultural assimilator. Students will evaluate the various explanations provided and discuss them in groups of three, before presenting their evaluations to the whole class. This critical incident is intended to begin providing students with insight into making attributions and considering alternative perspectives. It also introduces the topic for the next day, what is intercultural communication competence; and how do students manage anxiety and uncertainty to properly and effectively develop it?

**Time:** 2:15-3:00 p.m.

**Materials:** Handout

Student copy of handout will not include alternative interpretations.

**End of training for the first day:**

Students will take home a copy of the Individualism and Assessment that they will fill out and score. Their score will give them further insight to
their current state of intercultural awareness (see Appendix AH). Students will also complete an assignment on their host country to familiarize them with some basic information prior to their departure (See Appendix AI). The top three questions will be discussed as the most vital aspects students should be most cognizant of regarding their host country.

**Day Two**

**Topic: Application: Intercultural Communication Competence and Components**

**Unit 2-1:** *Introduction of Day Two Training Objectives*

At the end of day two training, students will be able to:

- Explain how differences in cultural patterns affect competence in intercultural communication. (Unit 2-3, Unit 2-5)
- Analyze aspects of intercultural communication competence. (Unit 2-4, Unit 2-6, Unit 2-8, Unit 2-10)
- Identify components of intercultural communication competence (ICC). (Unit 2-12)
- Apply awareness of ICC. (Unit 2-7, Unit 2-11)

**Time:** 9:00-9:20

**Activities:** Collect student scored individualism and collectivism assessments, and culture-specific questionnaires about host countries. Facilitate conversation regarding student findings: What did you discover that you didn’t know before? Was there a difference in the way your host country is oriented to time? Let’s go around the room and hear about specific values you learned about your host country. Were there any specific norms you found that were unexpected? Did any of you learn new phrases in the language of your host country? How does our training from yesterday apply to what you discovered in researching your host country?
Questions and comments from students.

Unit 2-2:  Student Recap (see Appendix AJ)

Time:  9:20-9:50 a.m.

Activities:  Introduction of Day Two learning objectives.

Collaborative student recap and review of day one training.

A collaborative student recap enables students to dialogue about the concepts from the first day of learning, reinforcing those concepts before moving on to new ones. By encouraging dialogue, students teach each other and meaning is personalized.

Materials:  Flip chart and markers and/or

Chalkboard and chalk

Paper and pens

Unit 2-3:  What do You See?  (see Appendix AK)

Time:  9:50-10:10 a.m.

Activity:  Exploring Perspectives and Ambiguity

Objective:  To highlight how differences in cultural patterns can affect perspective in ambiguous situations.

Materials:  Four pictures can be presented using overheads, computer, or handouts depending on the training room capabilities.

There are no right or wrong answers. Students will be asked to view the drawings, and then individually write down their interpretation of the drawing. Interpretations will then be discussed as a whole class.
| Unit 2-4: Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC) (see Appendix AL) |
| Time: 10:20-10:30 a.m. |
| Activity: Interactive Lecture with Training Modules |
| Materials: Overhead or computer image of Neulip’s (2006) contextual model of intercultural communication (see Appendix AM). Neulip’s model of intercultural communication will be introduced. Student high and low-context assessments from day one training will be ranked while students work on high and low-context differentiation (module 2-5). Individual scoring will make students more aware of the way in which they communicate, and where their communication style is on the high and low-context continuum. |
| Unit 2-5: High and Low-Context Communication Differentiation (see Appendix AN) |
| Time: 10:40-11:10 a.m. |
| Module: Students will be put into dyads to complete an exercise in differentiating between high and low-context messages. This exercise allows students to apply the knowledge from day one training. The exercise will be debriefed by the whole class. |
| Materials: Handout |
| Break: 11:10-11:20 a.m. |
| Unit 2-6: Continuation of interactive lecture. The concept of intercultural communication as a dynamic process within and between communicators |
will be introduced, and the imperative for maximizing the study abroad experience will be stressed. Factors that have the capacity to impede ICC will be introduced along with the theory of anxiety/uncertainty management. The ability to manage uncertainty is critical to ICC.

Time: 11:20-11:30 a.m.

Unit 2-7: They are Talking About Me (see Appendix AO)

Time: 11:30-12:15

Activity: Critical Incident

Students will be placed in groups of three to discuss what is most likely at issue in the critical incident. Students will be asked to explain their reasoning. After each group has justified their choice, each of the alternative explanations related to the critical incident will be discussed as a whole class.

Materials: Handout

Lunch Break: 12:15-12:45 p.m.

Unit 2-8: Resumption of Interactive Lecture on ICC Components

- Mindfulness and flexibility

Time: 12:50-1:00 p.m.

Unit 2-9: “Foreign Bureaucracy” (see Appendix AP)

Time: 1:00-1:45 p.m.

Activity: Critical Incident
When sojourners enter another culture, dissimilar values cause uncertainty and anxiety in many cases, as cultural values clash. This critical incident elucidates one issue that may generalize to other types of incidents. Students are able to apply the concepts of mindfulness and flexibility in completing this training module. Students will participate in dyads, discussing the incidents and present their interpretation and justifications to the class. The incident will then be discussed as a whole class.

Materials: Handout

Unit 2-10: Resumption of Interactive Lecture on ICC Components
- Empathy and sensitivity

Time: 1:45-1:55 p.m.

Unit 2-11: “The Flu” (see Appendix AQ)
Application of the concepts of empathy and sensitivity. Two students will self-select to role-play the cultural dialogue. It will then be analyzed to determine underlying cultural values. The dialogue will then be modified by two students who self-select again, to display flexibility and sensitivity in the context of the dialogue.

Time: 1:55-2:25

Activity: Cross-cultural Dialogue

Materials: Handout

Break: 2:25-2:35

Unit 2-12: Recap of day two objectives. Highlight of day three training.
Time: 2:35-3:00 p.m.

Activity: Questions and comments. Homework assignment.

Materials: Listening behavior assessment (see Appendix AR)

Students will fill out the listening behavior assessment to provide themselves with a general idea of their listening behaviors. Required assignment. The listening assessment will be discussed as an introduction to the day three objectives.

Day Three

Topic: Refining Skills—Rhetorical Sensitivity and Thai Communication Behaviors

Unit 3-1: Introduction of Day Three Training Objectives

Yesterday we spoke about applying specific behaviors to the concepts of intercultural communication competence. We will review the application of those behaviors in just a few minutes. Today we will be refining communication skills through utilization of rhetorical sensitivity and correlating it to Thai communication behaviors that personify ICC.

Objectives: As a result of day three training, students will be able to:
- Recognize strategies for improving the accuracy of attributions. (Unit 3-2, Unit 3-3)
- Comprehend and differentiate rhetorically sensitive behaviors. (Unit 3-4, Unit 3-5)
- Comprehend Thai communication behaviors. (Unit 3-6)
- Analyze ICC, RS, and Thai communication behaviors as isomorphic components of appropriate and effective communication. (Unit 3-7)

So what was the purpose of your homework for last night? Today we’ll explore what importance good listening skills have in common with intercultural communication. If you were honest with yourself in the
assessment, it gives you a starting point to improve. There is always room for each one us to improve listening skills. Why don’t you go ahead and pass that homework forward?

Time: 9:00-9:10 a.m.

Unit 3-1: Giving Questions and Getting Answers

Time: 9:10-9:40 a.m.

Activity: Student Recap of Day Two Training (see Appendix AS)

Materials: Index cards

Instructions to be given to class regarding exercise.

Unit 3-2: Culture, Misattributions, and Listening (see Appendix AT)

Time: 9:40-10:00 a.m.

Activity: Interactive lecture: building on information from training days one and two. The concepts of culture, misattributions, and listening will be discussed as a whole class, emphasizing the need for practiced listening during intercultural communication interactions. The importance of listening will be related to the topic of rhetorical sensitivity, which is receiver-oriented communication. Unless individuals pay active attention to listening, they will lack the skill to send receiver-oriented messages. Previous scores from listening self-assessment will be integrated in the importance to intercultural communication.

Materials: Flip chart and/or chalkboard

Markers and/or chalk
Unit 3-3: Skills Practice: Adapting Communication (see Appendix AU)

Time: 10:00-11:00 a.m.

Activity: Exercise. Students will work collaboratively in groups, and the exercise will be discussed by the whole class. See suggested answers and discussion points (see Appendix AV).

Materials: Handout

Break: 11:00-11:10 a.m.

Unit 3-4: Rhetorical Sensitivity Lecture (Appendix AW)

Time: 11:10-11:30 a.m.

Activity: Interactive Lecture

The components that comprise ICC are isomorphic with the theory of rhetorical sensitivity. ICC provides an abstract list of components involved in appropriate communication, but use of rhetorical sensitivity is the element that provides conceptual means of achieving ICC.

Materials: Flip chart and/or chalkboard

Markers and/or chalk

Handout for lecture (see Appendix AX)

Unit 3-5: Identifying Rhetorically Sensitive Behaviors (see Appendix AY)

Time: 11:30-12:15 p.m.

Activity: Permits time for clarification of information students may not completely comprehend. This is a new communication concept and there may be some need for clarification before moving into the exercise. The exercise
provides the opportunity for students to demonstrate comprehension of rhetorical sensitivity as a concept, as well as the ability to differentiate between noble self, rhetorically sensitive, and rhetorically reflective communication behaviors. Students will work in groups of two to three, and the exercise will be discussed by the whole class.

Materials: Handout

Lunch Break: 12:15-12:45 p.m.

Unit 3-6: Thai Communication Behaviors

Time: 12:45-1:15 p.m.

Activity: Interactive Lecture (see Appendix AZ)

Teachable Thai communication behaviors isomorphic with ICC and RS will be taught to complete the concept of appropriate and effective communication behaviors.

Materials: Overheads (see Appendix BA)

Unit 3-7: Analysis of Thai communication behaviors, RS, and ICC with U.S. American communication behaviors (see Appendix BB)

Time: 1:15-2:30 p.m

Activity: This is a collaborative exercise with whole class debriefing. This exercise assists in bringing all of the training pieces together. ICC, RS, and Thai communication behaviors are equally important in supporting each other, expanding and augmenting the development of appropriate and effective communication. Where one concept alone is insufficient, the three
concepts together, as in a triangle, support each other; where one may be lacking, the other informs. They are three equal and necessary concepts, supporting each other to achieve appropriate and effective communication. (Draw triangle concept, with “appropriate and effective communication” written in the middle of the triangle, on flipchart or chalkboard to amplify message.) Teaching Thai communication behaviors is another way of clarifying and teaching ICC behaviors.

Material: Handout
Flip chart and/or chalkboard
Markers and/or chalk

Break: 2:30-2:40 p.m.

Unit 3-8: Training Evaluation (see Appendix BC)
Time: 2:40-3:00 p.m.
Activity: Assessment of training by students
Materials: Handout

Unit 3-10: Final Jeopardy Review (see Appendix BD)
Time: 3:00-3:30 p.m.
Activity: A final review of course content in the form of a game. Students will be divided into two groups. This game is designed similar to the television show Jeopardy, where answers are given and the challenge is to come up with the correct question. This game will serve to review material one last time, and bring closure to the training session. The winning team will be
awarded prizes, such as a book to journal their travel abroad experiences in, or a text that will assist them on their sojourn abroad.

Materials: Jeopardy board with prepared answers on index cards which can be turned over. The team with the highest score wins the prizes. Refreshments are provided during the game play.

End of training:

Prepared closing summary and remarks based on input during training. Suggestions for closing remarks include a review of the training objectives from the student training syllabus. Whole class discussion should center on how the training objectives have been met and reinforced by the training. Students should have:

- Developed an awareness of U.S. American culture.
- Understand cultural variation and how communication affects culture and culture affects communication.
- Developed tools to enable forward movement in intercultural development.
- An ability to recognize communication behaviors, attitudes, and components and understand the components of intercultural communication competence.
- Knowledge of communication behaviors to refine ICC skills during the study abroad experience.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Without intervention in terms of pre-departure training, students’ limited opportunity for living in and interacting with another culture will fail to be maximized. Intercultural behavioral and communication skills are not innate, and in an ever-more intensely interconnected world, those individuals seen as possessing these skills, will assume positions of leadership. Driven by economic, security, and citizenship imperatives, study abroad is key to shaping the future of our nation and educating our students (Kagan & Stewart, 2004; Kaufman et al., 1992). Former Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, stressed this point in stating that U.S. Americans “cannot lead a world we don’t understand” (as cited in NAFSA, 2003, p. 3).

This training program responds to the imperatives stated above. Statistics indicate more international students study in the United States and other host countries than the total number of United States students who study abroad. United States students are falling behind in acquisition of skills necessary to communicate competently across cultures (Open Doors, 2005, 2008). Complicating the problem is the increase of students (55%) choosing short-term study programs, further limiting their exposure to experience interacting in another culture (Institute of International Education, 2008).

According to Rosen et al. (2000), global literacy is comprised of four constantly evolving interdependent and interrelated forms, with each aspect building a foundation for the next: global literacy “is a state of seeing, thinking, acting, and mobilizing in culturally mindful ways” (p. 57). Peterson (2004) defined cultural intelligence as:
The ability to engage in a set of behaviors that uses skills (i.e., language or interpersonal skills) and qualities (e.g., tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility) that are tuned appropriately to the culture-based values and attitudes of the people with whom one interacts. (p. 89)

The training program presented in this thesis project addresses components found in each of these definitions. Based on the theoretical conceptualization of ICC and behaviors summarized by that term, rhetorical sensitivity theory and specific Thai communication behaviors and attitudes, students have been provided with globally literate and culturally intelligent tools as a result of this training project, to hone during their sojourn abroad.

**Methodological Implications**

The training utilizes a multi-method, active learning approach with aspects of training that appeal to visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners. There are learning modules formatted as short lectures that include interactive discussion during the lecture, as well as visual aids. Each lecture is reinforced with hands-on activities to reinforce concepts that have just been introduced. The training is culture-general in approach, teaching communication concepts that can cross cultural boundaries. The use of cross-cultural dialogues, critical incidents as cultural assimilators, and active adaptation of communication utilizing high and low-context frameworks, enables students to practice intercultural communication concepts in a safe environment.

Evaluation at the end of training is a Likert-type evaluation questionnaire form with multiple open-ended questions. The Likert-type questions enable measurable evaluations to be made about the training and content to constantly evolve to better meet student needs. The open-ended questions ask students for specific areas of content improvement, asking them to summarize one last time the most important concepts they
feel they will be taking away from the training. This also serves to reinforce the concepts one final time and provides time for reflection on the course as a whole.

**Practical Implications**

Awareness has been sighted as the most important initial step in intercultural training (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994). Students socialized into U.S. American culture are largely unaware the impact their own culture holds, much less how to cope in another one. The training has been designed to take students from the first, initial step of awareness, to a comprehensive understanding of elements that can be developed during their international experience. Three days is hardly sufficient to completely accomplish such a task. The training is intense and rapidly paced; however, it provides students with initial understanding and communication tools to take on their sojourn and cultivate.

If possible, another day could be added to the training to deal with other specific issues, such as cultural variances in use of time, space, touch, body movements, and other nonverbal issues. High-context cultures use nonverbal communication differently from the low-context communication most U.S. students are accustomed to using. While the training does cover nonverbal communication in a required reading, additional training time would help prepare students for the variance more adequately. Other issues that could be addressed in an additional day of training would be the emotional aspects of study abroad, such as culture shock and re-entry. Emotional issues can significantly affect the study abroad experience, and if students are aware of what to expect, they may find it easier to deal with emotional upheaval. An additional day would also provide the opportunity to discuss some behavioral tendencies found among students who study
abroad, and actions to take in response. Engle (2009) stated that some of the obstacles for U.S. students who study abroad are “English speaking, adhering to the U.S. American-student group, excessive traveling, taking academics lightly, reproducing familiar patterns with the backdrop of an exotic setting, and viewing the host culture from a safe setting.” The idea of study abroad is to interact with host nationals and interact on an interpersonal level. As David Cuttino, Dean of Admissions, Enrollment, and External Affairs at Tufts University bluntly stated, “if a student wants a good travel experience, we can introduce them to a good travel agent. . . . The focus of study abroad is ‘study’—this should be a serious academic experience” (as cited in Rooney, 2002, p. A63).

Ideally, a one-semester course designed to teach students in a more relaxed and comprehensive fashion would serve to benefit the entire educational experience. Credit could be given as an elective for the time spent in such a course and would enable the training to include culture-specific training targeted at the host countries of students, looking at other cultures through foreign films, language development (the basics of conversation, if the student has no knowledge of the language of the host country), and more in-depth study of the host country itself. A semester course would be ideal, but is something that must be supported by a college or university administration aware of the vital importance of international education.

One idea that has not been addressed is the possibility of a web page for students who have been through training as a group. A website where students can post pictures, ask questions, and serve as support for each other during their study abroad experience would be a tool that has not be sufficiently explored. While each student will have their
own specific experiences, there will be similarity in some themes, and the administrator of such a training program could stay involved with students via the web page to answer intercultural questions, serve as a support to student experiential learning, or act as a liaison in directing students where to receive help. Additional information helpful to students during their study abroad could be posted and administered on a website such as www.wikispaces.com. A post-evaluation of the training could also be administered upon student return via Survey Monkey to refine the pre-departure training and meet future potential needs. Post-evaluation could also serve to further the study of pre-departure training and its affect on student study abroad success, as there is a lack of research in the area.

Many intercultural theories and learning theories have been used in development of this training program. The comprehensive literature review is designed to assist trainers or facilitators without the same extensive intercultural knowledge as the author to obtain a breadth of information before training the course. Unless the facilitator has extensive intercultural knowledge, a cultural expert should be utilized as co-presenter.

This project encourages both study abroad and academic research as it related specifically to students. While there are studies that generalize to students, more research should be targeted specifically at student study abroad. Whatever the individual reason of the student for study abroad, there is a larger goal and purpose: learning to engage in appropriate and effective communication across cultural boundaries. McPhail (2002) asserted not only are intercultural communication skills essential in a global world, but possession or lack of such skills will “have a greater impact on the future of the planet
than exploration and transportation combined” (p. 25). We need to prepare our students for the future, a future presenting daily contact with people from cultures other than our own.

According to Renwick (2004), the trainer is a facilitator to learning, a facilitator to interactions—interactions which will ultimately change an individual’s worldviews through their experiences, and hopefully impact critical communication skills necessary for our global society.

Renwick (2004) stated:

The concept of “trainer” is no longer adequate. We would be more like a partner in an ongoing dialogue; a chef; an expedition leader; a ship’s captain who dredges a deeper channel for the river; or maybe a janitor in an art museum who opens the gates and windows, turns on the lights, and removes obstacles from the walkways. (p. 445)

The objective of this thesis project is, in a sense, to turn the “lights on” for students, to guide them on their journey. To provide students with awareness they have not previously considered, fortify them with communication tools and knowledge in advance of their study abroad so they can indeed be sojourners, affected by their experience, and not educational tourists who remain unchanged. Ultimately, to enable students to return changed by their experience, able to communicate across cultures appropriately and effectively, and to ensure a globally literate and rhetorically sensitive citizenry.
## International Visitors (Inbound) and U.S. Residents (Outbound)
### International Travelers to/from the United States
#### 1998 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Visitors (Inbound)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Inbound (000s)</td>
<td>46,378</td>
<td>48,509</td>
<td>51,238</td>
<td>46,927</td>
<td>43,581</td>
<td>41,218</td>
<td>46,086</td>
<td>49,206</td>
<td>50,977</td>
<td>55,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>23,698</td>
<td>24,466</td>
<td>25,975</td>
<td>21,833</td>
<td>19,117</td>
<td>18,026</td>
<td>20,322</td>
<td>21,679</td>
<td>21,668</td>
<td>23,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>13,430</td>
<td>14,115</td>
<td>14,667</td>
<td>13,527</td>
<td>13,024</td>
<td>12,666</td>
<td>13,857</td>
<td>14,862</td>
<td>15,992</td>
<td>17,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>9,249</td>
<td>9,928</td>
<td>10,596</td>
<td>11,567</td>
<td>11,440</td>
<td>10,526</td>
<td>11,907</td>
<td>12,665</td>
<td>13,317</td>
<td>14,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Outbound (000s)</td>
<td>55,698</td>
<td>57,222</td>
<td>61,327</td>
<td>59,442</td>
<td>58,065</td>
<td>56,250</td>
<td>61,809</td>
<td>63,503</td>
<td>63,662</td>
<td>64,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>23,069</td>
<td>24,579</td>
<td>26,853</td>
<td>25,249</td>
<td>23,397</td>
<td>24,452</td>
<td>27,351</td>
<td>28,787</td>
<td>30,148</td>
<td>31,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14,894</td>
<td>15,180</td>
<td>15,189</td>
<td>15,570</td>
<td>16,167</td>
<td>14,232</td>
<td>15,088</td>
<td>14,391</td>
<td>13,855</td>
<td>13,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>17,735</td>
<td>17,463</td>
<td>19,285</td>
<td>18,623</td>
<td>18,501</td>
<td>17,566</td>
<td>19,370</td>
<td>20,325</td>
<td>19,659</td>
<td>19,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, ITA, Office of Travel and Tourism Industries; Statisticas Canada (Canada); and Banco de Mexico/Secretaria de Turismo (Mexico).

*Revised since preliminary estimates were released.

"Overseas" excludes Canada and Mexico.

Updated June 2008
APPENDIX C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Students who Studied Abroad</th>
<th>Total Fall Enrollment in Degree-granting Institutions</th>
<th>Percent of Students who Studied Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>258,406</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>29,853</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>567,192</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>147,391</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>2,434,774</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>312,907</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>177,711</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>51,238</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>109,905</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>8,284</td>
<td>885,651</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>7,580</td>
<td>435,403</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>68,893</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>77,872</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>850,676</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>8,068</td>
<td>368,013</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>238,834</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>153,146</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>248,914</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>224,147</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>66,149</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>323,939</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>10,916</td>
<td>451,526</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9,259</td>
<td>634,899</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8,484</td>
<td>375,899</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>151,137</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>377,098</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>47,501</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>124,500</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>112,770</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>70,659</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>385,656</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>131,828</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>19,178</td>
<td>1,162,557</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>8,454</td>
<td>495,633</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>49,519</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>10,223</td>
<td>619,942</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>206,236</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5,527</td>
<td>197,594</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>15,170</td>
<td>707,132</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>81,734</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>212,422</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>48,931</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>290,530</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10,957</td>
<td>1,252,709</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>202,151</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>40,095</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>8,751</td>
<td>456,172</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6,212</td>
<td>348,154</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>100,519</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6,264</td>
<td>340,158</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>34,693</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>241,791</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,758,870</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.36%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NAFSA: Association of International Educators (n.d..).
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International Student and U.S. Higher Education Enrollment Trends
Selected Years 1980/81 - 2007/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Int'l Students</th>
<th>Annual % Change</th>
<th>Total Enrollment ¹</th>
<th>% Int'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>311,882</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12,097,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981/82</td>
<td>326,299</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12,372,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>336,985</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12,426,000</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>338,894</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12,465,000</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>342,113</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12,242,000</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>343,777</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12,247,000</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>349,609</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12,504,000</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>356,187</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12,767,000</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
<td>366,354</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13,055,000</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>386,851</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13,539,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>407,529</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13,819,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>419,585</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14,359,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>438,618</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14,487,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>449,749</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14,305,000</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>452,635</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14,279,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>453,787</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14,262,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>457,984</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14,368,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>481,280</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>14,502,000</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>490,933</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14,507,000</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>514,723</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14,791,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>547,867</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>15,867,000</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>582,996</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>15,996,000</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>586,323</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>16,612,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>572,509</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>16,911,000</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>565,039</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>17,272,000</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>564,766</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>17,487,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>582,984</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17,672,000</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>623,805</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17,958,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Data from the National Center for Education Statistics. % Int'l data is not entirely comparable to previous Open Doors.
## APPENDIX E

Top destinations for U.S. and International Students in 2006/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top destinations of U.S. study abroad students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Top leading places of origin of international students to the U.S.</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>32,705</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>83,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>27,831</td>
<td>China, PRC</td>
<td>67,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>24,005</td>
<td>Republic of South Korea</td>
<td>62,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17,233</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>35,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>11,064</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>29,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10,747</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>28,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>9,461</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>13,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>8,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students studying abroad:</td>
<td>241,791</td>
<td>Total number of international students studying in the U.S.</td>
<td>582,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duration of Study Abroad by Institutional Type, 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
<th>Mid-Length</th>
<th>Long-Term</th>
<th>Total Study Abroad Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>141,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters’s</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>54,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>36,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>612%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Institutional Types</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>241,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# APPENDIX G

Duration of U.S. Study Abroad 1993/94 – 2003/04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Short-Term</th>
<th>Mid-Length</th>
<th>Long-Term</th>
<th>Total Study Abroad Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>191,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>174,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>160,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>154,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/20</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>143,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>129,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>113,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>99,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>89,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>84,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>76,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Figure 9C: Top 20 Destinations of U.S. Study Abroad Students, 2005/06 & 2006/07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>32,109</td>
<td>32,705</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>26,078</td>
<td>27,831</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>21,881</td>
<td>24,005</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>15,602</td>
<td>17,233</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8,830</td>
<td>11,064</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10,980</td>
<td>10,747</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10,022</td>
<td>9,461</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6,858</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>5,518</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>5,012</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### TOP 20 LEADING PLACES OF ORIGIN OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS  
2005/06 & 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2006/07 % of Int'l Total</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>76,503</td>
<td>83,833</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>China, PRC</td>
<td>62,582</td>
<td>67,723</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Korea, Rep. of (South)</td>
<td>59,022</td>
<td>62,392</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>38,712</td>
<td>35,282</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>27,876</td>
<td>29,094</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>28,202</td>
<td>28,280</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>13,931</td>
<td>13,826</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11,622</td>
<td>11,506</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>8,765</td>
<td>8,886</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8,829</td>
<td>8,656</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>8,274</td>
<td>8,438</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>7,886</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>128.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>6,061</td>
<td>7,754</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hong Kong, China</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>7,338</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>7,009</td>
<td>7,126</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>6,835</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>6,704</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>6,349</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>4,597</td>
<td>6,036</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from source: Open Doors (2008)
# APPENDIX J

## Key Differences Between Small and Large-Power Distance Societies: General Norm, Family, School, and Health Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMALL POWER DISTANCE</th>
<th>LARGE POWER DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inequalities among people should be minimized.</td>
<td>Inequalities among people are expected and desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relationships should be handled with care.</td>
<td>Status should be balanced with restraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less powerful people and more powerful people should be interdependent.</td>
<td>Less powerful people should be dependent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less powerful people are emotionally comfortable with interdependence.</td>
<td>Less powerful people are emotionally polarized between dependence and counterdependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents treat children as equals.</td>
<td>Parents teach children obedience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children treat parents and older relatives as equals.</td>
<td>Respect for parents and older relatives is a basic and lifelong virtue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children play no role in old-age security of parents.</td>
<td>Children are a source of old-age security to parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treat teachers as equals.</td>
<td>Students give teachers respect, even outside class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers expect initiatives from students in class.</td>
<td>Teachers should take all initiatives in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are experts who transfer impersonal truths.</td>
<td>Teachers are gurus who transfer personal wisdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of learning depends on two-way communication and excellence of students.</td>
<td>Quality of learning depends on excellence of the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less educated persons hold more authoritarian values than more educated persons.</td>
<td>More educated and less educated persons show equally authoritarian values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational policy focuses on secondary schools.</td>
<td>Educational policy focuses on universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients treat doctors as equals and actively supply information.</td>
<td>Patients treat doctors as superiors; consultations are shorter and controlled by the doctor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010, p. 72).
APPENDIX K

Key Differences Between Collectivist and Individualistic Societies: School, Workplace, and ICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLECTIVIST</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students speak up in class only when sanctioned by the group.</td>
<td>Students are expected to individually speak up in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of education is learning how to do.</td>
<td>The purpose of education is learning how to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomas provide entry to higher-status groups.</td>
<td>Diplomas increase economic worth and/or self-respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational mobility is lower.</td>
<td>Occupational mobility is higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are members of in-groups who will pursue the in-group's interest.</td>
<td>Employees are “economic persons” who will pursue the employer's interest if it coincides with their self-interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and promotion decisions take employee's in-group into account.</td>
<td>Hiring and promotion decisions are supposed to be based on skills and rules only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employer-employee relationship is basically moral, like a family link.</td>
<td>The employer-employee relationship is a contract between parties in a labor market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management is management of groups.</td>
<td>Management is management of individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appraisal of subordinates spoils harmony.</td>
<td>Management training teaches the honest sharing of feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group customers get better treatment (particularism).</td>
<td>Every customer should get the same treatment (universalism).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship prevails over task.</td>
<td>Task prevails over relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet and e-mail are less attractive and less frequently used.</td>
<td>The Internet and e-mail hold strong appeal and are frequently used to link individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 124).
### APPENDIX L

Key Differences Between Assertive and Nurturing Societies: Education and Consumer Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMININE</th>
<th>MASCULINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average student is the norm; praise for weak students.</td>
<td>Best student is the norm; praise for excellent students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy of those who try to excel.</td>
<td>Competition in class; trying to excel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing in school is a minor incident.</td>
<td>Failing in school is a disaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive sports are extracurricular.</td>
<td>Competitive sports are part of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are socialized to be nonaggressive.</td>
<td>Aggression by children is accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness in teachers is appreciated.</td>
<td>Brilliance in teachers is admired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job choice is based on intrinsic interest.</td>
<td>Job choice is based on career opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and women partly study the same subjects.</td>
<td>Men and women study different subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and men teach young children.</td>
<td>Women teach young children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and men shop for food and cars.</td>
<td>Women shop for food, men for cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples share one car.</td>
<td>Couples need two cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More products for the home are sold.</td>
<td>More status products are sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More fiction is read (rapport talk).</td>
<td>More nonfiction is read (report talk).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet is used for rapport building.</td>
<td>The Internet is used for fact gathering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 165).
APPENDIX M

Key Differences Between Weak and Strong Uncertainty-Avoidance Societies: Health, Education, and Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAK UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE</th>
<th>STRONG UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer people feel unhappy.</td>
<td>More people feel unhappy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have fewer worries about health and money.</td>
<td>People have more worries about health and money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have more heart attacks.</td>
<td>People have fewer heart attacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many nurses but few doctors.</td>
<td>There are many doctors but few nurses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are comfortable with open-ended learning situations and concerned with good discussions.</td>
<td>Students are comfortable in structured learning situations and concerned with the right answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers may say, “I don’t know.”</td>
<td>Teachers are supposed to have all the answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are attributed to a person’s own ability.</td>
<td>Results are attributed to circumstances or luck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers involve parents.</td>
<td>Teachers inform parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In shopping, the search is for convenience.</td>
<td>In shopping, the search is for purity and cleanliness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used cars, do-it-yourself home repairs</td>
<td>New cars, home repairs by experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People more often claim ethical considerations in buying.</td>
<td>People read fewer books and newspapers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is fast acceptance of new features such as mobile phones, e-mail, and the Internet.</td>
<td>There is a hesitancy toward new products and technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risky investments</td>
<td>Conservative investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of humor in advertising.</td>
<td>Appeal of expertise in advertising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 208).
APPENDIX N

Key Differences Between Short and Long-Term Orientation: General Norm and Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT-TERM ORIENTATION</th>
<th>LONG-TERM ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social pressure toward spending</td>
<td>Thrift, being sparing with resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts should produce quick results.</td>
<td>Perseverance, sustained efforts toward slow results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with social and status obligations</td>
<td>Willingness to subordinate oneself for a purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with &quot;face&quot;</td>
<td>Having a sense of shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for traditions</td>
<td>Respect for circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with personal stability</td>
<td>Concern with personal adaptiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage is a moral arrangement.</td>
<td>Marriage is a pragmatic arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with in-laws is a source of trouble.</td>
<td>Living with in-laws is normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young women associate affection with a boyfriend.</td>
<td>Young women associate affection with a husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility is for women only.</td>
<td>Humility is for both men and woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age is an unhappy period, but it starts late.</td>
<td>Old age is a happy period, and it starts early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool children can be cared for by others.</td>
<td>Mothers should have time for their preschool children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children get gifts for fun and love.</td>
<td>Children get gifts for education and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 243).
## APPENDIX O

Key Differences Between Short and Long-Term Orientation

Societies Based On CVS Data: Business and Ways of Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT-TERM ORIENTATION</th>
<th>LONG-TERM ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main work values include freedom, rights, achievement, and thinking for oneself.</td>
<td>Main work values include learning, honesty, adaptiveness, accountability, and self-discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure time is important.</td>
<td>Leisure time is not important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus is on the “bottom line.”</td>
<td>Focus is on market position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of this year’s profits</td>
<td>Importance of profits ten years from now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and workers are psychologically in two camps.</td>
<td>Owner-managers and workers share the same aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritocracy, reward by abilities</td>
<td>Wide social and economic differences are undesirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal loyalties vary with business needs.</td>
<td>Investment in lifelong personal networks, guanxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with possessing the Truth.</td>
<td>Concern with respecting the demands of Virtue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are universal guidelines about what is good and evil.</td>
<td>What is good and evil depends on the circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with one’s own contributions to daily human relations and to correcting injustice</td>
<td>Satisfaction with one’s own contributions to daily human relations and to correcting injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter and spirit are separated.</td>
<td>Matter and spirit are integrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If A is true, its opposite B must be false.</td>
<td>If A is true, its opposite B can also be true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority is given to abstract rationality.</td>
<td>Priority is given to common sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for cognitive consistency.</td>
<td>Disagreement does not hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical thinking</td>
<td>Synthetic thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 251).
APPENDIX P

Key Differences Between Indulgent and Restrained Societies: General Norm, Personal Feelings, and Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDULGENT</th>
<th>RESTRAINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher percentages of very happy people</td>
<td>Lower percentages of very happy people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A perception of personal life control</td>
<td>A perception of helplessness: what happens to me is not my own doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher importance of leisure</td>
<td>Lower importance of leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher importance of having friends</td>
<td>Lower importance of having friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrift is not very important.</td>
<td>Thrift is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loose society</td>
<td>Tight society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely to remember positive emotions</td>
<td>Less likely to remember positive emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less moral discipline</td>
<td>Moral discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>Cynicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More extroverted personalities</td>
<td>More neurotic personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher percentages of people who feel healthy</td>
<td>Lower percentages of people who feel healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher optimism</td>
<td>More pessimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In countries with well-educated populations, higher birthrates</td>
<td>In countries with well-educated populations, lower birthrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower death rates from cardiovascular diseases</td>
<td>Higher death rates from cardiovascular diseases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 291).
### Key Differences Between Indulgent and Restrained Societies:
Private Life, Consumer Behavior, Sex, and Politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDULGENT</th>
<th>RESTRAINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher approval of foreign music and films</td>
<td>Lower approval of foreign music and films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More satisfying family life</td>
<td>Less satisfied with family life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household tasks should be shared between partners</td>
<td>Unequal sharing of household tasks is no problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are actively involved in sports</td>
<td>People are rarely involved in sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail and the internet are used for private contacts</td>
<td>Less use of e-mail and the Internet for private contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More e-mail and Internet contacts with foreigners</td>
<td>Fewer e-mail and Internet contacts with foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less consumption of fish</td>
<td>More consumption of fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More consumption of soft drinks and beer</td>
<td>Less consumption of soft drinks and beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In wealthy countries, higher percentages of obese people</td>
<td>In wealthy countries, lower percentages of obese people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loosely prescribed gender roles</td>
<td>Strictly prescribed gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In wealthy countries, less strict sexual norms</td>
<td>In wealthy countries, stricter sexual norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling as a norm</td>
<td>Smiling as suspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of speech is viewed as relatively important</td>
<td>Freedom of speech is not a primary concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining order in the nation is not given a high priority</td>
<td>Maintaining order in the nation is considered a high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower numbers of police officers per 100,000 population</td>
<td>Higher numbers of police officers per 100,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hofstede et al. (2010, p. 297)
APPENDIX R

Needs Assessment for Study Abroad Training

Name: _________________________________________________________________
Host Country:____________________________________________________________
Duration of Stay Abroad:___________________________________________________

Directions: Please fill in the answers to the following questions below. Additional information may be requested depending on your responses. Please return the form by email no later than two weeks prior to your training date. (Date for training here) This information will assist in structuring the pre-departure training to your needs and maximize your time and training experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have prior intercultural travel experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived abroad before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is my first language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is my first language, but I speak a second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Circle which category most applies to your fluency in your second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Beginning/I speak a few phrases (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Intermediate (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Fluent (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the language of my host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Circle which category most applies to your fluency in the language of your host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ I have no language skills in that of my host country. (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ I have a basic understanding of the language of my host country. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ My fluency in the language of my host country is at the intermediate level. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ I am fluent (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the norms of my host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the communication rules of my host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the values of my host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes means yes and no means no in all cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All big cities are essentially alike; Tokyo is just another big city like New York.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to remember that differences can be dangerous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to experience other countries, but I believe everything is bigger and better in the United States.

Norms in the host country are socially shared expectations of appropriate behavior.

Have you ever attended any type of intercultural training?

What are your goals for studying abroad?

What issues about study abroad concern you the most?
APPENDIX S

Needs Assessment for Study Abroad Training

Name: _________________________________________________________________

Host Country:____________________________________________________________

Duration of Stay Abroad:___________________________________________________

Directions: Please fill in the answers to the following questions below. Additional information may be requested depending on your responses. Please return the form by email no later than two weeks prior to your training date. (Date for training here) This information will assist in structuring the pre-departure training to your needs and maximize your time and training experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have prior intercultural travel experience.</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have lived abroad before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is my first language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is my first language, but I speak a second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle which category most applies to your fluency in your second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beginning/I speak a few phrases (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intermediate (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fluent (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the language of my host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle which category most applies to your fluency in the language of your host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I have no language skills in that of my host country. (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I have a basic understanding of the language of my host country. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• My fluency in the language of my host country is at the intermediate level. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am fluent (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| I understand the norms of my host country. | True | False |
| I understand the communication rules of my host country. | | |
| I understand the values of my host country. | | |
| Yes means yes and no means no in all cultures. | | |
| Concept of Face: Yes does not always mean yes | X | |
| All big cities are essentially alike; Tokyo is just another big city like New York. | X | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMIS-Denial Stage: Ethnocentric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to remember that differences can be dangerous.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to experience other countries, but I believe everything is bigger and better in the United States. <strong>DMIS – Defense Stage-Ethnocentric</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms in the host country are socially shared expectations of appropriate behavior.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever attended any type of intercultural training?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your goals for studying abroad?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What issues about study abroad concern you the most?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T

Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension

Directions: This instrument is composed of twenty-four statements concerning your feelings about communicating with other people. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Are Undecided, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Many of the statements are similar to other statements. Do not be concerned about this. Work quickly; just record your first impressions.

_____ 1. Generally, I am comfortable interacting with a group of people from different cultures.

_____ 2. I am tense and nervous while interacting in group discussions with people from different cultures.

_____ 3. I like to get involved in group discussions with others who are from different cultures.

_____ 4. Engaging in a group discussion with people from different cultures makes me tense and nervous.

_____ 5. I am calm and relaxed when interacting with a group of people who are from different cultures.

_____ 6. While participating in a conversation with a person from a different culture I feel very nervous.

_____ 7. I have no fear of speaking up in a conversation with a person from a different culture.

_____ 8. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations with a person from a different culture.

_____ 9. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations with a person from a different culture.

_____ 10. While conversing with a person from a different culture, I feel very relaxed.

_____ 11. I’m afraid to speak up in conversations with a person from a different culture.
12. I face the prospect of interacting with people from different cultures with confidence.

13. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when interacting with people from different cultures.

14. Communicating with people from different cultures makes me feel uncomfortable.

To score the instrument, reverse your original response for items # 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 14.

For example, for each of these items 1 = 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2, 5 = 1.

If your original score for Item #2 was 1, change it to a 5. If your original score for Item #4 was a 2, change it to a 4, etc.

After reversing the score for these seven items, then sum all 14 items.

Scores cannot be higher than 70 or lower than 14. Higher scores (e.g., 50-70) indicate high intercultural communication apprehension.

Low scores (e.g., 14-28) indicate low intercultural apprehension.

A Pre-Departure Training Program to Promote Success for U.S. Student Study Abroad

Course Background:
Research has shown that students who receive pre-departure training prior to arrival in their host country have a higher success rate in adapting to other cultures. For most students, study abroad is a limited opportunity. Intercultural communication skills and behaviors are not innate, and scholars and studies show that intercultural communication competence and global literacy will be among the most sought after skills in the 21st century. This training course has been developed in response to that need: to maximize your study abroad experience, and maximize your opportunity to practice communication skills and behaviors to achieve intercultural communication competence.

Course Description:
This course is built around the concept of active learning. In a sense, this is a “hands-on” training atmosphere; a safe environment in which to learn and practice communication skills before you arrive in your host country. Research has shown theoretically based training to be more successful, and this training, based on theoretical foundations will generalize across cultures.

Training Objectives
As a result of training, students will exhibit the following behaviors:

- Awareness of U.S. American culture.
- Display an understanding of culture and how communication is affected by culture and culture by communication
- Recognize tools intercultural development.
- Recognize communication behaviors, attitudes and apply components of intercultural communication competence
- Apply communication behaviors to refine intercultural communication skills during your study abroad experience.
## Training Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day One 9:00-3:00</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Required Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why Are We Here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Getting to Know You</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is Culture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Exercise: The Iceberg Metaphor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frameworks for Cultural Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lunch (12:00-12:30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Cross-Cultural Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DMIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Differentiate the Stages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Critical Incident: “Am I that Different?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day Two 9:00-3:00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Recap of Day 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What do You See?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o High- and Low Context Communication Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Critical Incident: They are Talking About Me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lunch (12:15-12:45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Critical Incident: Foreign Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Cross-Cultural Dialogue: The Flu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recap and Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day Three 9:00-3:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of Objectives/Homework Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Giving Questions and Getting Answers: Day 2 Recap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Culture, Misattributions and Listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Exercise: Adapting Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Listening Behavior Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lustig &amp; Koester (2010, pp. 201-216) (Nonverbal communication and behaviors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Identifying Rhetorically Sensitive Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Communication Behaviors (TCB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Analysis of TCB, ICC and RS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Jeopardy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

Getting to Know You—Icebreaker (45 minutes)

Choose students and place them in dyads. Group students in different locations around the room, allowing as much space as possible between groups.

**Dyad One:**
Give index card with the following instructions to the person being interviewed:
- Stand very close, almost uncomfortably close, to the person who is interviewing you.
- Speak very closely to the face of the interviewer.
- If the interviewer attempts to move away, continue to move closer into the other person’s “space”.
- *(Difference in use of space/proxemics)*

**Dyad Two:**
Give index card with the following instructions to the person being interviewed:
- Stand about 2 feet apart.
- Speak very softly and avoid eye contact with the interviewer.
- Look at the floor while speaking softly.
- Do not repeat yourself if asked to, simply look around in an uncomfortable manner.
- Maintain your distance.
- *(Different norms for conversing)*.

**Dyad Three:**
Give index card with the following instructions to the person being interviewed.
- Stand back to back with the interviewer.
- Answer the questions of interviewer omitting every other word you would normally say.
- Alternate sentences saying only every third word. (You can say the words out loud and then speak the other words in your head to keep track of words), Provide true answers to questions.
- Example: What country are you going to study in?
  - I…going…study…Germany. (I am going to study in Germany). (every other word omitted)
  - I…be…when…out. (I want to be an engineer when I get out of school.) (every third word omitted)
- *(Language difficulties)*.
Dyad Four:
Give index card with the following instructions to the interviewer.
- Look intently into the eyes of the person you are interviewing.
- Aggressively ask the other person about their personal accomplishments.
  - What kind of grades do they get?
  - What kind of car do they drive?
  - Where do they expect to be in two years?
  - Be direct. Get to the point. Hurry things along.
- *(US cultural values of directness and personal achievement and outcome-oriented).*

Dyad Five:
Give index card with the following instructions to the interviewer.
- Ask about the other person’s family.
  - Where do they come from?
  - What is the last name of the families on both sides?
  - What is the ethnic background?
  - What do the family members do for a living?
- *(Emphasis on Family/Collectivist/standing)*

Dyad Six:
Give index with the following instructions to the person being interviewed:
- Every time the interviewer asks a question using the word “you”, giggle, look away, and ask “why?”
- *(Different communication rules).*

Depending on the number of students expected for training the following elements can be added to the exercise:
- Use of silence (most U.S. Americans attempt to fill silence with words)
- Excessive use of facial expressions (some cultures are much less expressive in communicating)
- No use of facial expressions (unfamiliar to most U.S. American cultures)
- And/or having a student with a second language, answer only in the second language to questions

Debrief using the Description-Interpretation-Evaluation Model (see Table 3.3).
APPENDIX W

What is Culture? (20 minutes)

Objectives
Following this lecture, students will be able to:
- Define culture.
- Recognize the impact of values, beliefs and norms.
- Distinguish the difference between the terms values, beliefs and norms

Lecture Outline:
I. In order to advance effective communication across cultures, it is first necessary to possess a clear understanding of culture itself.

A. Six different characteristics have been suggested as summarizing the concept of culture (Knutson, 1994, Tubbs & Moss, 2008):
   1. Culture is learned.
      a. Through interactions with others, fables, proverbs, social environment.
      b. It is not biological, innate, determined by nationality or race.
   2. Culture provides rules for appropriate, desirable and acceptable behavior.
      a. Values
      b. Beliefs
      c. Norms
   3. Culture structures daily life by organizing and classifying our environment in distinctive ways.
   4. Culture provides meaning and a way of seeing the world.
   5. Culture is transmitted and passed on from generation to generation, providing consistency and tradition.
   6. The common code of culture is language, and is employed in: rituals, education, institutions, religion, and myths designed to condition people.

B. Rapid, intense, technological change, cultural exposure and globalization suggests a broader definition (Zuckerman, 2005): “A range of expectations of enacted behaviors, beliefs and ideas, and their resulting material creations, shared by a group of people who may or not be confined to a limited geographical area.”
   1. A range of expectations of enacted behaviors, beliefs and ideas...(i.e. globalization and cultural interaction at home and abroad lead us to expect a range of behaviors, beliefs and ideas.
2. …and their resulting material creations…(i.e., creations are not restricted to thought, behaviors, beliefs and ideas, but include material artifacts of a culture such as music, art, clothing, etc.
3. …shared by a group of people who may or may not be confined to a limited geographic area (i.e., a virtual environment, social networking, or individuals who are dispersed around the world (such as members of the Jewish faith, refugees, etc.)

C. It is the combination of these two definitions which provide a synergistic and comprehensive definition of culture in a global world.

D. Values, beliefs and norms are fundamental terms to understand in any discussion of culture, as they ultimately affect behavior and communication.
   1. **Values** are deeply held, shared perceptions of what ought to be, not what is. (Martin & Nakayama, 2000).
      a. Think of these as core concepts that guide action, judgment, choice, attitude, evaluation, and attributions.
      i. Concepts such as freedom or independence
      ii. Values such as good and evil, moral and immoral, ugly and beautiful (Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2007).
      iii. Learned early in life through proverbs, school, family, church, etc.
      iv. What is perceived as good or correct in one culture can often be seen as incorrect or improper in another culture (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994).
   b. Example: Individual freedom vs. social harmony
   2. **Beliefs** refer to what is understood by a culture to be true or false; there is an emotional component and beliefs usually advocate a worldview. (Lustig & Koeester, 2010; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005).
      a. Can be attached to traditions, rituals, religion, use of time and space.
      b. Misunderstandings related to cultural beliefs may lead to failure to communicate.
      c. Example: The world is round/ Grandparents should live in nuclear family homes instead of rest homes.
    3. **Norms** refer to a set of underlying assumptions or rules for appropriate behavior based on cultural values within a culture.
      a. Unspoken rules about how individuals should act in interaction scenes which go largely unquestioned (Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005)
      b. Norms are linked to beliefs and values to form the patterns of a culture.
      c. Example: Finland: Verbal communication should be about something that is not obvious (Carbaugh, 2005).
      d. Example: U.S.: Fill the silence with words. “Nice day, isn’t it?”
APPENDIX X

The Iceberg Metaphor: Values, Beliefs, and Norms (30 minutes)

Objectives
As a result of this exercise, students will be able to:

- Analyze the differences between values, beliefs and norms.
- Illustrate where these differences appear in culture using the iceberg metaphor.
- Interpret these decisions in whole class discussion.

Materials Needed:
- Handout of “Identifying Aspects of Culture” (Mikk, Cohen, Paige, Chi, Lassegard, Meagher & Weaver, 2009).
- Pens/Pencils

Instructions: Randomly assign students into groups of three. This can be done by counting off, depending on the number of students present. Students will work collaboratively and then discuss their choices with the entire class.

Suggested Answers:

Values: Equality, relationship with nature, concept of beauty, time management
Beliefs: Religious beliefs, attitudes towards sexuality, rules of politeness.
Norms: Clothing, personal distance, works of art, methods of worship, tipping customs, gestures, degree of eye contact, food

Adapted from: Mikk, Cohen, Paige, Chi, Lassegard, Meagher, & Weaver (2009, p. 198).
APPENDIX Y

Identifying Aspects of Culture

What are the kinds of things that typically lie below the surface in a culture? Take a look at these sample items and place them on the iceberg – the more visible elements going above the water line and the less visible below.
Label which are beliefs, values or norms.

Clothing  Methods of Worship  Rules of Politeness
Views on equality  Time management  Relationship with nature
Religious beliefs  Tipping customs  Attitudes towards sexuality
Personal distance  Gestures  Degree of eye contact
Works of art  Concept of beauty  Food

Adapted from: Mikk, Cohen, Paige, Chi, Lassegard, Meagher, & Weaver (2009, p. 197).
APPENDIX Z

Theoretical Frameworks and Cultural Variability (25 minutes)

Objectives
As a result of this lecture, students will display the following behaviors:

• An understanding of how high and low-context cultures vary and affect communication and behaviors.
• Comprehend individualism and collectivism and how it affects communication.
• Differentiate U.S. American culture according the these cultural frameworks.

The initial step in understanding other cultures, and the ability to communicate competently and effectively, lies first with an understanding of one’s own culture. (Brislin & Yoshida; 1994, Daspit, 1994; Kaweewong, 2002; Martin, 1989; Parnell & Vanderkloot, 1989; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005).

Several theoretical frameworks have been studied by scholars through the years regarding dimensions across which cultures vary; but Hall’s (1989) high-context and low-context continuum, along with the individualistic and collectivistic dimensions researched by Hofstede (1980) are among the most important.

Today we will concentrate on Hall’s work in high- and low-context cultures, the most repeatedly cited work in intercultural communication (Gudkyunst, 1997), along with Hofstede’s (1980) individualistic and collectivistic dimension. These two frameworks are essentially duplicate in nature, with all high-context cultures essentially collective, and all low-context cultures individualistic (Deng, 1992). (Write on flip chart or chalk board).

1. Hall (1989) views cultures as ranging on a continuum from high- to low-context.
   A. No one individual displays each of the differences generalized across the continuum.
   B. High-context cultures communicate differently than the general U.S. American norm. (Remember, we are talking in generalities as a way of categorizing to enable understanding and prediction of communication behaviors.)
      1. Individuals tend to talk less, use fewer words, and prefer nonverbal over verbal messages.
      2. Most of the information in contained in the physical context of a communication interaction or internalized in the person. (Hall, 1989).
         a. Considered a sort of “fill in the blanks” or “verbal shorthand communication” Lustig & Koester, 2003).
      3. Use of covert messages (e.g., tone, posture, distance)
      4. Reactions are reserved and modest.
      5. Silence is valued.
6. There is a more formal verbal communication style, with an emphasis on not interrupting the other person speaking.

**Question:** How do you envision context as having an impact on communication?

**Anticipated Responses:** It impacts communication effectiveness. What a person chooses to pay attention to affects communication outcomes. Meaning and context are inextricably bound to each other (Hall, 1989, p. 90). Norms for verbal behavior, as well as perception associated with norms that vary from culture to culture (Kim, Aune, Hunter, Kim & Jung-Sik, 2001, p. 386).

**Question:** What are some ways you can see context as affecting communication in a global world?

**Anticipated Responses:** A person from a high-context culture would expect the person they are speaking with to have an understanding of context in a specific interaction. In less complex and fast-moving times this might have been true; the problem of mutual understanding was not as difficult. Most transactions were conducted with people well known to the speaker or writer, people with similar backgrounds. (Hall, 1989, p. 90)

C. High-context values affect behaviors
   1. Vertically hierarchical societies.
   2. Emphasis on social harmony and selflessness
   3. Group affiliations are important and stable
   4. Diplomacy before truth
(Hall, 1989; Knutson et al., 2002; Knutson et al., 2003; Lewis, 2005; Lustig & Koester, 2003; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005)

D. U.S. Americans generally communicate in a high-context manner, towards the opposite end of the continuum. (Again we are speaking in generalities).
   1. Individuals tend to talk more, use more words, and prefer a direct verbal style.
   2. Information is contained in the coded, explicit, transmitted message; the message is contained in the words with little emphasis on contextual cues.
   3. Communication style is one of verbal assertiveness and talkativeness (profuseness) with words used to fill the silence.
   4. Reactions in low-context communication are overt, forceful, and reactive.
   5. There is a more informal verbal communication style, with a tendency to interrupt the other person speaking.

**Question:** Why would there be less of a tendency to interrupt another person that was speaking in a high-context culture?

**Possible Answers:** High-context communication is a more formal verbal style, with an emphasis on not interrupting the other person speaking. There is also an emphasis on social harmony and selflessness, putting the other person and their words first, before interrupting.
C. High-context values affect behaviors.
   1. Democratic and egalitarian societies.
   2. Emphasis on personal recognition and individualism.
   3. Group affiliations are fluid.
   4. Truth before diplomacy.

**Question:** How is communication affected by the diplomacy and truth issue?

**Possible Answers:** Low-context cultures are direct and assertive with an emphasis on the truth. They are not hindered by the value of social harmony?

**Question:** In communicating across these types of cultural differences, what can you envision as being necessary qualities to communicate appropriately and effectively?

**Possible Answers:** Sensitivity, flexibility, patience, thinking and communicating in different ways than an individual socialized in the United States might be accustomed to communicating.

II. The theory of cultural dimensions presented by Hofstede et al., (2010) provides another approach to understanding communication patterns between and among cultures.

A. Six dimensions of cultural variability have been identified by Hofstede et al., (2010); but the one that is considered isomorphic with high-and low-context is the dimension of individualism and collectivism.
   1. Each of these dimensions serves as a means of intercultural comparison, not definitive classifications. No one culture is fully defined by specific dimensions, and socialization, pre-dispositions, and individuals vary.
   2. These are central tendencies of a nation, mediated by individual preference, personalities, and individual values which may differ from a nation’s dominant central tendency. (Gudykunst, 1998; Kaweewong, 2002; Kim et al., 2001, Resinger & Crotts, 2009).
   3. These national dimensions though, impact intercultural communication.

B. The individualist dimension can be seen as the degree to which “the interests of the individual prevail over the interests of the group” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 91)

C. Individualists are typified by:
   1. Nuclear families
   2. Personal identity preference and an “I” mentality.
   3. Membership exists in a variety of groups (in-groups) that change constantly with life’s transitions (social, religious, professional, familial)
      a. Group influence is mediated due to frequency of change in group memberships.
      b. Individualistic cultures consequently display less emotional investment or attachment to in-groups (Gudykunst, 1997).

D. The value of individualism is seen as central to U.S. American values.
   1. Children are raised to be autonomous.
2. Decision-making is based on individual choice.
3. Emphasis on personal achievement and self-realization
4. Assertiveness
   (Knutson, Hwang & Deng, 1999: Knutson et al., 2002)

E. Collectivist cultures are marked by interdependence and “the interest of the group prevails over the interest of the individual” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 90).

1. This is a “we” consciousness with an emphasis on belonging (Lustig & Koester, 2003).
2. Extended families
3. In-groups are more stable, and separation from groups can cause discomfort or even pain (Triandis, et al., 1988).
   a. In-groups are the major source of identity and the only secure protection in life.
   b. In-groups demand life-long loyalty, and breaking group loyalty is one of the worst things a person can do (Hofstede et al., 2010).
   c. Maintenance of group harmony is emphasized.
4. FACE – The quest for harmony involves the maintenance of face in collectivist cultures.

**Question:** Has anyone ever heard about this idea before? For example: “I don’t want to lose face?” This is where that concept comes from

   a. Face is seen as a metaphor for self-worth (West & Turner, 2004)
   b. Social harmony is maintained through maintenance of face.
   c. Face involves mutual respect, maintenance of deep and enduring friendships, and behaviors which emphasize co-operation (Chan, 1998).
   d. Collectivists (interdependent-selves) tend to use more other-oriented, face-saving and face-honoring, non-impositional strategies in communicating. (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998)
   e. Individualists tend to use more self-oriented and approval seeking communication interaction strategies (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

F. The priority of group interest is seen as central to collectivist cultures.

1. Children are raised to respect their elders and authority.
2. Decision-making is based on group consensus.
3. Emphasis is on obedience and conforming behaviors with a clear group identification.
4. There is a preference for indirect, covert communication and preservation of harmony. (Deng, 1992).

**Question:** What kind of a culture is U.S. American culture according to these frameworks?

**Anticipated Response:** Low-context and individualist.
**Question:** What are some of the characteristics we’ve talked about that would indicate U.S. American culture as low-context and individualistic?

**Question:** Can you see how this might have implication for communicating differently in a classroom if you are going to study abroad in a high-context, collectivistic culture?

Let’s briefly examine what some of those differences are, and how they might affect communication in the educational environment and classroom:

III. For students studying abroad, the high/low context and individualist/collectivistic frameworks can play a crucial role in expected classroom behaviors.

A. Individualistic cultures expect and even encourage students to be verbally expressive, ask questions, and answer individually.

B. Students from collectivistic cultures may hesitate to speak up in the presence of a teacher, feel more comfortable participating and answering in groups.

**Question:** As a student from a low-context individualistic culture studying in a high-context, collective culture, how would you expect to display appropriate and effective behavior?

**Anticipated responses:** Work as a group, do not contradict the teacher in front of the class, do not speak loudly, consider the context, do not try to be the center of attention, do not interrupt, respect others and their face. Face is saved in group answers versus individual answers. (Why?)
**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR CULTURAL VARIATION**
High- and Low-Context Continuum – Hall (1980)
Individualism and Collectivism – Hofstede et al., (2010)

Fill in the table below with applicable concepts and characteristics from lecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-context</th>
<th>Collectivistic</th>
<th>Low-Context</th>
<th>Individualistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Question for Miss Yoshikawa (25 minutes)

Objectives
As a result of this exercise, students will learn communication behaviors to:

- Apply knowledge of high-and low-context cultural frameworks to a communication interaction.
- Analyze the communication interaction.
- Distinguish the underlying reasons for communication misunderstanding which may be present.

Dialogue:

Theresa: That was an excellent presentation. You and Dr. Nagai must have worked very hard on this.

Miss Yoshikawa: I was very honored to be asked by Dr. Nagai to assist him on this project. He’s my thesis advisor, you know.

Theresa: Well, you were very good. He’s lucky to have found you. I had a question about a point you made at the end.

Miss Yoshikawa: Yes, of course. Let me just get Dr. Nagai.

Theresa: Oh, don’t bother him; he’s talking to some other people. Anyway, it’s a great point that you made.

Miss Yoshikawa: I see. Can I get you some tea?

Interpretation:

Miss Yoshikawa has indeed done a good job and is no doubt quite capable of answering Theresa’s question. But that’s hardly the point; she is an assistant here, a helper, apparently a graduate student. It would be presumptuous of her to answer Theresa’s question so long as Dr. Nagai is still in the room, for that would suggest that she knows as much as Dr. Nagai – which may be quite true, of course; but to act in such a way would be very disrespectful to one’s elder and superior.

This is why Miss Yoshikawa tries to break away from Theresa to get Dr. Nagai and why, when that doesn’t work, she then tries to play for time by offering to bring tea. Come
what may, she’s not going to let Theresa put her in the position of humiliating her professor.

From Theresa’s point of view, she simply wants an answer to her question and is going about it in the most efficient way possible: to ask the person who happens to be available at the moment. She means no disrespect and may in fact only be trying to be sensitive by going to Miss Yoshikawa, someone lower down the pecking order, and not bothering the exalted professor with her question.

Objectives
As a result of this lecture, student will be able to:

- Explain development of communication competence as a process.
- Define ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism.
- Comprehend development of intercultural sensitivity as key to facilitating intercultural development and growth.
- Differentiate between stages and understand the behaviors, knowledge and attitudes student have at various stages in order to work through them more effectively.

As we are beginning to understand, communicating across cultures is a process. Competence can be developed once awareness of our own cultural values exists, plus an understanding of how those values differ from other cultures. Today we have come to understand how individuals possess multi-layered, diverse cultural personalities, utilizing cultural generalizations and frameworks.

Each one of you has personal goals for study abroad. The broader, overarching goal is development of intercultural communication skills to utilize in your future, and in a global society. So how do you progress in your personal development from this point, to increased sophistication in coping with cultural differences?

The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity or DMIS, based on the assumption that intercultural sensitivity develops on a continuum, is one tool to help facilitate growth. In other words, simply traveling abroad and interacting with other U.S. American students will not resulting in you as individuals developing intercultural competence or sensitivity. It is through recognition of differences and interaction with other cultures that the process of development occurs.

I. Bennett and Bennett (2004) propose that growth in intercultural sensitivity develops along a continuum ranging from ethnocentric stages to ethnorelative stages.

A. It is individual experience, the construction of knowledge that facilitates growth.

**Question:** Who can explain what ethnocentric means?

**Anticipated Response:** (1) It is where someone believes that their own culture is superior to another; (2) The belief that an individual’s own culture is central to reality; to view other culture’s through the terms of one’s own culture (Bennet & Bennett, 2004; Mikk et al., 2009).
Question: Is ethnocentricity a natural behavior?
Anticipated Response: Yes. Most of us are raised believing we do things the best way. Most people grow up being ethnocentric because they grow up being socialized into a culture they are not even aware is there most of the time. (Mikk et al., 2009).

B. Six stages of individual development are proposed: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, integration. We are going to look at each of these stages briefly, to provide you with tools to move through them to facilitate growth.

Question: First of all, if we as individuals are attempting to move from ethnocentric stages to ethnorelative stages, it might be useful to make sure we all understand the definition of ethnorelative. Can anyone explain that to me?
Anticipated response: Ethnorelative means that individuals have moved away from an ethnocentric worldview to one that does not judge others. Rather, it is a state of mind that respects, compares and contrasts, “according to the perspectives of the cultures involved” (Mikk et al., 2009, p. 76).

1. Denial: Refusal to acknowledge that cultural difference exists, or staying in one’s own in-group as a sojourner.
   a. Characterized by behaviors of indifference, cultural ignorance and observational naivety (Paige et al., 2003).
   b. Example: “As long as we speak the same language, there will be no problems.” (Mikk et al., 2009, p. 74)

Question: What is needed for individuals to get past this stage?
Anticipated Response: The ability to gather information to recognize differences.

2. Defense: Individuals in this stage are threatened by differences and closed to change.
   a. Polarization of us/them, we/they, superior/inferior.
   b. Negative evaluation of cultural differences and stereotyping.
   c. Defense may be interpreted as arrogance.

Question: What is stereotyping?
Anticipated Response: Generalizations about people, objects or events; lazy misguided perceptions (Tubbs & Moss, 2008; Neulip, 2003) Stereotypes hinder intercultural communication competence in four ways: 1) they act as a filter; 2) create cognitive biases; 3) are oversimplified, exaggerated and over-generalized; and 4) resistant to change (Neulip, 2003, p. 322)
   d. Example: “When you go to other countries, it makes you realize how much better the United States is” (Mikk et al., 2009 p. 74)

Question: What is needed to facilitate growth at this stage?
**Anticipated Response:** The ability to manage anxiety, develop tolerance, and the ability to recognize similarities.

3. Minimization: involves refusing to look past the surface to see cultural differences.
   a. One’s own worldview is experienced as universal.
   b. Individuals feel more comfortable expecting similarities and trivializing differences.
   c. Example: People are really the same everywhere; they all want the same things for their families.

**Question:** Development of what skills would help a student to progress past this stage?

**Anticipated Response:** Open-mindedness, openness to new information, culture-general knowledge, listening skills, and mindfulness. (Mikk et al., 2009, Langer, 1989).

4. Acceptance: This is the first stage of ethnorelativism, indicating growth in intercultural sensitivity; worldviews are beginning to consider the relevance of cultural contexts.
   a. Acceptance does not necessarily imply agreement with culturally different viewpoints, but acceptance of the fact that there are equally valid viewpoints. There is curiosity and healthy respect for another culture.
   b. Equal but different attitude; development of empathy.
   c. Example: “I generally enjoy the differences between myself and people from other countries” (Mikk et al., 2009, p. 75)

**Question:** How does one move into this stage of development?

**Anticipated Response:** It requires flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity, knowledge of cultural context, respect for other values and beliefs, and culture-specific knowledge. Remember, that we have been talking about culture general knowledge up to this point. You can still acquire communication skills that we will talk about tomorrow to achieve intercultural communication competence; but the more you know about the specific culture your in, the easier it will be to develop empathy.

5. Adaptation: Adaptation occurs when we are able to think outside our own cultural context, engaging the perspective of another culture. At this point knowledge moves behavior to action that *feels* appropriate (Bennett & Bennett, 2004).
   a. The capacity to shift in and out of contextual perspectives enables communication behavior to suit the cultural context.
   b. Enables switching between frames of reference, and the ability to think, communicate and interact more effectively with other cultures. (Paige et al., 2003).
c. Example: “I can maintain my values and behave in culturally appropriate ways”. (Mikk et al., 2009, p. 75).

**Question:** So do you have to give up your culture to adapt successfully to another culture? What are some of the skills you need to develop to successfully adapt?

**Anticipated Response:** No, I just have to be aware, respectful and understand that another perspective. This would require risk-taking, problem-solving skills, and engaging in the process of continued development. It is a constant and dynamic process.

6. Integration: Person at this stage of development “transcend the cultures of which they are a part” (Paige et al., 2003, p. 472); at this point, individuals are generally bicultural or multicultural in their worldviews (Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

   a. At this stage individuals have developed intercultural sensitivity to the point they are able to create new categories as needed and able to engage in role and identity flexibility (Mikk et al., 2009, p. 75).

II. This model represents a dynamic ongoing process of development.

   A. Each of you can identify with a particular stage of development.

   B. It is not necessary to label yourself, this model is meant to propose and facilitate development through various stages of intercultural sensitivity.

   C. This model is especially for students in that it assumes that change is creating through experience and contact with strangers; similarities and differences are encountered, and ultimately students are changed by their experiences.

III. Each of the factors related with development through the DMIS stages are related to intercultural communication competence, which we will be discussing tomorrow.

   A. Intercultural communication competence, also known as ICC, is composed of the behaviors we have just spoken about in the development of intercultural sensitivity:

      1. openness
      2. tolerance
      3. mindfulness
      4. flexibility
      5. sensitivity

   B. All of these components enable communication considered effective and appropriate in distinct contextual interactions.

   C. Intercultural communication competence minimizes cultural misunderstandings.
We’ll begin tomorrow with how to apply those components to develop communication skills. Right now, let’s take a few minutes and apply the information we just went over and differentiate between the developmental stages, so we can reinforce what we just learned in our minds.
APPENDIX AD

Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)

Experience of Cultural Difference
Development of Intercultural Sensitivity

Denial | Defense | Minimization | Acceptance | Adaptation | Integration

Ethnocentric Stages | Ethnorelative Stages

Denial:

Defense:

Minimization:

Acceptance:

Adaptation:

Integration:

Can You Differentiate the Stages? (30 minutes)

Take a moment to look at the following comments from various people. Try to guess what stage of intercultural sensitivity they are in based upon their statements. Choose from denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation and integration.

Remember: These are not distinct stages; moving through the stages is a process of development.

1. “While I’m in a foreign country all I really need to know is how to get back to my hotel if I get lost, or how to take a taxi to get where I want to go.”

   Stage:____________________________________________

2. “When I examine a problem, I usually think about it from more than one cultural point of view.”

   Stage:____________________________________________

3. “When I travel abroad, it makes me realize how much better things are in the U.S.”

   Stage:____________________________________________

4. “I usually try to behave appropriately in intercultural situations, but AI also can still maintain my values and beliefs.”

   Stage:____________________________________________

5. “My life is enriched by my relationships with people from different backgrounds and experiences.”

   Stage:____________________________________________

6. “Why do we always have to emphasize what makes people different? People are people after all.”

   Stage:____________________________________________
7. “People from other cultures are not as friendly as people from my own.”

   Stage:____________________________________________________

8. “We should have no trouble interacting in the new culture as long as we can speak the same language.”

   Stage:____________________________________________________

Activity adapted from: Bennett (1993).

© Regents of the University of Minnesota. Permission is granted to make copies of this handout for classroom use.
APPENDIX AF

DMIS – Stage Differentiation Answers

1. “In a foreign country all I really need to know is now to get back to my hotel if I get lost.”
   
   **Stage: Denial**
   
   *Although this may work for some tourists, for most others this attitude will cause problems in a foreign country. There is no recognition of difference here.*

2. “When I examine a problem, I usually think about it from more than one cultural point of view.”

   **Stage: Adaptation and Integration**
   
   *This statement is indicative of deep familiarity with other cultural systems and incorporation into one's own.*

3. “When I travel abroad, it makes me realize how much better things are in the U.S.”

   **Stage: Defense**
   
   *The person is making a blanket statement about the superiority of everything American.*

4. “I usually try to behave appropriately in intercultural situations, but I also can still maintain my values and beliefs.”

   **Stage: Adaptation and Integration**
   
   *Person demonstrates ability to culture shift based upon the cultural appropriateness of the situation.*

5. “My life is enriched by my relationships with people from different backgrounds and experiences.”

   **Stage: Acceptance**
   
   *This person is interested in others culturally different from own.*

6. “Why do we always have to emphasize what makes people different? People are people after all.”

   **Stage: Minimization**
   
   *The person refuses to acknowledge the value of cultural differences.*

7. “People from other cultures are not as friendly as people from my own.”

   **Stage: Defense**
   
   *This indicates belief in the inherent superiority of home culture.*

8. “We should have no trouble interacting in the new culture as long as we can speak the same language.”

   **Stage: Denial**
   
   *This person is unable to acknowledge cultural differences.*
Critical Incident: “Am I That Different?” (45 minutes)

Susan was a rather tall, blonde Californian who had just arrived in Mexico City to spend a month doing historical research at the Museum of Fine Arts. She was excited about the trip although she had some feelings of trepidation, as this was the first time she had traveled to anywhere besides Canada and her spoken Spanish was very poor. From the moment she first stepped out on the bustling streets of the city her feelings of apprehension were confirmed and then intensified. She continually felt all eyes upon her, sensing her differences, and believed that passersby were talking about her in phrases she could only half comprehend. She tried shutting all this out but it became impossible – the stares, the whispers, the suggestive leers of the men were too overwhelming. She hated having to go out in public and took taxis to the museum every day even though she could not really afford it. At night she stayed in her small and rather depressing boardinghouse room, feeling trapped and persecuted. She was extremely relieved when her month was up and she could return to California.

How would you help Susan sort out her feelings about her experience?

1. Explain that Mexicans are by nature very curious about foreigners and meant no harm.

2. Suggest that she should have been more assertive and stared them down.

3. Explain that her feelings of persecution were largely just a figment of her overly vivid imagination.

4. Suggest that she was probably being overly self-conscious as to the amount of attention she was getting.

Rationales for Alternative Explanations:

1. This may be some consolation, and our validation sample found this is possible, but it would probably not be very convincing to Susan. There is a factor involving Susan’s reaction to the attention she received that has more validity. Please choose again.

2. This would have taken a lot of dogged will and would have been dangerous in that it would have been regarded as rude, strange, or inviting attentions from males. There are more useful suggestions. Please choose again.
3. Although there may be some elements of truth in this, it obliges Susan to accept that there was something wrong with her. There is a more acceptable explanation that applies to many foreigners. Please choose again.

4. This is the best explanation. Although individuals have different degrees of sensitivity to feeling themselves in the focus of attention or being made to feel different, many sojourners find they develop heightened self-consciousness in their initial experiences abroad. For most, these feelings gradually lessen, but some are unable to ignore them and they consequently become intensified and lead to exaggerated reactions concerning the attention they are being given or their perceived degree of difference. As a tall blonde in a city of predominantly short, dark people, Susan would undoubtedly stand out, but it is unlikely that most would pay her more than a passing glance or appreciative stare. Her sense of apprehension or furtiveness stemming from her self-consciousness ways are just as likely to have caught people’s attention and could have made personal interaction with the Mexicans strained. If sojourners can be persuaded that such feelings are not unnatural, that indeed they are a relatively harmless result of the situation in which they find themselves aware, they may accept and gradually lose this heightened awareness.

### Individualism and Collectivism Assessment

Below are 32 statements designed to assess your attitudes and beliefs about yourself. There are no right or wrong answer and some of the statements are similar to others. In the space to the left of each item, indicate the degree to which you either strongly agree or strongly disagree. If you are unsure or think that an item does not apply to you, enter a 3 in that blank. In short, use this key:

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

1. ______ I often do “my own thing.”

2. ______ Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and friends.

3. ______ One should live one’s life independently of others.

4. ______ I would sacrifice an activity I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it.

5. ______ I like my privacy.

6. ______ I prefer to be direct and forthright when discussing with other people.

7. ______ We should keep our aging parents with us at home.

8. ______ I am a unique individual.

9. ______ If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.

10.______ To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

11.______ What happens to me is my own doing.

12.______ I feel good when I cooperate with others.

13.______ If a co-worker were to get a prize, I would feel proud too.

14.______ When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.
15. ______ My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.

16. ______ I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.

17. ______ I would do what please me family, even if I detested that activity.

18. ______ Competition is the law of nature.

19. ______ I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group.

20. ______ It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.

21. ______ It is important to maintain harmony within my group.

22. ______ When another person does better than I do, I get tense.

23. ______ Without competition it is not possible to have a good society.

24. ______ The well-being of my co-workers is important to me.

25. ______ Winning is everything.

26. ______ I feel like sharing little things with my neighbors.

27. ______ It is important that I do my job better than others.

28. ______ I hate to disagree with others in my group.

29. ______ I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.

30. ______ Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award.

31. ______ Some people emphasize winning: I’m one of them.

32. ______ Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.
Scoring:
1. Add your responses from questions: 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 31. This is your Individualism Score.

2. Add your responses from questions: 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28, 30 and 32. This is your Collectivism Score.

Adapted from: Neulip (2006).
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Let’s Play Q and A

Following is a list of basic questions about your host country and culture. It is not intended to be a comprehensive list. Many more questions will be suggested as you attempt to answer these questions. If you don’t know the answer, look up the answers online. The top 3-5 questions will be discussed in class, along with the language portion of the assignment. Be prepared to share your findings with the class.

1. What things are considered taboo in this society?

2. What are some specific customs, values and norms of your host country? Name at least two of each.

3. How do people organize their daily activities? What is their orientation to time? If you are invited to dinner should you arrive early? On time? Late? Is being on time important for appointments?

4. What is the history of the relationship between this country and the United States?

5. What does the flag of your host country look like and what does it symbolize?

6. What kind of government does your host country have? Can you name the leader/leaders of the host country?

7. Who are the country’s national heroes and heroines? Can you recognize the national anthem?
8. What is your country’s attitude toward the environment?

9. Are there other languages spoken besides the dominant language? What are the social and political implications of language usage?

10. Is the price asked for merchandise fixed, or are customers expected to bargain? How is bargaining conducted?

11. What are the most important religious observances and ceremonies? How regularly do people participate in them?

12. What is the usual dress for women? For men? Are slacks and/or shorts worn? If so, on what occasions?

13. What is the normal work schedule?

14. How does your host country observe children are “coming of age?” Is there any specific celebration? Are males preferred over females?

15. Be prepared to say the following sentences in the language of your host country in training tomorrow:
   - Hello
   - Thank you
   - Numbers from one to 10 (the actual numbers, not “Numbers from one to 10”)
   - Excuse me.
   - The days of the week (ditto, the actual days. ☺)
   - My name is ___________
   - What is your name?
   - It’s nice to meet you.
   - Do you speak English?
   - Good-bye
If you do not have access to foreign language books, go online to: http://translate.google.com

*Google Translate* will translate in over fifty languages and has the capacity for you to listen to correct pronunciation in the language of your host country.

Day Two Student Recap (30 minutes)

Overview:
This strategy gives students the opportunity to summarize what they have learned and to present their summary to others. It is a good way to get students to recap what they have learned on their own.

Procedure:
1. Explain to students that for you to provide a summary of the class would be contrary to the principle of active learning.

2. Divide students into groups of three to four members.

3. Ask each group to create their own summary of the previous day’s class session. Encourage students to create an outline, a mind map, or any other device that will enable them to communicate their summary to the class.

4. Use any of the following questions to guide student work:
   - What were the major topics we have examined?
   - How do these topics relate to communicating across cultures?
   - What did you personally take away from the session to utilize in your study abroad experience?
   - What did you learn that you had not expected?
   - Have your attitudes or insights changed as a result of what you have learned up to this point?

5. Invite groups to share their summaries to the class. Applaud their efforts.

Adapted from: Silberman (1996, p. 166).
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What Do You See? (20 minutes)

Picture One Possible Interpretations:

- Two women are walking and a man threatens one of the women with a piece of wood
- Two men are attacking a woman
- A woman steps aside to let a blind man pass
- A beggar and a woman
- Gardening
- A farm family working on their land
- Two people helping each other do something
- Poor people. The man is digging for something and the woman is waiting to take it
- A man cleaning the floor
- A man is digging a hole and a woman is dropping seeds in it
Picture Two Possible Interpretations:

- A teacher reprimanding a student
- A man teaching other men
- A boss giving instructions to employees
- A government official warning a gathering of people with different religions
- Blessing
- A preacher in a church
- A film director instructing his crew where to stand for the next scene
- A salesman trying to sell his wares
Picture Three Possible Interpretations:

- Prayer before a meal; two people do not want to pray
- People thinking hard to solve some problem
- Difficult conversation
- A meeting about to begin
- A family that has just received a sad letter
- A meeting. Two women on the left are talking on the side about a mobile phone
- The person on the left just bought some bread and is offering a piece to everybody
- People looking for a solution to some problem. The guy on the left is hiding the important evidence and showing something unimportant to the others
- The man in the middle presides over the debate. One guy is not involved
- A religious ritual
Picture Four Possible Interpretations:

- A woman is giving some money to a man and he is claiming he wants more money
- A woman is trying to bribe a man
- A man is taking money from a woman
- A man is giving money to a woman. Something is problematic and they are discussing it
- Negotiation
- Educated people discussing something
- A woman asking the way and a man orientating her
- A discussion among friends
- A quarrel. She has insulted him in some way
- A lady giving her address to a man

What is Intercultural Communication Competence? (ICC)
(Lecture without learning modules- 20 minutes)

Objectives
As a result of this lecture, students will:

- Understand how differences in cultural patterns affect competence in intercultural communication
- Be able to analyze aspects of intercultural communication competence
- Identify components of intercultural communication competence (ICC)
- Apply awareness of ICC

Introduction:
We have just spent a time looking at the relationship between cultural patterns, and how communication and perspective are ultimately affected by different cultural foundations. The patterns of culture create a filter through which we all see things differently, and these cultural patterns also filter how our verbal, and as we just saw, how nonverbal symbols can be interpreted. Each cultural pattern, as with high- and low-context and individualism-collectivism, influences what is considered to be communicatively appropriate and effective (Lustig & Koester, 2003).

Today’s global world necessitates intercultural communication competence. Competence does not just “happen” through exposure to another culture; just as intercultural sensitivity is a process, the development of intercultural communication competence is also a process.

Overhead: of Intercultural Communication as a process (See Appendix AM)

Definition of intercultural communication: refers to interactions between people who do not share the same value orientations, communication codes, or role expectations (Lustig & Koester, 2010)

The goal of intercultural communication competency involves creating communication that is “effective to the extent that participants are able to minimize misunderstanding” and interactions perceived as fulfilling objectives appropriately “to the context in which the interaction occurs (Posirusk, 2004, p. 25-26).

A. ICC is effective – misunderstandings are minimized.
   1. Individuals are entering into conversations from differing cultural foundations and differing concepts of what is considered effective.
B. ICC is appropriate – in other words, competent communication considers the context in which the communication is occurring; “the exchanged behaviors are regarded as proper and match the expectations generated by the insiders of the culture” (Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005, p. 17).

Module: High- and Low-Context Communication (See Appendix AN)

C. Two views of competence are proposed: (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997).

1. Competence comes from within the communicator
   a. individual capacity or capability (Kim, 1991)
   b. individual communication skills (the following are examples)
      i. managing cultural differences
      ii. inter-group posture
      iii. experience of stress

2. Competence is between the communicators
   a. involves process and interaction
   b. effective and appropriate responses between communicators

D. ICC involves creating communication in which the same meaning is attached to messages in communication involving two or more people (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003).

Question: What is the goal of ICC?
Anticipated Response: Effective and appropriate communication.

Question: What are the processes involved in competence?
Anticipated Response: Competence within and between individuals.

Question: How do you obtain ICC?
Anticipated or facilitated response: It is a process. Knowledge/Application and Skills.

That’s what we’re here to learn about. It’s what you’re going to take with you; what you’re going to put in your suitcase and take with you on your study abroad experience to practice. ICC is a process. It takes practice. You have an opportunity that few other students in this nation have to develop ICC during your study abroad. Statistics show that less than 1.5% of U.S. American students study abroad, while 3.5% of all students in the U.S. are international students. Let me reiterate that: less than 1.5% of American students study abroad, while 3.5% of the total student population in the United States are international students. That percentage does not take into account the international students who study in other countries such as Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia or elsewhere. ICC is considered the global literacy of the 21st century. You are part of a small percentage that can develop into globally literate leaders. Take advantage of this opportunity; statistics show most of you will never have the opportunity to live abroad again. Take this rare opportunity develop communication skills. Knowledge and application of the skills you learn here, in this training, will maximize your study abroad experience.
II. Application of ICC skills can be mediated by an individual’s ability/ability to manage anxiety and uncertainty.

A. Physical closeness of an unfamiliar culture and the emotional distance generated by cultural variance and dissimilar values create uncertainty and anxiety for strangers.

B. Anxiety/Uncertainty Management (AUM) theory proposes that strangers in unfamiliar situations or communication interactions may question how to act, question how the other will respond, or question how a message will be perceived across cultural barriers (Gudykunst, 2005).

Question: Who has experienced a similar situation where you feel unsure about what to say or do in unfamiliar surroundings? What was that like?

1. Uncertainty is reduced by information-gathering, enabling prediction of alternative behaviors and effective communication.
2. Individuals have maximum thresholds for anxiety; if uncertainty exceeds that threshold, interactions with host nationals are ineffective and adaptation to a different culture will fail (Gudykunst, 2005).

Question: Why will uncertainty that is above an individual’s threshold cause them to fail?

Anticipated or facilitated response: Anxiety can paralyze action. Anxiety is the emotional counterpart to uncertainty in AUM theory and affects and individual’s participation in intercultural interaction.

C. Anxiety management skills enable personal growth, adaptation to another culture, emotional well-being, and effective and competent interactions with host nationals.

1. Four needs must be met in anxiety reduction:
   a. the need for predictability (information gathering, the rules of the road)
   b. the need for a sense of group inclusion (no one feels at ease feeling like an outsider)
   c. the need to diffuse anxiety (creates a sense of security)
   d. the need to sustain self-conception (a sense of self-respect, self-confirmation and worthiness. “I’m such an idiot”)

2. Once these four needs are met anxiety is reduced competent communication is enabled.

D. Application of skills can also be hindered by ethnocentrism, prejudice and stereotypes.
1. Ethnocentrism: belief or assumption in the superiority of the cultural group to which one belongs.
2. Stereotypes: act as a filter; create cognitive biases through assumptions; are oversimplified, exaggerated and over generalized; and are resistant to change (Neulip, 2003, p. 322)
3. Prejudice: A preformed opinion, usually an unfavorable one, based on insufficient knowledge, irrational feelings or inaccurate stereotypes.

Module: Critical Incident – They are Talking About Me (see Appendix AO)

III. Application of behavioral skills diffuses individual anxiety, enabling greater comfort and growth venturing into unknown territory.

A. Mindfulness is a consciousness of process versus results; and considers the concept of context as dynamic versus static.
   1. It is process-oriented: it allows for changing circumstances.
   2. It allows for interpretation of individual contexts:
      a. creation of new categories
      b. openness to new information
      c. openness to different points of view
   3. Mindfulness contributes to a student’s ability to “think outside the box”; it is process-oriented and dynamic; it is ever-changing.
   4. Mindfulness and openness to can be directly related to flexibility which is cited by numerous scholars as a central characteristic of ICC (Gudykunst, 1991; Komin, 1990; Knutson, 1994; Knutson, et al., 2003; LeRoux, 2002; Martin 1989).

B. Flexibility enables a communicator to be sensitive and respond to situational and contextual constraints accordingly.
   1. The idea of change and creativity is inherent in the definition of ICC and central to communication flexibility (Spano & Zimmerman, 1995).
   2. Mindful behavioral flexibility results in the ability to gather information and adapt messages to a specific context.

Module: Critical Incident – Foreign Bureaucracy (see Appendix AP)

C. Flexibility implies empathy and sensitivity.
   1. Empathy is composed of interrelated cognitive, affective and communicative aspects.
      a. Cognitive: empathy is the process of striving to understand from another’s perspective.
b. Affective: seeking to experience the emotions and thoughts of the other.
c. Communicative: Attempts to communicate understanding verbally and/or nonverbally (Bennett, 1979; Gudykunst, 2004; Lustig & Koester, 2010)
d. Empathy is the key concept in “The Platinum Rule”: “do unto others as they themselves would have done unto them” (Bennett, 1998, p. 213).
e. Platinum rules implies empathy as others would like to be treated from their own perspectives (Bennett, 1998).

**Question:** Why would it be difficult to completely empathize with individuals from other cultures?

**Anticipated Response:** Among other differences, different styles of communication, beliefs, values and ideas make it difficult to empathize with dissimilar others.

2. Shared meaning is developed in a relational view of empathy during a transactional communication event (Broome, 1991).
   a. Development of a third culture between participants.
   b. The essence of relational empathy (Broome, 1991).

Module: Cross-Cultural Dialogue (see Appendix AQ)

D. Intercultural sensitivity, the primary assumption of the DMIS, enables higher levels of awareness and deeper observation of differences and greater display of empathy (Jackson, 2008).

1. Intercultural sensitivity is defined as encompassing:
   a. understanding the differences when interacting with high- and low-context cultures.
   b. open-mindedness in cultural encounters
   c. flexible behavior when confronted with dissimilar norms of another culture (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992).

**Question:** Does any of this sound familiar? We are beginning to hear how these terms are process oriented and interrelated with one another in terms of ICC.

E. Tolerance for ambiguity- or the ability to “deal successfully with situations even when a lot of information needed to interact effectively is unknown” (Gudykunst, 1991, p. 119)

**Question:** Remember the pictures and the interpretations you had of the pictures? You weren’t sure what they were about. Asking questions would have clarified ideas. The pictures were purposely ambiguous to help you understand there can be many interpretations to the way individuals see things.

If you are in an ambiguous situation in your host country, how are you going to handle it?
**Anticipated response:** Gather information, make observations, be flexible and open. Be sensitive to noticing cultural differences, and be respectful with a mind to communicating in a manner that would be considered appropriate.

IV. Summary of behaviors related with ICC:
   A. Anxiety/Uncertainty Management
   B. Mindfulness
   C. Flexibility
   D. Empathy
   E. Intercultural Sensitivity
   F. Tolerance for Ambiguity
   G. Appropriate and Effectiveness

(Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Broome, 1991; Gudykunst, 2004; Knutson, 1994; Knutson et al., 2003; Kohls, 2001; Lustig & Koester; 2010, Martin, 1989; Posirisuk, 2004; Samovar et al., 2004; Ting-Toomey & Chung, 2005)

The Theory of Rhetorical Sensitivity has been shown to be isomorphic with each of the behaviors listed above, and capable of providing teachable skills to facilitate ICC, cultural progression and adaptation in your host countries.
A Contextual Model of Intercultural Communication

Human Communication is:

- A Process
- Dynamic
- Interactive/Transactive
- Symbolic
- Intentional
- Contextual
- Ubiquitous
- Cultural

High and Low-Context Communication (30 minutes)

Knowing how to distinguish between high- and low-context messages can help you learn how to “read between the lines,” a skill of high-context communicators. This exercise will help you become more familiar with the differences in high- and low-context communication. Remember that all high-context cultures are considered collectivistic, and all low-context are primarily individualistic. For the following statements, decide whether the communication is low context or high context and then circle the statements that exemplify your communication style.

H = high-context
L = low-context

1. A friend emails you about going to a party and you reply, Things are busy with my exams, but I would like to go.” You know that you won’t be going and trust your friend knows this from the email.
   Answer: _____

2. Your professor asks, “Do you have time to meet after class?” You interpret this to be a request to come after class, rather than a question about whether or not you are available.
   Answer: _____

3. Your professor asks, “Do you have time to meet after class?” You interpret this to be a question, and you respond yes or no based on whether or not you are available.
   Answer: _____

4. When you disagree with someone, you use questions to suggest that you have a different opinion.
   Answer: _____

5. You feel good when you are honest with your co-workers and tell them that you are upset about something they did.
   Answer: _____

6. You feel it is alright to say “I disagree” to your professor in class.
   Answer: _____
7. If you have a problem with someone, you won’t go to them and say that you are upset. Rather you will ask another friend to help work out the problem.
Answer:______

8. I you want something, you feel it’s best to come out and ask for it.
Answer:______

9. You feel that hinting at something is an effective way of getting what you want.
Answer:______

10. In a job interview, you begin by summarizing the accomplishments on your resume.
Answer:______

Answers:

1. You are relying on your friend’s knowledge of how serious the exams are to understand that you will not be going. You have been polite because you expressed that you would like to go. A more explicit statement of “No, I won’t be going” is not necessary and may be considered rude. Answer: H

2. You pay more attention to the status of the person communicating than the actual message itself. In this case, even though the professor asked whether or not you have time, the question is treated as a request to stay after class. How you respond will be influenced by several things, including the extent to which hierarchy matters in the culture and to you, the perceived consequences for denying a request, your availability, and how others might understand you changing your plans to meet with the professor. Answer: H

3. This situation is the reverse of #2 in that the focus is on the words (the question) the professor asked. Although is status may influence your response, it does not lead to a different interpretation of the words used. If you are not available, your response may take the professors’ status into account by being more formal or polite and requesting to meet soon, but at another time. Answer: L

4. At times it’s best to save face (your own and others involved) and be vague so that you do not embarrass others by contradicting them publicly or privately. Questions are used to explore a topic further (even when a firm opinion is held). However, as the topic continues to be discussed, clues are given to help the listener understand that you hold an opposing view. Answer: H

5. While it may be hard to hear or say, great value is placed on being open and truthful with others. Answer: L
6. Learning is deemed to take place, at least in part, through conversation and dialogue with fellow students and professors. A debate approach in which ideas are presented and openly critiqued is valued and practiced throughout one’s education in high school and college. **Answer: L**

7. Use of intermediaries or go-betweens is common and can be a signal that you care a great deal about those involved in the situation because you made the effort to involve others. **Answer: H**

8. The question “How will they know if you don’t tell them?” emphasizes that it is the speaker’s responsibility to request what he or she wants and not the listener’s job to figure it out. **Answer: L**

9. The listener is given credit for being able to figure out what you may need. There’s no need to be forceful or self-absorbed when asking for something. **Answer: H**

10. “Selling yourself” is viewed as the purpose of the interview, and it is up to the interviewee to make sure that all accomplishments are discussed that are relevant to the new job. It is not viewed as demeaning (as it might be in high-context cultures) to repeat in the interview what has already been presented on a resume. **Answer: L**

They Are Talking About Me (30 minutes)

Mark Ludwig had been in a Latin country for about 2 months, in a university where 98% of the students were citizens of the host country. Mark had lived all his life in his home country, the United States, and had done extremely well in his college-level foreign language studies, including the language of his host university. He was making good progress in his classes and had been asked to give a formal presentation to his department as a whole. His language skills were good enough that he could do this in the hosts’ language.

Although he was pleased with his educational progress, he was unhappy about informal contacts at school. He did not seem to be included in informal gatherings, such as during lunch breaks. Fellow students would sit around smiling at him, laughing and chatting with each other, and Mark overheard his name mentioned often enough to become convinced that these informal groups were mostly talking about him. He became worried that they were talking negatively. He began to lose sleep, and this was eventually reflected in lower grades than he was usually accustomed to receiving. Mark began to feel isolated and homesick.

If Mark asked you to help him sort out his feelings, what would you say to him? Focus on the issue that is almost certainly the case.

1. There is a natural tendency for sojourners to feel that they are being singled out for attention hosts’ conversations among themselves.

2. The other students should have been more sensitive and should have included Mark in their informal lunch breaks and gatherings.

3. The other students were jealous of Mark’s success, as shown by his being asked to address the department as a whole.

4. Mark’s formal language studies in the United States did not include coverage of casual social conversations (language as it is used rather than language from a book), and so he was ill prepared to interact informally with people.

Rationales for Alternative Explanations:

1. This is the best answer. Sojourners, all of whom go through some degree of culture shock, are naturally anxious about their relationships with hosts. Most want to make a good impression and most want to be well remembered after they return to their own
countries. But it should be kept in mind that a sojourner is a unique event – with 98% of the host nationals in the university, as in this case, outsiders are noticeably different and will be the focus of hosts’ curiosity and informal conversations. Sojourners should be advised that they will be the focus of hosts’ curiosity and informal conversations, but that they should not over interpret this fact. They should not conclude that host are always talking ill of them, are talking about them all the time, or are calling special meetings to talk about them. Such feelings are rarely warranted.

2. Although this is perhaps true, it is not the best answer to help Mark sort out his feelings. People are comfortable with the familiar in their informal chats, and the presence of an outsider (Mark) would make them less comfortable and would make the lunch and study breaks more formal. People like to be with their in-groups during informal chats, and although this may lead to exclusion of newcomers and outsiders, informal groupings of people who are similar is a natural tendency. Please choose again.

3. This is a possibility, and unfortunately one about which sojourners should be careful. However, it does not happen in all Latin countries with such frequency that it can be considered a general principle, especially if Mark is modest about his accomplishments (braggarts are rarely liked; this is true of most places, including Mark’s home country). Although the possibility of jealousy is a topic that Mark might well discuss with experienced sojourners he respects, there is another answer that meets the criterion. Please choose again.

4. The content of what is taught in college-level language classes varies widely. Some instructors, realizing that the criticism that students once left classes “talking like books” was valid, now regularly introduce material on informal conversational styles in their course work. Thus Alan could well have had a good deal of exposure to informal conversational styles. For instance, language instructors sometimes invite foreign students to come to their classes and engage in informal chats with students. Although this is a good answer, there is another one that sheds additional light on the issue. Please choose again.

Adapted from: Cushner and Brislin (1996, pp. 138, 146).
Critical Incident – “Foreign Bureaucracy” (45 minutes)

Robert, an Englishman, has recently arrived in a Middle Eastern country and obtained a position as a private English teacher. He is required to obtain a work permit, and so presents himself at the appropriate government office to apply. He is told to fill out a form and return in a few days. When he returns and asks if the permit is granted, he is told there are some problems and to return in a few days. On two more visits he meets the same response and exasperatedly asks another teacher if this is normal. He is told that such delaying tactics are frequent and that he can avoid them by giving the official a small amount of money to expedite the process. Robert becomes very indignant at this and de3clares he will never resort to such bribery. However, aft4er several more fruitless visits he slips the official some money and is subsequently granted his permit. He feels very bitter about the incident, however, and constantly denounces the corruption of “these people” to his fellow expatriates.

How would you interpret the official’s action so as to make it more acceptable to Robert?

1. The official is not being discriminatory, as everybody is obliged to pay such bribes. Robert should not take it so personally.

2. The payment could be regarded as the equivalent to a tip for services, such as that given to a waiter or porter.

3. Such behavior is probably not seen as unethical by the official, so Robert should not try to impose his culturally influenced values upon someone from another culture.

4. The official does not demand any large sums of money, so he is not really doing anything seriously wrong.

Rationales for the Alternative Explanations:

1. This is a partial explanation. Robert’s negative reaction is more a result of a perceived violation of his ethics than because he feels discriminated against. Such practices are very common in many countries, and Robert probably realizes this. However, this knowledge probably will not go far toward making the actions more acceptable to him. There is another explanation. Please choose again.

2. This could be the best way to view such behavior. If one can relate certain customs to actions that are similar or parallel to some in one’s own culture, one may see previously unacceptable behaviors in a better light. Tipping for various services is very common in England and accepted as an ethical practice, yet visitors from
countries that do not have such practices feel very uneasy at being obliged to tip. The reason for such financial supplements is generally to compensate the worker for a low basic remuneration. The official in the Middle Eastern country probably requests such supplementary payment for the same reason.

3. This alternative has a good deal of merit, and our validation sample selected this as the best possible response. This explanation, however, will probably not reduce Robert’s feeling that his values are being violated. Although such explanations are often given to attempt to endorse such behaviors, they are very abstract – it is preferable to find an explanation that Robert can relate to more specifically. In light of this, please try again.

4. It is unlikely that the size of the sum will decrease Robert’s perception of the act as corrupt. There is a better suggestion.

APPENDIX AQ

The Flu (30 minutes)

Sarah is a U.S. American and Luisa is Latina

Sarah: I was hoping we could have that meeting of the sales team tomorrow morning.

Luisa: Actually, my daughter has some kind of flu and I was going to take her to the doctor tomorrow morning.

Sarah: I see. Well, let me check with Bob and see if he can sit in for you. Shouldn’t be any problem. I’ll let you know.

Luisa: Thank you.

Sarah: Don’t mention it.

Debrief:

In all honesty, Sarah might be insensitive even by American standards; by Luisa’s standards, she’s downright ill-mannered. To a Latin, one’s family comes before one’s work (and one’s boss would, of course, understand this). The least Sarah could have done was to express her concern about Luisa’s daughter. The next thing she could have done was to postpone the meeting. And beyond that she should have offered to help in any way that she could. Sarah may have thought she was helping by arranging for Luisa to miss the meeting, but all she was doing was communicating that the real emergency was the one at work – not the one at Luisa’s home.

How could this conversation have been handled differently in light of the cultural differences at play?

Who would like to volunteer and role play this conversation with those thoughts in mind?

Adapted from: Storti (1994, pp. 43, 63).
Assessing Your Listening Behavior

The purpose of this questionnaire is to assess your listening behavior with strangers. Respond to each statement indicating the degree to which it is true regarding the way you generally listen: Always False (AF); Usually False (UF); Sometimes False (SF); Sometimes True (ST); Usually True (UT); Always True (AT).

\[ AF = 1 \quad UF = 2 \quad SF = 3 \quad ST = 3 \quad UT = 4 \quad AT = 5 \]

1. I have a difficult time separating important and unimportant ideas when I listen to strangers.

2. I check new information against what I already know when I listen to strangers.

3. I have an idea what strangers will say when I listen to them.

4. I am sensitive to what strangers will say when I listen to them.

5. I think about what I am going to say next when I listen to strangers.

6. I focus on the process of communication that is occurring between me and strangers when I listen to them.

7. I cannot wait for strangers to finish talking so I can take my turn.

8. I try to understand the meanings that are being created when I communicate with strangers.

9. I focus on determining whether strangers understand what I said when they are talking.

10. I ask strangers to elaborate when I am not sure what they mean.

To find your score, first reverse your responses for the odd numbered items (i.e., if your chose “Always False” (1) – score it a 5; if you chose “Usually False” (2) – score it a 4; if you chose “Sometimes False” or “Sometimes True” leave it as a 3; if you chose “Usually True” (4) – score it as 2; if you chose “Always True” (5) – score it as a 1.

Next add the numbers next to each statement. Scores range from 10 to 50. The higher your score, the better your listening behavior.

Adapted from: Gudykunst (2004, p. 184).
APPENDIX AS

Giving Question and Getting Answers (30 minutes)

Procedure

1. Hand out two index cards to each student.

2. Ask each student to complete the following sentences based on topics from the previous days training:

   Card 1: I still have a question about ________________.

   Card 2: I can answer a question about ________________.

3. Create subgroups of 3 students and have each subgroup attempt to answer their fellow group members questions.

4. Have each subgroup select the most pertinent “question to ask” and the most interesting “question to answer” from the cards of their group members. Inform the group members they will be asked to explain why their choice of “question to answer.” What is it about the topic or question they found interesting and why?

5. Ask each subgroup to report the “question to ask” it has selected. Determine if anyone in the full class can answer the question. If not, the trainer should respond.

6. Ask each subgroup to report the “question to answer” it has selected. Have subroups members share the answer with the rest of the class.

APPENDIX AT

Culture, Misattributions, and Listening

Objectives
As a result of this lecture, students will be able to:
- Define and explain attributions and misattributions.
- Recognize mediating factors for misattributions.
- Identify strategies to make to improve the accuracy of attributions.

Who can tell me some of the things we have learned about culture so far? I’m going to write down what you tell me here on the flip chart.
- Culture is dynamic
- It is learned
- People are socialized into cultures without being aware of its existence most of the time
- Culture affects communication

Note: If the students do not suggest concepts of culture in the general direction of culture and how it affects communication, the trainer will facilitate them to that direction through utilization of points students have already suggested.

“The most critical dimension of culture concerns itself with people’s assumptions about life” (Cushner & Brislin, 1996, p. 6). And culture is composed of varying values, beliefs, and norms that guide behaviors and communication.

- Cultures is largely invisible until some value, norm, expectation of behavior is crossed. Hall (1989) is famous for making the comment that culture is like water to a fish. You don’t realize you’re in it until you’re out of it.
- Misattributions occur when “people from different cultures interact in ways that each believes are proper and appropriate from his or her own perspectives but are different from what is expected by the other.

What is an attribution? Attribution is the assigning of some quality, action, meaning, or character to a person or thing.
So what is a misattribution? It is incorrectly assigning meaning.

I. The cultural rules and the rules for communication we learned as children often contribute to misunderstandings or misattributions when we communicate with strangers (Gudykunst, 2004, p. 170).
   A. Mediating factors
1. Cultural frameworks (High- and low-context/individualism-collectivism)

**Question:** What are those frameworks we’ve talked about again?

**Anticipated Response:** High- and low-context and individualism-collectivism

2. Awareness

3. Differences in ways people seek to reduce uncertainty

**Question:** What would some of those ways include?

**Anticipated Response:** gathering information, considering the context

B. Stereotypes and prejudice

**Question:** How do stereotypes hinder ICC?

**Anticipated response:** Categorize and make assumptions based on over-generalizations and over-exaggerations.

Joke: An airliner leaves Heathrow Airport under the control of a Jewish captain. His co-pilot is Chinese. It’s the first time they’ve flown together, and there’s a awkward silence between them. Once they reach cruising altitude, the captain activates the auto-pilot, leans back in his seat and mutters, “I don’t like Chinese.”

“You don’t like Chinese” asks the co-pilot? “Why not?”

“You people bombed Pearl Harbor, that's why!”

“No, no”, the co-pilot protests, “The Chinese didn’t bomb Pearl Harbor, that was the Japanese, not the Chinese.”

“Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese...It doesn’t matter, you're all alike!”

A few minutes of silence follow.

“I don’t like Jews!” the co-pilot suddenly announces.

“Oh yeah, why not?” asks the captain.

“The Jews sank Titanic!” says the co-pilot

“What? That's insane! The Jews didn't sink the Titanic!” exclaims the captain, “It was an iceberg!”

“Iceberg, Goldberg, Rosenberg...it doesn’t matter; you’re all the same.”

C. There are three ways to improve the accuracy of attributions:

1. Perception checking
   a. *Describe* the behavior we think we observe
   b. *Tell* the other person what we think we perceive.
   c. *Ask* strangers if our perceptions are accurate (Gudykunst, 2004, p. 180).

2. Listening effectively
   a. Listening is not a natural activity; it takes mindfulness.
   b. Listening is a process without pre-supposing the outcome; it is active.
   c. It is practiced as a skill.
3. Feedback: “Feedback from others enables us to understand how our behavior affects the, and allows us to modify our behavior to achieve our desired goals” (Haslett & Ogilvie, 1988, p. 385).
Skills Practice: Adapting Communication (60 minutes with debriefing)

This exercise will allow you to synthesize and evaluate specific instances of adapting communication, applying information from the lecture on rhetorical sensitivity.

This exercise is in three parts in order to practice the skill of flexibility and adapting your communication in more than one context.

Part One:
In this exercise you are presented with a series of five statements that are more characteristic of low-context, individualistic communicators. Read each statement and then try to rephrase the statement in a manner more sensitive to a high-context, collectivistic communicator. Apply what you have learned about ICC and rhetorical sensitivity. For the purposes of the activity, the context is that of a meeting in which several people may be present.

The first item has been done for you to illustrate the exercise.

1. I’m not sure that’s such a good idea.
   Do you think that’s a good idea?
   Are there any other ideas?
   I like most parts of that idea.
   What is your reasoning for these adaptations? In high-context cultures, it is considered very important to not embarrass others. Rather than saying it’s a bad idea (or not such a good idea), asking for other ideas includes other group members and the last statement compliments parts of the idea, while leaving the door open for other new parts to be suggested.

2. That’s not exactly the point.

   What is your reasoning for these adaptations?

3. I think we should…
4. What do you think Mr. Cato?

What is your reasoning for these adaptations?

5. I don’t agree.

What is your reasoning for these adaptations?

Part Two:
In this exercise you are presented with a series of four statements which are more characteristic of high-context, collectivistic communicators. Read each statement and then try to rephrase the statement in a manner more sensitive to a low-context, individualistic communicator. Apply what you have learned about ICC and rhetorical sensitivity. At the end of the exercise, explain your reasoning for the adaptations that were made.

1. This proposal deserves further consideration.

2. Can we move on to the next topic?

3. We will try our best.

4. That is a very interesting viewpoint.

Reasoning for adaptations:
Part Two:

High-context communication may also be referred to as indirect communication. Consideration of context is principal, where communication is implied, inferred and suggested rather than saying things directly. Harmony and saving face are critical components in communication; as members of collectivist cultures there is sometimes an intuitive understanding in which words are not necessary to spell things out.

Low-context communication is also referred to as direct communication. There is less instinctive understanding and a greater need to spell things out. The meaning of communication is in the words. The goal of communicating does not consider face, but outcome, in getting and giving information.

The following exercise asks you to consider the definitions of high-context/indirect and low-context/direct communication styles and apply them to specific examples of communication behavior. Below is a list of twelve items, each of which is more representative of one pole of this dimension than the other. Remember that no culture uses one approach exclusively, but most cultures tend to be more one way than the other on the continuum.

Read each item and put an I next to those behaviors more consistent with indirectness/high-context, and a D next to those behaviors more consistent with directness/low-context.

1. This is like the communication between siblings.  
2. This is like the communication between two casual acquaintances.  
3. People are reluctant to say no.  
4. You may have to read between the lines to understand what someone is saying.  
5. It’s best to tell it like it is.  
6. Yes means yes.  
7. Yes means I hear you.  
8. There is no need to read between the lines.  
9. Who attends your meeting is an indication of how important you or the topic is.
10. Who attends your meeting is an indication of who is available to attend.

11. Silence may mean disapproval or dissatisfaction.

12. People tell you what they think you want to hear.


Skills Practice: Adapting Communication Exercise with Answers

This exercise will allow you to synthesize and evaluate specific instances of adapting communication, applying information from the lecture on rhetorical sensitivity.

This exercise is in three parts in order to practice the skill of flexibility and adapting your communication in more than one context.

Part One:
In this exercise you are presented with a series of five statements that are more characteristic of low-context, individualistic communicators. Read each statement and then try to rephrase the statement in a manner more sensitive to a high-context, collectivistic communicator. Apply what you have learned about ICC and rhetorical sensitivity. For the purposes of the activity, the context is that of a meeting in which several people may be present.

The first item has been done for you to illustrate the exercise.

1. I’m not sure that’s such a good idea.
   Do you think that’s a good idea?
   Are there any other ideas?
   I like most parts of that idea.

   What is your reasoning for these adaptations? In high-context cultures, it is considered very important to not embarrass others. Rather than saying it’s a bad idea (or not such a good idea), asking for other ideas includes other group members and the last statement compliments parts of the idea, while leaving the door open for other new parts to be suggested.

2. That’s not exactly the point.
   That’s another good point.
   Has anyone thought about doing it this way?

   What is your reasoning for these adaptations? Again, you want to help another to save face, so you are leaving the door open for other points to be presented by saying that’s another good point. There may be other good points. The adaptation shows sensitivity and empathy, both aspects of ICC and rhetorical sensitivity. In the second example, creation of new categories is explored by suggesting another way of accomplishing a task, while maintaining the face of the person who made the first point.

3. I think we should...
   What do you think of this idea?
   Has anyone thought about doing it this way?
What is your reasoning for these adaptations? In speaking with a high-context culture, “I think we should” may be considered too direct and assertive. It also does not take into consideration what other members of the group may have as input. The alternatives display mindfulness and sensitivity by considering the context.

4. What do you think Mr. Cato?
   Have we heard all the other opinions?
   Are there any other suggestions?
   Does anyone else want to speak?
What is your reasoning for these adaptations? Asking people directly sometimes embarrasses them. By asking the question in an alternative way, it is possible to find out what Mr. Cato is thinking without putting him on the spot or making him feel uncomfortable.

5. I don’t agree.
   That’s a good idea, but may I suggest another one as well?
   What do you think of this idea?
   May I make a small suggestion?
What is your reasoning for these adaptations? The comment is too direct and may cause the person to feel embarrassment or loss of face. The comment is too direct and aggressive and could be considered offensive. It is focused on outcome with no consideration of the relational aspect, considered important in high-context, collective cultures.

Part Two:
In this exercise you are presented with a series of four statements which are more characteristic of high-context, collectivistic communicators. Read each statement and then try to rephrase the statement in a manner more sensitive to a low-context, individualistic communicator. Apply what you have learned about ICC and rhetorical sensitivity.

1. This proposal deserves further consideration.
   We don’t agree with certain features of this proposal.
   This proposal needs some work.

2. Can we move on to the next topic?
   Let’s discuss this later.
   We’re not ready to talk about this now.
   We need to get some advice/more information before we can talk about this.

3. We will try our best.
   This will be difficult under the circumstances.
   This is not going to be easy.
   I’m not optimistic about this.
4. That is a very interesting viewpoint. 
   I don’t completely agree with you. 
   We need to talk about this. 
   I see thing very differently.

Reasoning for adaptations: Low-context and individualistic cultures are to the point, without feeling the need to consider relational issues as intensely. Mindfulness is displayed by consideration of the need of low-context cultures to get to the outcome and the freedom to express individual ideas and thoughts independent of the group. There is less tolerance for ambiguity and a desire to spell things out in a distinct manner.

Part Three:

High-context communication may also be referred to as indirect communication. Consideration of context is principal, where communication is implied, inferred and suggested rather than saying things directly. Harmony and saving face are critical components in communication; as members of collectivist cultures there is sometimes an intuitive understanding in which words are not necessary to spell things out.

Low-context communication is also referred to as direct communication. There is less instinctive understanding and a greater need to spell things out. The meaning of communication is in the words. The goal of communicating does not consider face, but outcome, in getting and giving information.

The following exercise asks you to consider the definitions of high-context/indirect and low-context/direct communication styles and apply them to specific examples of communication behavior. Below is a list of twelve items, each of which is more representative of one pole of this dimension than the other. Remember that no culture uses one approach exclusively, but most cultures tend to be more one way than the other on the continuum.

Read each item and put an I next to those behaviors more consistent with indirectness/high-context, and a D next to those behaviors more consistent with directness/low-context.

___I___ 1. This is like the communication between siblings. 
   Members of the same family usually have considerable shared experiences, hence a more innate understanding. They can thus be more indirect with each other.

___D___ 2. This is like the communication between two casual acquaintances. 
   Because they share less common understanding, they have to be more direct.
3. People are reluctant to say no. This is more characteristic of collectivist cultures, which prize harmony and are therefore more indirect.

4. You may have to read between the lines to understand what someone is saying. Understatement is classic indirect style.

5. It’s best to tell it like it is. Some people don’t like what they call “beating around the bush.”

6. Yes means yes. Direct communicators should be interpreted fairly literally.

7. Yes means I hear you. Since saying no may not be an option, yes is more of an automatic response, which may not mean very much.

8. There is no need to read between the lines. This is because the lines (the words) are primary carrier of meaning.

9. Who attends your meeting is an indication of how important you or the topic is. Where words are not the primary carrier of meaning, other methods are to communicate the message.

10. Who attends your meeting is an indication of who is available to attend. Where words are the primary carrier of the message, you don’t read so much extra meaning into nonverbal behaviors.

11. Silence may mean disapproval or dissatisfaction. If saying no is impolite and saying yes might mislead, then saying nothing can be the polite way of saying no.

12. People tell you what they think you want to hear. This saves face and preserves harmony.


Rhetorical Sensitivity (RS)

Objectives
As a result of this lecture, students will:

- Understand the process of RS as receiver-oriented communication.
- Have the capability to differentiate between Noble Self, Rhetorically Sensitive and Rhetorically Reflective communication behaviors.
- Distinguish RS as encompassing communication behaviors isomorphic with ICC.

Yesterday we examined the components and behaviors that encompass the concept of ICC. Today we have considered the impact making incorrect attributions can have when interacting across cultures, and the importance of listening in communicating to avoid miscommunication. Now we are going to combine all these aspects in development of skills to cultivate ICC.

I. There is no panacea (cure-all, one solution) to apply in all intercultural communication episodes (Kim, 2001)

   A. Every culture possesses specific contexts and behaviors
      1. (i.e.,) what is considered respectful and polite
      2. communication patterns

   Question: Before we go any further, does everyone understand the meaning of the word rhetorical?
   Answer: It means the effective use of language, relating to the skill of using language effectively and persuasively (Encarta Online Dictionary).

   B. The theory of rhetorical sensitivity, as an international dimension capable communicating across cultures, is the answer in solving the dilemma of communicating across cultures.

   C. Rhetorical sensitivity reflects a culture general stance, but is also capable of culture specific situations, by teaching the importance of adapting communication behaviors.

   D. The theory of rhetorical sensitivity (RS) is the result of a program of research that has sought to identify teachable characteristics of ICC, using Thai communication behaviors (Knutson, 1994; Knutson, 2000; Knutson, 2004, Knutson, et al., 2007). We will talk more about Thai communication behaviors later, but first it’s important to grasp the concept of RS.

   Question: What are the characteristics of ICC that we have discussed?
   Anticipated Response: It is a process that includes anxiety and uncertainty reduction, mindfulness, tolerance of ambiguity, flexibility, empathy and sensitivity.
II. RS focuses on message transmission and how individuals think about the messages they send.

A. It is receiver-oriented communication.

**Question:** Thinking about the fact the RS is receiver-oriented communication, how could this be helpful in intercultural communication?

**Anticipated Response:** If the emphasis is on receiver-oriented communication it means that there is a process of thoughtfulness about how messages are sent. Context is considered, and the individual situation and person are considered. It implies sensitivity and awareness.

B. Three categories of communicators exist within the concept of RS, which runs along a continuum, with noble selves at one end and rhetorical sensitives at the other:

1. Nobles selves
2. Rhetorical Reflectors
3. Rhetorical Sensitives

C. Noble selves: see any variation from their own personal norms as hypocritical, sticking to their own personal ideal without variation (Darnell & Brockriede, 1976; Littlejohn, 1996).

1. Inflexible communicators
2. Consider maintenance of self goals and objectives as more important than the message being sent.
3. Egocentric and ethnocentric in nature
4. Research has shown a greater prevalence of noble self communication in low-context, individualistic cultures. (Hart et al., 1980; Knutson et al., 2003; Posirisuk, 2004)
5. Noble self behavior directly hinders and interferes with ICC

D. The polar opposite of the noble self is the rhetorical reflector (RR).

1. RR’s have been compared to chameleons.

**Question:** Who can tell me what it is chameleons do?

**Anticipated Response:** Chameleons change their color based on light, temperature and emotional state, which, in many cases means they change their colors to suit the situation. Creepy factoid: They can also look in two directions as once.

2. The thing about chameleons and RR’s is that in a sense they have no self to call their own, because with every situation, they are presenting themselves as a new self (Darnell & Brockriede, 1976).

3. Where noble-selves are inflexible and egocentric communicators, RR’s have such an intense regard for the receiver’s requirements they are constantly adjusting themselves (Knutson, 2003)

4. This type of communicator is frequently found in high-context cultures where the preservation of harmony and face are considered supremely important.

**Question:** Who can explain the concept of face to me again?
**Anticipated response:** Briefly, face has to do with respect and other-identity considerations. It has to do with considering the other person’s dignity, being careful not to impose and maintaining harmony so that the other person is treated politely to avoid embarrassment (Ting-Toomey, 2005; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

5. RR communication is described as indirect and impersonal communication, where there is more use of qualifying words such as: maybe, somewhat, perhaps, and probably (Posirusuk, 2004).

**Question:** Can anyone see where this might type of communication might prove ineffective? How so?

**Anticipated and/or Facilitated Response:** RR communicators may be incapable of expressing personal thoughts, ideas or needs as they are always deferring to others. They risk losing themselves and their communication needs. (Kaweewong, 2002; Posirsuk, 2004)

E. So in the middle of this continuum, between the extremes of noble selves and rhetorical reflectors we find? Yes! rhetorical sensitive! I don’t expect you to remember the names of this theory – but the concepts behind what we’re discussing.

1. Rhetorical sensitives moderate the extremes between noble self and rhetorical reflective behavior (Hart et al., 1980).
2. Rhetorically sensitive communication is considered as competent because it is able to combine a concern “for self and others with a situational perspective” (Knutson et al., 2003, p. 64).
3. Competent communication is achieved because RS individuals are able to adjust their communication behavior based on the context of a situation, and maintain their own principles at the same time (Kaweewong, 2002).
   a. They don’t lose themselves.
   b. They are not egocentric or ethnocentric in their communication.

F. Rhetorically sensitive individuals exhibit communication skills (remember, we know what the components are from yesterday, now we’re talking about the skill in using them) and behaviors associated with ICC:

1. RS communicators are contextually aware individuals
2. They are open to new ideas in communicating (in other words they are mindful.
3. They are conscious of creating shared meaning.

**Question:** How would shared meaning be difficult to create as a noble self and a rhetorical reflector?

**Anticipated or Facilitated Response:** A person communicating as a noble self is only interested in sending the message. They don’t take the needs of the receiver into consideration, so it would be more difficult to create shared meaning if only one person is involved in the process. Rhetorical reflectors may bend themselves so much they don’t communicate what they need in trying to please the other person, so shared meaning is also hindered.
4. As communicators conscious of creating shared meaning they are also empathic and sensitive and possess a tolerance for ambiguity.

**Question:** Who can explain to me how these characteristics would be necessary for creating shared meaning?

5. The RS communicator is flexible then, and all these skills directly correlate with what we have talked about in relationship to intercultural communication competence.

6. So you can have knowledge of the components of ICC, which is good, but the skill development comes in learning to apply them correctly.

G. A rhetorically sensitive individual can be said to possess the following five characteristics in communicating (Hart et al., 1980):

1. Acceptance of personal complexity
   a. Awareness of complex network of selves; awareness of various dimensions of personality, role behaviors, communication predispositions (due to cultural differences), awareness of cultural values individuals possess
   b. Remember – awareness is the first step. Awareness of difference. That’s the first place we started in this training on day one.
   c. Awareness of self and the capacity to choose the appropriate contextual self for the communication interaction.

2. Avoidance of communication rigidity
   a. Implies ICC components of awareness, empathy, flexibility, coordination of verbal and nonverbal behaviors, knowledge of what is appropriate and effective in a given context

3. Interaction consciousness
   a. Compatible with ICC concept of focusing on the process of communication rather than its outcome
   b. Compatible with the concept of competence emerging from with and between communicators (Broome, 1991; Gudykunst & Kim, 1997)
   c. Awareness and understanding of context, actions and mindfulness

4. Appreciation of the communicability of ideas
   a. Understanding of communication rules, context, sensitivity and normative expectations
   b. Distinguishing between information and information considered acceptable for communicating.
      1. Appropriateness of communicating certain things
      c. Appreciation of the communicability of ideas enables ICC

**Question:** How many of you have been around someone who discloses information that they should have kept to themselves? How did that make you feel? Too much information? Not the sign of an appropriate or effective communicator. And that is communicating within our own culture; so the
repercussions of not considering what is appropriate communication in another culture has the potential for creating conflict and misunderstandings.

5. Tolerance for inventional searching
   a. This speaks to the very essence of the rhetorically sensitive individual.
   b. ICC and mindfulness: openness to new information, being aware of more than one perspective, creation of new categories.
   c. There is flexibility in thinking involved in inventional searching.
   d. Tolerance for inventional searching makes the creation of shared meaning possible across cultures, languages, values, communication rules and so on.

Question: Can you see how ICC is related to rhetorical sensitivity? Tell me how.

Anticipated or Facilitated Response: The same components that comprise ICC are the same components involved in rhetorical sensitivity. Noble self communicators are unaware or don’t care to use behavioral skills to adapt communication. RR’s are aware, but go too far. ICC are the components to be aware of and rhetorical sensitivity relates to how to appropriately and effectively put the skills into action.

Summary:
- Rhetorical sensitivity is an “undulating, fluctuating entity” (Hart & Burks, 1972, p. 91). It is dynamic.

Question: What it meant by that statement?
- Rhetorically sensitive individuals possess behaviors associated with ICC.
- Rhetorically sensitive individuals understand the skill of utilizing these behaviors for appropriate and effective communication, to minimize misunderstandings, and to create shared meaning.
- Rhetorically sensitive communicators are contextually aware, open to new ideas and categories (they are mindful) empathic, sensitive and possess a tolerance for ambiguity.
Handout for Lecture on Rhetorical Sensitivity

Rhetorical Sensitivity: Receiver-Oriented Communication

Noble Selves        Rhetorical Sensitives   Rhetorical Reflectors

Noble selves:

Rhetorical Sensitives:

Rhetorical Reflectors:

Five components of a rhetorically sensitive communicator:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
Exercise: Identifying Noble Self, Rhetorically Sensitive, and Rhetorically Reflective Statements

For each of the twenty statements below, identify whether the statement could be considered Noble Self (NS) Rhetorical Sensitive (RS) or Rhetorical Reflector (RR) communication.

1. When conversing, I try to please the other person while being myself. (RS)
2. I express my feelings openly when I am displeased with another person. (NS)
3. Others would say I am overconfident. (NS)
4. I usually say “excuse me” when I have to bother others. (RS)
5. I can find a way to persuade others to accept my opinion without making them lose face. (RS)
6. I usually comply with others’ opinions even though I disagree with them. (RR)
7. I am willing to adjust my talking style to please the other person. (RR)
8. I will respond immediately in conversations when I disagree with the opinion proposed by another person. (NS)
9. I am a compromising person. (RS)
10. I am willing to change my opinion to be compatible with older people. (RR)
11. I hold on to an opinion, even though others may be opposed to it. (NS)
12. When conversing, I select a topic of discussion that suits the other person’s interests. (RS)
13. I don’t speak against the groups’ decision. (RR)
14. I like to be the center of attention in a conversation. (NS)
15. I often give advice to friends who are not as good as I in class (RS)
16. I speak overtly, others’ feelings are not as important as the point I am trying to make. (NS)

17. More than a few times I’ve been told that I communicate well in difficult situations. (RS)

18. I show admiration to others in order to make myself feel accepted. (RR)

19. I would never express an opinion in conflict with the group opinion. (RR)

20. In a discussion, I will aggressively express my opinions even if they are in conflict with others. (NS)

Thai Communication Behaviors

**Question:** To review, does anyone remember the Golden Rule?
**Anticipated Response:** Do unto others as you have them do unto you.

**Question:** What about the Platinum rule?
**Anticipated or facilitated response:** Do unto others as they themselves would have done unto them (Bennett, 1998).

The Golden Rule implies similarity.
The Platinum Rule reinforced that similarity cannot be assumed in communicating across cultures.
The Platinum Rule implies: mindfulness, empathy, flexibility, and sensitivity, because what is considered appropriate and effective behaviors differs across cultures.

Earlier, we discussed how programmatic research has shown the theory of rhetorical sensitivity to be isomorphic with ICC (Knutson et al., 2003; Knutson, 2004; Posirusuk, 2004; Knutson & Posirsuk, 2006; Knutson et al., 2007). There’s that word again: isomorphic. What does it mean?

It means “being of identical or similar in form, shape or structure (www.merriamwebster.com). Rhetorically sensitive communicators have been shown to display characteristics matching with ICC. It is clearly evident the two terms are linked (Knutson et al, 2003).

During the program of research on rhetorical sensitivity, Thai communication behaviors were found to be isomorphic with both rhetorical sensitivity and ICC. There are a multitude of reasons for this equivalence. As students preparing to sojourn abroad, there are some key concepts presented in Thai communication behaviors that can be taught to develop your communication skills and work on the process of ICC.

We live in a diverse nation, but first let’s examine some of the reasons behind Thai capacity for ICC and the demands for diversity and flexibility in communicating:

I. In Thailand, individuals communicate within an intricate and complex communication system to ensure the correct amount of politeness in a specific context. *(We’ve spoken a lot about differentiating context, and this requires mindfulness, flexibility, tolerance for ambiguity and awareness of what is appropriate communication in a given context.)*
   
   A. Complexity of the Thai language
      1. In English there is one form of “I,” while in Thai there up to 17 forms of the first person pronoun.
2. In the English language, there is one word “you” as the second person pronoun; in Thai, there are up to 19 forms of the pronoun (Knutson et al., 2003)

B. Importance of social harmony.
   1. Social harmony is the number one national cultural value.
      a. Thai communication must be flexible
      b. It is by necessity, receiver-oriented communication, as communicators must adapt their communication regularly to specific contexts.
      c. Receiver-oriented communication is communication that is ICC.

II. Lack of appropriate and effective communication across cultural barriers has significant consequences in a global world.
   A. In a chaotic and interconnected world, harmonious communication can be considered diplomatic communication.
   B. ICC and rhetorically sensitive communication considers the position of the sender and the receiver, as well as the various constraints of the situation and context (Knutson & Posirusuk, 2006)
   C. ICC and rhetorically sensitive communication can be considered diplomatic communication.
   D. Thai communication has been shown in research to be rhetorically sensitive and display ICC behaviors.
   E. Thai communication can provide teachable communication behaviors that are considered diplomatic and harmonious.

III. Thai communication does not separate heart and mind as we do in U.S. American communication.
   A. In the United States it would not be uncommon to hear the phrase “He/she is thinking with their heart instead of their head.”
      1. It is dichotomous. It must be one or the other.
   B. In Thailand the heart and mind are not separated.
      1. The heart/mind connection (jai) enables thinking that puts the others’ perspective into focus versus perspective on self.
      2. Jai means heart and most commonly is associated with a phrase that reflects “relationship” or “humanity” (www.apmforum.com).
      3. If we remember the Platinum Rule that was proposed, thinking with the attitude of heart and mind enables thinking outside of the box stressing other perspective and frame of reference.
         a. Do unto others as they would have done unto them.
         b. Takes it a step beyond “When in Rome do as the Romans do.”

Question: What is the difference between these two statements?

Anticipated or facilitated response: When in Rome, do as the Romans do, infers you are imitating something. The Platinum Rule takes into consideration the concept of
empathy. You are putting yourself in the others’ shoes versus simply doing without understanding.

4. “The concept of jai can be associated with intercultural effectiveness because it implies politeness, caring consideration and self-control” (Posirusuk, 2004, p. 67).

IV. Five specific communication behaviors that suggest the very behaviors we have been learning about and building on for the last three days will be discussed as tools to facilitate and develop ICC.

A. Nam jai: literally means “water of the heart”
1. It is an attitude of kindness and helpfulness given without expectation.
2. It refers to the ability for sincere compassion and empathy to flow from the heart (Kaweewong, 2002; Posirusuk, 2004)
3. Nam jai is projected in communication behaviors as openness, sensitivity, and empathy, resulting in eliminating uncertainty and anxiety in communication interactions.
4. Two examples of nam jai in action:
   a. A boss assigns extra work to his/her secretary. The secretary works very hard on the assignment with his/her boss into the night. At the end of the night the boss gives the secretary a ride home even though the residence of the boss is in the opposite direction. The next day the secretary chats with colleagues and the boss is admired for having demonstrated nam jai. (www.apmforum.com)
   b. A sales manager works side by side with the sales team on a special project. The office staff works until late evening. At dinnertime, everyone is still working on the project and the sales manager orders pizza for the staff and pays for the pizza. Again, the next day, the sales team will say the boss has big nam jai. (www.apmforum.com)

B. Kreng jai: usually translated as “consideration.”
1. Kreng jai has no precise English equivalent or translation.
2. It is an attitude of not imposing on others to the point of making compromising for the happiness of others (Vongvipanon, 1994).
3. Kreng jai implies deference and concern for others.

Question: Is the behavior that would come naturally for someone coming from an individualist culture? Why or why not?
Anticipated Response: As individualists, U.S. Americans are naturally self-oriented; taking on an attitude of compromise is a process.

4. Kreng jai is also described as “the desire to be self-effacing [modest], respectful and extremely considerate as well as the wish to avoid embarrassing others or intruding upon them” (Fieg, 1989, p. 43).
a. The diplomacy of kreng jai can be seen in conflict avoidance, and consideration of face, as well as other-orientation.

5. Kreng jai is projected in communication behaviors through considered communication that is appropriate and effective to the communication context.

C. Jai yen: literally means cool heart

1. Jai yen has been defined as “the capacity to restrain emotions and keep interpersonal relations on a smooth, even keel” (Fieg, 1989, p. 41).
   a. Social harmony again, jai yen considers the importance of politeness, harmony, and consideration of face.
   b. Restraining emotions and tempers could also be considered diplomatic behavior.
   c. Jai yen affects communication behavior.
      1. Temper causes loss of face to the person losing their temper and the person who is the target of the temper.
      2. Motivation for persons to communicate with an angry person is affected.
         i. Loss of jai yen is considered crude behavior and bad manners.
   d. Cool heart = not too involved and not too distant (The three bears).
   e. Jai yen is displayed in ICC and RS behaviors through mindfulness, flexibility, tolerance for ambiguity and appropriate and effective behavior.

D. Bunkhun: is defined as the reciprocity of kindness.

1. This behavior has been described as a psychological bond that exists between two persons based on the value of gratitude.
   a. A grateful relationship between two people exists when one person helps another out of kindness and sincerity, and the receiver of the goodness remembers, with readiness to reciprocate the kindness.
2. Gratefulness and the attitude of reciprocity is not bound by time or distance (P. Dhattuyawat, personal communication, October, 2010)
3. This communication behavior projects itself through empathy and sensitivity.

E. Mai pen rai: is translated as “It doesn’t matter” or “Never mind.”

1. This communication behavior is situation oriented and displays flexibility and adaptability to context.
2. This communication behavior takes into consideration how individuals react to unavoidable events, placing the other first.
3. Mindfulness, flexibility, empathy, anxiety management and harmony along with individual face are maintained by through this communication behavior, representing intense other-orientation, diplomacy and ICC.
Thai Communication Behaviors in Summary:

*nam jai* – water of the heart – flowing compassion and empathy

*kreng jai* – consideration – respect, modesty, and non-intrusive

*jai yen* – cool heart – keep it cool and mind your temper

*bunkhun* – reciprocity of kindness – relationship and gratefulness

*mai pen rai* – it doesn’t matter – flexibility and context

Thai communication skills complete the understanding of ICC and RS by expanding on the concept, including aspects of ICC which may have been neglected by a completely Western understanding of the concept. In preparing to study abroad, inclusion of aspects of ICC highlighted by Thai communication behaviors will enable you to further develop appropriate and effective communication interactions. ICC skills are essential in a global and interconnected world in which interactions with dissimilar cultures occur daily. Maximize this study abroad experience to hone your communication skills.
The following may be utilized in making overheads or computer images to assist students in comprehending the concepts. The facilitators discretion may be used in creating the visual overheads. Visual learners are aided by actually seeing the words while they listen to the lecture. The table organizes thought and allows for students to add in on additional behaviors and attitudes presented during the lecture.

**Thai Communication Behaviors in Summary:**

- *nam jai* – water of the heart – flowing compassion and empathy
- *kreng jai* – consideration – respect, modesty, and non-intrusive
- *jai yen* – cool heart – keep it cool and mind your temper
- *bunkhun* – reciprocity of kindness – relationship and gratefulness
- *mai pen rai* – it doesn’t matter – flexibility and context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thai word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Communication Behaviors and Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Nam jai</em></td>
<td>Water of the heart</td>
<td>Flowing compassion and empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kreng jai</em></td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Respect, modesty, the desire to not impose on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jai yen</em></td>
<td>Cool heart</td>
<td>Keep it cool, Mind your temper, Do not cause loss of face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bunkhun</em></td>
<td>Reciprocity of goodness</td>
<td>Relationship, An attitude of gratefulness vs. expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mai pen rai</em></td>
<td>It doesn’t matter, Never mind.</td>
<td>Flexibility, Awareness of context, Awareness of other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX BB

Analysis of Thai Communication Behaviors (45 minutes)

1. How do these communication behaviors compare with the communication behaviors identified as ICC behaviors? Are they the same? How are they the same? Are they different? How are they different?

2. Provide an example of communication behavior that could be identified as nam jai. How is nam jai different from U.S. communication behavior? How is it the same?

3. Provide an example of communication behavior that could be identified as kreng jai. How is kreng jai different from U.S. communication behavior? How is it the same?

4. Provide an example of communication behavior that could be identified as jai yen. How is jai yen different from U.S. communication behavior? How is it the same?

5. Provide an example of communication behavior that could be identified as bunkuhn. How is bunkuhn different from U.S. communication behavior? How is it the same?

6. Provide an example of communication behavior that could be identified as mai pen rai. How is mai pen rai different from U.S. communication behavior? How is it the same?

7. Which aspect of these behaviors do you individually consider will be most challenging? Consider ICC behaviors, RS behaviors and Thai communication behaviors – what do they have in common and how are they different?

8. As a group, which of these behaviors do you find most challenging to develop on your sojourn abroad? Was there consensus on choice of behavior? What does this tell you about values and perspectives?
APPENDIX BC

Training Evaluation

Please answer the following questions so we can learn your reactions to this program to help us improve in the future. Most questions require a only a check in the appropriate space, or require you to circle the answer that reflects your level of agreement. You need not sign your name, though you may if you wish. Many thanks for your help, and may your travel abroad be just the first of many such experiences. Bon Voyage!

How would you rate this program overall? (circle one)

Excellent  Good  Fair  Poor

Did this program meet:
□ all of your expectations  □ some of your expectations
□ none of your expectations  □ most of your expectations

Did the program make you aware of aspects of culture of which you were unaware?
□ Yes  □ No

If yes, what aspects in particular?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I consider the content of this training program to be valuable.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

The skills we developed in this program will help me in my study abroad experience.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

The trainer was effective in helping me to develop interculturally competent communication skills.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Undecided  Agree  Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5
I understand the components involved in interculturally appropriate and effective communication as a result of this training.

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

I will use what I learned in this training.

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

Learning objectives were clear.

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

Training was interesting.

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

Experiential learning activities were appropriate.

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

There was adequate balance between lecture, experiential activities and group discussion.

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

Trainer/s were clear and articulate.

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

Trainer/s answered our questions satisfactorily.

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

I would recommend this training.

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

I feel more prepared and aware of other cultures and communicating with other cultures as a result of this training.

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

This training has helped me to understand the importance of cross-cultural concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This training has made me more aware of communication misunderstandings that can occur due to cultural differences.

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

This training has made me more aware of culturally biased assumptions.

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

I feel more prepared to interact with other cultures because of this training.

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

The most interesting part of training was:

________________________

Was there any information you felt should have been covered in training that was not addressed?

What should be done to improve this program in the future?

What do you consider the most important learning concept you are taking away from this training?
Additional comments:

Thank you for your input. Safe travels!

Adapted from: Kohls and Knight (1994) and Beebe, Mottet, and Roach (2004).
APPENDIX BD

Final Jeopardy Review

Procedure:

1. Create review questions from the following categories:
   - Culture
   - Cultural Frameworks
   - ICC
   - RS
   - Thai Communication Behaviors

2. Develop at least five answers per category (and their corresponding questions).
   For example, “Deeply held and shared perceptions of what ought to be, not what is.” If a secondary clue is needed: “They serve as standards or criteria to guide judgment, choice, evaluation, choice, etc.” The Jeopardy question is “What is a value?”

3. The Jeopardy board should be made ahead of training, with index cards already placed under each heading. Announce the categories and point values for each category. Each group will select a team captain and a scorekeeper.

4. Team captains represent the team. They are the only ones who can hold up the responder card and give an answer. Team captains must confer with the team before giving an answer. Scorekeepers are responsible for adding and subtracting points for correct and incorrect answers.

5. Review the rules of the game before beginning.

6. The jeopardy board will look something like the one below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Cultural Frameworks</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>Thai Communication Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 pts.</td>
<td>10 pts.</td>
<td>10 pts.</td>
<td>10 pts.</td>
<td>10 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 pts.</td>
<td>20 pts.</td>
<td>20 pts.</td>
<td>20 pts.</td>
<td>20 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 pts.</td>
<td>30 pts.</td>
<td>30 pts.</td>
<td>30 pts.</td>
<td>30 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 pts.</td>
<td>40 pts.</td>
<td>40 pts.</td>
<td>40 pts.</td>
<td>40 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 pts.</td>
<td>50 pts.</td>
<td>50 pts.</td>
<td>50 pts.</td>
<td>50 pts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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