1998

# A review of the concept of intercultural awareness

Guo-Ming Chen
*University of Rhode Island*, gmchen@uri.edu

William J. Starosta



## Citation/Publisher Attribution

Chen, Guo-Ming, and William J. Starosta. "A review of the concept of intercultural awareness." *Human Communication,* vol. 2, 1998-1999, pp. 27-54.

Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED408634.pdf

Human Communication, 1998/1999, 2(1), 27-54.



# A Review of the Concept of Intercultural Awareness

*Guo-Ming Chen*
*Department of Communication Studies*
*University of Rhode Island*
*Kingston, Rhode Island USA*

*William J. Starosta*
*Department of Communication*
*Howard University*
*Washington, DC USA*

*Taken together, intercultural adroitness, intercultural awareness, and intercultural sensitivity account for being communication competent in a global society. Due to conceptual confusion and operational fragmentation of the three concepts in the literature, this article explicates the concept of intercultural awareness. The concept is defined and a rationale is built for the study of intercultural awareness in a global society. The article indicates levels of and approaches to the study of intercultural awareness. Models for the study of basic cultural knowledge and cultural values are also discussed and evaluated. Finally, directions for future research on intercultural awareness are provided.*

## A Review of the Concept of Intercultural Awareness

Globalization marks a world in which people of different cultural backgrounds increasingly come to depend on one another. To understand and accept cultural differences becomes imperative to be effective in intercultural communication in a global society. According to Chen and Starosta (1996, 1997a), technology development, especially communication and transportation technology, over the last decades is the main reason the world now faces intercultural communication on a daily basis. Communication and transportation technology not only enables people to easily and efficiently move from continent to continent to encounter others in face-to-face communication, but also brings about other impacts including increasing domestic cultural diversity and the globalization of economy. As a result, the need for intercultural knowledge and skills that

lead to intercultural communication competence becomes critical for a productive and successful life in the twenty-first century.

Intercultural communication competence has been defined as the ability to effectively and appropriately execute communication behaviors that negotiate each other's cultural identity or identities in a culturally diverse environment (Chen & Starosta, 1996). Interculturally competent persons know how to elicit a desired response in interactions and to fulfill their own communication goals by respecting and affirming the worldviews and cultural identities of the other interactants. In other words, it is the ability to acknowledge, respect, tolerate, and integrate cultural differences that qualifies us for enlightened global citizenship. Intercultural communication competence in our view, comprises three interrelated concepts: intercultural sensitivity, intercultural awareness, and intercultural adroitness (Chen & Starosta, 1996). Intercultural sensitivity is the affective aspect of intercultural competence, and refers to the development of a readiness to understand and appreciate cultural differences in intercultural communication. Intercultural awareness is the cognitive aspect of intercultural communication competence that refers to the understanding of cultural conventions that affect how we think and behave. Intercultural adroitness is the behavioral aspect of intercultural communication competence that stresses these skills needed for us to act effectively in intercultural interactions.

Unfortunately, although the three concepts are closely related, most research tends to mingle them without clearly distinguishing them from each other. In order to alleviate this problem of conceptual ambiguity and confusion this article focuses on intercultural awareness by conceptualizing and operationalizing the concept through reviewing existing literature and by further providing directions for future research in this line of study. The discussion considers the following: what is intercultural awareness, levels of intercultural awareness, approaches to the study of intercultural awareness, models for the study of intercultural awareness, assessment of intercultural awareness, and directions for future research.



## Intercultural Awareness: Why and What?

The globalization of the world community inevitably leads to cultural diversity or multiculturalism in all aspects of life. In other words, the changing cultural characteristics of neighborhoods, schools, the workforce, and social and political life make cultural diversity the norm rather than the exception of life in most countries, especially the United States. According to Belay (1993), the trend will nourish multiple identities for citizens in terms of culture, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, and nationality. To be aware of the relevant multiple identities of another is the first step to becoming an enlightened global citizen who tolerates cultural differences and shows mutual respect among cultures in order to practice a multicultural coexistence in a "global civic culture" (Boulding, 1988). Thus, intercultural awareness functions as the minimum condition for interculturally competent individuals in the global village.

The importance of intercultural awareness in the modern world is reflected in the increasing demands of intercultural training programs. Scholars and experts have developed numerous intercultural training programs to help people acquire the ability of intercultural awareness (Landis & Bhagat, 1996; Yum, 1989). A common goal of intercultural training is to increase awareness of cultural differences in order to develop one's communication skills while lessening the likelihood of misunderstandings in intercultural interactions (Seidel, 1981). Among the six most common intercultural training programs (including affective training, cognitive training, behavioral training, area simulation training, cultural awareness training, and self-awareness training), cognitive training, cultural awareness, and self-awareness training are directly concerned with intercultural awareness (Brislin, Landis, & Brandt, 1983; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983).

According to Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, and Wiseman (1991), cognitive training promotes understanding of cultural differences and similarities. Cultural awareness training requires participants to understand the aspects of culture that are universal and specific. Finally, self-awareness training helps participants identify attitudes, opinions, and biases

embedded in their own culture that influence the way they communicate. Thus, intercultural awareness requires individuals to understand, from their own cultural perspective, that they are cultural beings and to use this understanding as a foundation to further figure out the distinct characteristics of other cultures in order to effectively interpret the behavior of others in intercultural interactions (Triandis, 1977). It refers to the understanding of cultural conventions that affect how people think and behave.

Intercultural awareness is, therefore, the cognitive perspective of intercultural communication. It emphasizes the changing of personal thinking about the environment through the understanding of the distinct characteristics of our own and other's cultures (Triandis, 1977). It provides us with an opportunity to develop an understanding of cultural dynamics by reducing the level of situational ambiguity and uncertainty in intercultural interactions. With little visible discomfort, little confusion, and little nervousness in a new environment, individuals can adapt to situational demands with few noticeable personal, interpersonal, or group consequences and can cope with the changing environment rapidly and comfortably (Ruben, 1976; Ruben & Kealey, 1979).

Thus, understanding the dimensions of cultural variability provides ways for us to identify how communication differs across cultures. Because each culture tends to favor certain forms of processing the data around us, we constantly encounter problems in intercultural communication when we misunderstand such thought patterns. Therefore, to be effective in intercultural interaction we must first learn the preferences of a culture for supporting its arguments and determining knowledge (Glenn & Glenn, 1981; Harris & Moran, 1989; Oliver, 1962). In other words, we must understand cultural variability in order that we may modify our communication patterns to be congruent with the cues of unfamiliar interactants (Hall, 1959, 1976; Hall & Whyte, 1963). Changing behaviors to be congruent with our counterparts helps us reach a mutual understanding and to maintain multicultural coexistence.

Finally, intercultural awareness resembles the ideas of "cultural map," (Kluckhohn, 1948), "cultural theme" (Turner, 1968), or "cultural



grammars" (Colby, 1975) that emphasize the importance of cultural knowledge for being competent in intercultural communication. Kluckhohn asserted that cultural awareness requires understanding the "cultural map"; "if a map is accurate, and you can read it, you won't get lost; if you know a culture, you'll know your way around in the life of a society" (p. 28). If a point in reality consistently corresponds to points on a mental map, the map is said to be "isomorphic" with reality. Thus, isomorphic attribution becomes a level of cognitive awareness. Tumer (1968) indicated that to be aware of a culture means to catch the "culture theme"—the thread that goes through a culture and organizes a culture as a recognizable system. It acts as a guideline to people's thinking and behavior, and appears repeatedly in daily life.

## Levels of Intercultural Awareness

Intercultural awareness can be considered as a process of attitudinally internalizing "insights about those common understandings held by groups that dictate the predominant values, attitudes, beliefs, and outlooks of the individual" (Adler, 1987, p. 31). This process can be integrated into three levels: (1) awareness of superficial cultural traits, (2) awareness of significant and subtle cultural traits that contrast markedly with ours, and (3) awareness of how another culture feels from the insider's perspective (Hanvey, 1987).

The first level is the understanding of another culture based mainly on stereotypes. The awareness in this level tends to be superficial and often partial. Information about the culture comes from media, tourism books, textbooks, or the first impression. For example, US Americans are perceived as outgoing, friendly, loud, hard-working, wasteful, wealthy people by foreigners (Kohis, 1984). Chen and Starosta (1998) also reported some of the first impressions the Japanese visitors had of US Americans. They include that Americans walk very fast, are always in a hurry, always try to talk everything out, and don't respect teachers in school. In this level we tend to understand a culture or its people by the most visible characteristics it possesses. We then apply part of these characteristics to the whole group. For example, Asian students with a

high GPA in American colleges are often incorrectly considered as science and math majors because from media we know that Asian students often do better in those areas. Finally, we give the same treatment to each member of the group by saying, for example, "You are a Japanese, you must be smart."

In the second level of intercultural awareness we begin to know significant and subtle cultural traits that are sharply different from our own through direct or secondhand experience. This level has two phases. The first phase approaches intercultural awareness through culture conflict situations and the second through intellectual analysis. Although media, tourism books, or textbooks may provide information that contrasts with ours, we don't fully feel or grasp the real meaning of the cultural differences until we experience direct or indirect interactions with people of another culture. In the first phase of this level the experience of cultural conflict may lead to depression, helplessness, hostility, anxiety, withdrawal, or disorientation, but at the same time it provides us a chance to further recognize and understand another's culture. The feeling in this phase is similar to cultural shock in the process of intercultural adjustment (Oberg, 1960). Many sojoumers such as Peace Corps volunteers and foreign students experience stress during this phase of intercultural awareness. If they are unable to overcome the symptoms of cultural shock, then development of intercultural awareness will be halted in this frustrating stage, and culture conflict situations will continue to exist in which they feel alienated and marginalized (Mansell, 1981). At this point the conflict situations that lead to cultural shock may impede the process of being aware of the host culture. For example, as Draguns (1977) indicated, experiencing something imbalancing may be detrimental to the psychological growth of some leamers or sojourners. Moreover, cognitively and perceptually, some sharp cultural differences are considered bizarre or idiosyncratic. It may take a long time or may prove impossible for learners or sojourners to sort through their feelings about cultural differences. This, in turn, leads them to judge the unfamiliar more harshly and irrationally than they did in the first level of intercultural awareness.



In the second phase of the second level of intercultural awareness, through rational and intellectual analysis, we come to understand that cultural differences can be justified from the other culture's perspective. In other words, differences in cultural traits begin to make sense to us. We then believe and accept the differences (Bennett, 1988). It is this believability through understanding that helps sojourners fully adjust to the host culture. According to Thomas and Althen (1989), in this phase sojourners begin to appreciate and respect the new culture and to develop sensitivity towards cultural differences. Cultural differences in this phase are processed with a positive affect. This provides motivational force for us to move forward to a higher level of intercultural awareness. In addition, intercultural understanding in this phase results from our drawing of comparisons and contrasts. This practice enables us to leam cultures that we have not yet experienced (Adler, 1987; Hall, 1976; Stewart & Bennett, 1991). While a few scholars argue that some people reach this kind of intellectual understanding even before they move into the first phase of this level (Hanvey, 1987), research on intercultural adjustment portrays it as a process that all sojoumers must experience, though the duration of staying in each phase may vary.

Finally, the third level of intercultural awareness requires the ability of empathy to help us see the culture from an insider's perspective. The believability through understanding explicated in the phase two of the second level is enhanced by intellectual analysis and by subjective familiarity (Hanvey, 1987). In other words, we need to foster the power of flexibility to make psychic shifts. The power of flexibility is nourished by empathy and "transspection." Empathy allows us to estimate what is inside another's mind and to share their experience (Barnlund, 1988). Through this selfless and affectively or telepathically sensitive process we are able to more accurately estimate behaviors or internal states of our counterparts that are different from ours (Campbell, Kagan, & Drathwohl, 1971; Gardner, 1962). The latent capacity of empathy can be activated through the process of "transspection." The term was coined by Maruyama (1970) who indicated that "transspection" is an understanding by practice. Empathy is our ability to project feelings to others with one

epistemology; while "transspection" is a trans-epistemological process in which we temporarily believe whatever our counterparts believe by trying to learn their beliefs, their assumptions, their perspective, their feelings and consequences of such feelings in their context. This parallels the stage of duality or biculturalism in the intercultural adjustment process through which the fully developed autonomy provides us the freedom and ability to approach dual cultural identity, awareness of being in control of creative enjoyment, aesthetic appreciation for the contrasts of cultures, development of satisfactory interpersonal relationships, and a high level of commitment toward both cultural contexts (Mansell, 1981). Whether this stage can be fully achieved or only approximated is still an open question (Chen & Starosta, 1988).

The developmental levels show that intercultural awareness is a learning process by which we become aware of our own cognitive growth, learning, and change regarding a set of cultural situations and cultural principles stemming from intercultural communication. It is a part of cognitive function regarding the knowing of how people's outlook, attitudes, values, and behavior are based on cultural dispositions. Thus, intercultural awareness involves change and movement from one cultural frame of reference to another and provides unlimited opportunity for contrast and comparison due to cultural differences. A clearer picture of cultural maps, cultural themes, or cultural grammars emerges through this process.

## Approaches to the Study of Intercultural Awareness

Culture-general and culture-specific are two approaches used to demystify the process of intercultural awareness. A culture-general approach aims to understand culture's global influence on human behavior. Through different learning techniques we come to know the possible variations in culture. For example, cultural assimilators and baFa baFa simulation (Shirts, 1973) are common techniques used in intercultural training programs to help participants learn about the general influence of culture. Cultural assimilators require participants to answer a question by selecting the best from the four or five possible answers about a critical incident regarding a specific culture. The critical incident has been demonstrated to produce variant cultural interpretations. This kind of attribution training helps participants not only recognize that the way they think is not always the way other cultural groups think, but also understand there are certain experiences that are common to all intercultural interactions (Albert, 1986; Cushner, 1989; Cushner & Brislin, 1995). BaFa BaFa is a simulation game that divides participants into Alphas and Betas cultural groups representing two distinct sets of values and communication patterns. Members in each group are sent to the other group to collect information about the culture (Chen & Starosta, 1998). The ensuing exchange gives participants a chance to play a new role in a different cultural setting and to experience the inevitable communication frustration, confusion, and anxiety due to the different cultural orientations. An understanding of the general influence of culture on its members is therefore reached.



The culture-specific approach aims to impart information about specific culture and cultural guidelines for interacting with people in a specified culture. In addition to cultural assimilators that can help participants learn about the specific characteristics of a culture, role plays and area studies are commonly used to culture-specific understandings. Role plays allow participants to gain insights into the experiences of people of different cultures. Through playing a role of a host national in a situation that is problematic because of cultural differences, learners are transformed from observers of a culture into participants in another culture. The process can develop great understanding of the thinking and behavioral patterns of people from different cultures and can further augment and enhance intercultural communication skills (Barnak, 1980; Seidel, 1981). Area studies usually employ a lecture to present information about a particular country and its people and culture. For example, environmental briefings or cultural orientations are used to describe facts such as the locale, history, politics, or economics of a particular cultural group. A "dos and don'ts" format is often used to help learners obtain specific data that can be assembled to develop a holistic picture of the culture.

Both culture specific and general approaches indicate that intercultural awareness can be reached through didactic and experiential learning. Didactic learning is implemented through traditional academic methods in which, for example, the lecture format is used to disseminate cultural information and characteristics of another culture to learners. Didactic learning is commonly used in the first level of intercultural awareness. Experiential leaming involves participants intellectually, emotional, and behaviorally in a simulated environment of role play (Cargile & Giles, 1996). It aims to reach intercultural awareness through interactions. The second level of intercultural awareness, especially the second phase, demands participants to learn, respect, and accept sharp cultural differences through this kind of interactional experience with people of or representing the target culture.

## Models for the Study of Intercultural Awareness

What constitutes the components of "cultural map," "cultural theme," or "cultural grammars" that embody a comprehensive knowledge of a culture? From the discussions of the levels of and approaches to the study of intercultural awareness we generate two categories of cultural components: basic factual information and deep structured cultural values. The basic factual information concerns the profile of the culture or nation regarding history, geography, family and social organization, art, or political system. It concerns the "what" aspect of the culture that can be obtained through reading, didactic learning, or other media without the need to interact with the national of the target culture for collecting the information. For example, Saville-Troike (1978) proposed 20 categories for learning about the basic factual information of a culture. Such learning also proceeds incidentally and stereotypically from viewing mass media productions. Fact learning includes asking general questions about what are "traditional" or "typical" cultural beliefs or behaviors, family structure and relationships, life cycle, positional roles, interpersonal relationships, communication, decorum and discipline, religion, health and hygiene, food, dress and personal appearance, history and traditions, holidays and celebrations, education, work and play, time and space, natural phenomena, pets and other animals, art and music, and expectations and aspirations.



Similar to this, Kohls (1984) pointed out ten basic areas that comprise foundational cultural factual information: food, clothing, shelter, family organization, social organization, government, defense, arts/crafts, knowledge/science, and religion. *Culturgram,* a series published by David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies, classifies the understanding of a nation into four categories: customs and courtesies (including greetings, visiting, eating, personal appearance, and gestures), the people (including general attitude, population, language, and religion), lifestyle (including the family, dating and marriage, social and economic levels, diet, work schedules, recreation, and holidays), and the nation (including land and climate, history and government, economy, education, transportation, and health). Harris and Moran (1989), by contrast, used a coordinated systems approach to divide the unitary whole of a culture into eight systems: kinship system, educational system, economic system, political system, religious system, association system, health system and recreational system.

While the basic factual information of a culture tends to be easier to approach and acquire, the deep structure of the culture is much more difficult to attain. Cultural values are the most fundamental framework of the deep structure of a culture. They concern the "why" aspect of a culture. They justify why people of the culture think or practice as learned in the "what" aspect: why do people of the culture dress like that, celebrate that, communicate in that way, or have that kind of religious belief? Cultural values dictate what we ought or ought not to do. In other words, they are a set of explicit or implicit conception that distinguishes an individual or characteristic of a group from another. They are the "desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action" (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 395), and tell us what goes with what or what should lead to what. According to Sitaram and Haapanen (1979), cultural values are communicated through verbal and nonverbal symbols. For example, the proverb "A man's home is his castle" explicates the USAmerican's emphasis on "privacy" and hints at male domi-

nance, while the custom of exchanging gifts in Japanese society reflects the cultural values of reciprocity and generosity. Moreover, cultural values determine our communication patterns. For example, the emphasis of "harmony" in the Chinese culture leads Chinese to minimal displays of public emotion and to avoid saying no in interactions. Thus, understanding cultural values through direct and indirect experience with people is the key to the awareness, respect, and acceptance of the contrasting cultural practices.

Much research has been conducted to examine cultural values. The following section discusses six representative models developed by Parsons, Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, Condon and Yousef, Hall, Hofstede, and Schwartz.

### Parsons' Model

Parsons (1951) developed a model called the "pattern variables of role-definition" that can be used to classify value-pattern types. The model is comprised of five categories: (1) the gratification-discipline dilemma: affectivity vs. affective neutrality, (2) the private vs. collective interest dilemma: self-orientation vs. collectivity-orientation, (3) the choice between types of value orientation standards: universalism vs. particularism, (4) the choice between "modalities" of the social object: achievement vs. ascription, and (5) the definition of scope of interest in the object: specificity vs. diffuseness. These five categories combine to form a pattern of mutual and systematic interrelations. For example, the combination of the choice between types of valueorientation standard and the definition of scope of interest in the object leads to four basic patterns of value orientation: (1) universalistic achievement pattern—which represents the expectation of active achievements in accord with universalized standards and generalized rules relative to other actors, (2) particularistic achievement pattern—which shows the expectation of active achievements relative to and/or on behalf of the particular relational context in which the actor is involved, (3) universalistic ascription pattern—which represents the expectation of orientation of action to a universalistic norm defined either as an ideal state or as embodied in the status-structure of the existing society, and (4) particularistic ascription pattern—which represents the expectation of orientation of action to an ascribed status within a given relational context.



These four basic patterns can be further extended to combine the other four categories to form a 16-pattern matrix. We can similarly combine another two categories and then extend the 16-pattern list to examine the variations of value orientations. Parsons' model is a complex but systematic approach to the study of cultural values. For example, Lipset (1963) used the model to compare cultural differences among Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and the United States. However, due to its complexity and sociology orientation, it is not widely employed by intercultural communication scholars.

### Kluckhohn and Strodbeck's Model

Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961) indicated that all human societies must face universal problems and the ways used to solve these universal problems are limited and different for each society. Based on this assumption, they proposed five universal problems faced by human societies: (1) what is the character of innate human nature—representing human nature orientation, (2) what is the relation of persons to nature (and supernature)—representing human-nature orientation, (3) what is the temporal focus of human life—representing time orientation, (4) what is the modality of human activity—representing activity orientation, and (5) what is the modality of people's relationship to others—representing relational orientation. Kluckhohn and Strodbeck then provided three possible solutions that are used by different societies to solve each universal problem. The three solutions for human nature problem include evil, mixture of good and evil, and good; for human-nature problem including subjugation to nature, harmony with nature, and mastery over nature; for time orientation including past, present, and future; for activity orientation including being, being-in-becoming, and doing; and for relational orientation including lineality, collaternity, and individualism.

This is a very precise and heuristic model that continues to influence intercultural communication research to the present. The model can be

developed into a chart to compare the differences of cultural values between cultures. For example, Kohls (1988) indicated that the United States tends to prefer the views that human nature is good or a mixture of good and evil, that humans should master nature, that future time and doing orientation are preferred, and see that individualism is to be preferred in social relations; while Arab cultures tend to see human nature as neutral and immutable, to view humans as subjugated to nature, tend to prefer past time and being orientation, and likely emphasize lineal/authoritarian social relations.

### Condon and Yousef's Model

Based on Kluckhohn and Strodbeck's model, Condon and Yousef (1975) examined cultural values from six interactional and interdependent spheres of human societies: the self, the family, society, human nature, nature, and the supernatural. Each sphere is comprised of four or five universal problems with three solutions for each one. The sphere of the self includes four problems: individualism/interdependence (the three solutions are individualism, individuality, interdependence), age (youth, the middle years, old age), sex (equality of sexes, female superiority, male superiority), and activity (doing, being-in-becoming, being). The sphere of the family: relational orientations (individualistic, collateral, lineal), authority (democratic, authority-centered, and authoritarian), positional role behavior (open, general, specific), and mobility (high mobility, phasic mobility, low mobility). The sphere of society: social reciprocity (independence, symmetrical-obligatory, complementary-obligatory), group membership (many groups, medium, few groups), intermediaries (no intermediaries, specialist intermediaries, essential intermediaries), formality (informality, selective formality, pervasive formality), and property (private, utilitarian, community). The sphere of human nature: rationality (rational, intuitive, irrational), good and evil (good, mixture, evil), happiness/pleasure (happiness as goal, mixture, sadness), and mutability (change, some change, unchanging). The sphere of nature: relationship of human and nature (human dominating nature, human in harmony with nature, nature dominating human), ways of knowing nature



(abstract, circle of induction-deduction, specific), structure of nature (mechanistic, spiritual, organic), and concept of time (future, present, past). The final sphere is the supernatural: relationship of man and the supernatural (man as god, pantheism, man controlled by the supernatural), meaning of life (materialistic goals, intellectual goals, spiritual goals), providence (good in life is unlimited, mixture, good in life is limited), and knowledge of the cosmic order (order is comprehensible, faith and reason, mysterious and unknowable).

Condon and Yousefs model represents a comprehensive list of value orientations. It includes the five categories proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodbeck and extends to cover social, philosophical, and religious aspects of human society. However, this comprehensive nature adds to the complexity of the model which prevents scholars from integrating all the categories to develop a holistic picture of a specific culture's value orientations. Only separation rather than combination of the spheres for the purpose of study is possible. For example, Chen (1988) adopted the family sphere to compare value orientations of Chinese and American families. It was found that Chinese families tend to be lineal, authoritarian, specific, and low-mobility oriented, while American families tend to individualistic, democratic, open, and high-mobility oriented.

### Hall's Model

Hall (1976) examined culture from a communication perspective and classified culture into two categories: high-context culture and low-context culture. He argued that cultural context affects every aspect of human communication. As he stated:

> A high-context communication or message is one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message. A low-context communication (LC) communication is just the opposite, i.e., the mass of the message is vested in the explicit code. (p. 79)

Thus, in the communication process people of high-context cultures, such as the British, Chinese, and Japanese, tend to implicitly embed meanings at different levels of the sociocultural context, to value group sense, to cultivate and establish a long-term personal relationship, to emphasize spiral logic, to value indirect verbal interaction, to use more feelings in expression, and to give simple and ambiguous messages. In contrast, people of low-context, such as Germans, Northern Americans, and Swiss, tend to overtly display meanings through direct communication forms, to value individualism, to develop transitory personal relationship, to emphasize linear logic, to value direct verbal interaction, to use "logic" to present ideas, and to emphasize highly structured messages and place great stress on words and technical signs (Chung, 1992; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988).

Hall's model is a simple, precise, and elegant one which provides an effective way of thinking regarding cultural differences. The model is widely applied in the study of intercultural communication. Nevertheless, the model oversimplifies the complex nature of culture and its simplicity often leads to the misperception that the two cultural contexts are dichotomous and in polar opposition to each other (Chen & Starosta, 1998). In fact, the two cultural contexts form a continuum of cultural differences.

### Hofstede's Model

Hofstede (1983, 1984) approached cultural values from the organizational perspective. Based on a series of surveys on about 160,000 managers and employees working in 60 countries, Hofstede found four consistent dimensions of cultural values that can be used to explain working behaviors: individualism/collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity/femininity. The dimension of individualism/collectivism parallels the individual/group values orientation. Workers in individualistic cultures, such as the United States, especially men, define themselves as separate individuals and tend to have loosely knit social networks, while in collectivistic cultures, such as Arabia, workers express common goals and objectives with the group that provides protection and security to members in exchange for their loyalty. The dimension of power distance deals with to what extent a person accepts an unequal power distribution in relationships or organizations. People in high power distance cultures, such as the Philippines, tend to adopt the authoritarian leadership style and develop a hierarchical and vertical social relationship. In contrast, people in low power distance cultures, such as Denmark, tend to minimize differences of age, sex, and status and develop a more horizontal or equal social relationship. The dimension of uncertainty avoidance refers to the ability to tolerate ambiguous situations. High uncertainty avoidance cultures, such as Greece, always try to reduce the uncertainty level by increasing security, establishing formal rules, and rejecting deviant behaviors in social and organizational life. Low uncertainty avoidance cultures, such as Sweden, are more able to tackle the anxiety and stress caused by ambiguous situations by tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, initiating new moves, and being more flexible in social and organizational interactions. Finally, the dimension of masculinity/femininity refers to the extent a culture orients to masculine and feminine traits. In masculine culture, such as Japan, people tend be more aggressive in communication by showing characteristics of assertiveness, ambition, and competitiveness. In feminine culture, such as Norway, gender roles are more equal and males tend to be more affective, sensitive, and nurturing.

Hofstede's model applies directly to the understanding of cultural values in an organizational setting. The dimensions were empirically validated. However, the dimensions of cultural values identified by this model are work-related values that were largely solicited from men. They may not represent those values manifested in other aspects of the society. In addition, like Hall's model, the dichotomy of the dimensions, especially the dimension of individualism/collectivism, leads to ignoring the fact that in collectivistic societies some people are individualistic oriented, and vice versa (Chen & Starosta, 1998). The model tends to oversimplify the complexity of cultural values.

## Schwartz's Model

Aiming to improve the problem of dichotomous categorization of cultural values, Schwartz (1990, 1992) argued that many universal values exist in both high-context and low-context, and individualism and collectivism cultures. In order to reach intercultural awareness, in addition to cultural differences as specified by the above mentioned models, we must also study the universal commonalities of human behaviors. Those universal cultural values include ten categories: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. With a set of cultural values embedded in each category, the ten categories of cultural values can be grouped into two opposite polar dimensions: openness to change vs. conservation and self-transcendence vs. self-enhancement. Through a series of empirical tests (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995), the two dimensions were found to be universal in different cultures.

Schwartz's efforts echo research from Bond (1988), Brown, (1991), Fiske (1992), John (1990), and Strack and Lorr (1990). These scholars are searching for common factors of human behaviors that can be used to help people from different cultures better understand each other. Although the model is not yet commonly employed in intercultural communication study, it can complement the above models that focus only on differences of cultural values. In other words, a completely intercultural awareness should promote the understanding of the two sides of a coin that represent both differences and similarities of cultural values.

In sum, the study of cultural values is the most important gateway to reach intercultural awareness. The models discussed not only provide us a structured way to tackle the complexity of cultural values, but also offer the potential for further examining different aspects of human society. For example, based on the differences of cultural values, Okabe (1983) examined the differences of the problem of ordering and organizing a discourse between Americans and Japanese; Condon (1981, 1985) examined how to communicate with Mexicans from the perspective of cultural values, and used the concept of cultural value to delineate the ethical principles in intercultural communication; Wei (1983) tried to figure out



how the Chinese emphasis of politeness that is embedded in the cultural value of harmony causes communication difficulties in the process of interactions; Kume (1985) compared the differences of the decision-making process between Amencans and the Japanese due to the dissimilarities of cultural values; Chen and Chung (1997) examined the impact of cultural values on organizational communication between the Chinese and Westerners; Chen and Starosta (1997) used dominant cultural values to develop a model of Chinese conflict management and resolution; Moran and Stripp (1991) explicated the influence of cultural values on the negotiating styles in eleven different nations; Althen (1988) and Lanier (1988) specified American cultural values to help people better adjust to American culture, and Andersen (1997) extended the study of cultural values to explain nonverbal communication in different cultural contexts.

Nevertheless, the great potential for the application of cultural values to reach intercultural awareness is not without its limitation and inherent problems. In addition to the misperception of the dichotomy of cultural values such as high-context vs. low-context culture and individualism vs. collectivism, we must understand that all models used for the study of cultural values are incomplete and show the scholars' biases. Furthermore, the categories used to explain the models tend to fragmentize the concept and components of cultural values. In other words, the cultural values approach to cultural classification is only for the purpose of illustration. In real life situations cultural values are meaningful only when the categories are treated or examined in combination rather than in isolation (Condon & Yousef, 1975), and are viewed within specified contexts.

## Assessment of Intercultural Awareness

Because intercultural awareness aims to unveil the "cultural map," "cultural theme," or "cultural grammar," the next question will be how to extract empirical indicators from the process of operationalization. In other words, the question is about how to measure or assess intercultural awareness. Although a thorough literature review shows that presently there is no instrument used to directly measure intercultural awareness in

the field, there are measurements developed to assess our understanding of the basic factual information of the culture and cultural values.

Four measurements regarding the basic factual information or knowledge of a culture include Saville-Troike's Questions to ask about culture, Kitao's Test of American culture, Kohl's Fifty Questions about culture, and Harris and Moran's Pre-deployment Area Questionnaire.

As indicated above, Saville-Troike (1978) proposed 20 categories for learning about the basic factual information of a culture. For each category the author created three to ten open-ended questions that reflect the understanding of the basic information of the category. For example, the category of communication asks "What languages, and varieties of each language, are used in the community? By whom? When? Where? For what purposes?" One hundred and twenty-eight questions are attached to the 20 categories. Kitao's (1981) Test of American culture is a specific measurement used to test participants' knowledge of basic traits of American culture. The test contains 100 multiple choices questions about 49 different areas of American culture. Examples of questions include "The Gettysberg Address was given by, (a) Abraham Lincoln (b) Patrick Henry (c) Daniel Boone (d) Martin Luther King, Jr." And "Common speaking distance is, (a) 1 ft (b) 1.5 ft (c) 2 ft (d) 3 ft."

Kohl's (1984) Fifty Questions were developed to help sojourners better know their host country and culture. The author claimed that if sojourners know the answers to the fifty open-ended questions, they will have moved well beyond the beginner stage of intercultural adaptation. Representative questions include "Who are the country's national heroes and heroines?" and "What are the most important religious observances and ceremonies? How regularly do people participate in them?" Finally, Harris and Moran's (1989) questionnaire was designed to help a global manager, who is planning to go abroad on an extensive foreign assignment, become familiar with the host culture.

Ninety-two "yes" or "no" questions were used to reflect different aspects of the culture that are closely related to the business interaction. For example, a question asks about an aspect of social structure, "Does



dress reflect social or economic status?" and a question about the aspect of roles of men and women queries: "Are there differences between male and female roles in business?"

While these measurements can be used to assess and help people understand the basic cultural information or traits, they suffer from two main weakness. First, the complexity of a culture requires a large volume of questions to catch different nuances of cultural characteristics. It is not uncommon to have over 100 items in a single measurement. This often leads to the problem of efficiency in the process of measurement. Thus, they are more appropriate to be applied to the didactic learning settings in which participants are gradually learning to know the basic information or traits of a culture, rather than to be used to assess a person's ability in terms of the degree of understanding a specific culture. Second, culture is dynamic. Some of the basic information or traits of a culture tend to change in a short period of time. This leads to the problem of content validity of the measurement. For example, the answer to a question such as "Minimum wage per hour: (1) $1.60 (b) $2.00 (c) $2.20 (d) not specified" in Kitao's Test may be subject to change several times in a few years.

Studies that measure values are not scarce in the literature. Two of the representative measurements are Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey's study of values (1960) and Rokeach's (1967, 1973) value survey. The two measurements are highly reliable and valid and have been widely used to assess values. Unfortunately, the measurements approach values from the psychological rather than cultural perspective. Their applications to the assessment of intercultural awareness are limited. There are three measurements that are more helpful for the assessment of intercultural awareness. First, Kluckhohn and Strodbeck's (1961) categories of cultural value orientations were used as an index for deriving instruments in written questionnaire form (Platt, 1985; Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clark, 1985). For each universal problem a case is created and explanations for the three value orientations are listed. Participants are then asked to choose which explanation is the most appropriate for answering

the case. This kind of questionnaire can reflect value orientations of a culture in terms of human nature, human and nature, time perception, human activity, and social relation. The weakness is that it takes too much time and energy to create a case for each universal problem and explanations of the three value orientations attached to each universal problem. It is also a time-consuming process for participants to answer all the questions. Second, Gilgen and Cho (1979) revised and simplified Klucknohn and Strodbeck's original measures by using the Likert scale to answer statements that represent all cultural value orientations. For example, participants were asked to answer how much they agree or disagree with each statement, such as "I do not believe in a personal god," and "Man should strive to free himself from the uncompromising forces of nature," by using a 5-point scale.

Finally, Chen (1995) generated 15 items of cultural value orientations from Kluckhohn and Strodbeck's and Condon and Yousef's models. Participants were also asked to use the 5-point Likert scales to answer the degree they agree or disagree with each of the statements, such as "Americans see themselves as individualists," and "Americans tend to express their opinions openly and directly." The instrument has been applied to assess participants' degree of intercultural awareness in international electronic communication settings. The nation underlined in the instrument can be changed to any nation to fit the purpose of the study. Both Gilgen and Cho's and Chen's instruments have a great potential for the assessment of intercultural awareness due to their preciseness and ease to operate. However, more empirical testings are needed for assessing the validity of the instruments before they are widely applied.

## Directions for Future Research

Although the trend of global society has attracted more and more scholars to explore the components that account for intercultural competence, we find that such research still suffers from conceptual ambiguity and operational fragmentation, especially for the concepts of intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity, and intercultural competence. As Chen and Starosta (1997b) indicated, the existing literature shows that



scholars tend to mingle the three concepts without providing a clear definition to distinguish them from one another. Such conceptual ambiguity has caused difficulties and confusion for scholars who would further elaborate the concepts and apply the research to intercultural training programs. This conceptual ambiguity and confusion is the first major problem scholars must tackle. We have argued that intercultural communication competence is an umbrella concept that is comprised of three components, including intercultural adroitness, intercultural awareness, and intercultural sensitivity (Chen & Starosta, 1996, 1997a, 1997b). Intercultural adroitness is the behavioral aspect of intercultural communication competence that focuses on communication skills, such as behavioral flexibility, interactional management, and verbal and nonverbal skills, in intercultural interaction settings. Intercultural awareness is the cognitive aspect of intercultural communication competence that refers to understanding of the basic cultural traits and cultural values; and intercultural sensitivity is the affective aspect of intercultural competence that refers to self-monitoring, open-mindedness, empathy, and suspending judgment, to develop a positive emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences. Thus, in order to live productively and successfully in the global society, competent individuals must possess the ability of intercultural communication competence that requires us to be equipped with the three wheels of behavioral adroitness, cognitive awareness, and affective sensitivity towards cultural diversity.

The problem of conceptual ambiguity and confusion directly leads to the inconsistency and fragmentation of operationalizing the concepts. For example, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) used the affective, behavioral, and cognitive components of intercultural communication competence to develop an instrument for measuring intercultural sensitivity. Blue, Kapoor, and Comadena (1996-7) used universal cultural values specified by Schwartz (1990, 1992) and Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) to assess intercultural sensitivity. This kind of blurring of distinctions between intercultural adroitness, intercultural awareness, and intercultural sensitivity not only helps explain the reliability and validity problems of the in-

strumentation, but also jeopardizes the systematic development of knowledge in this line of research. Future research should aim to improve this situation.

Finally, future research also needs to move one step further to examine the appropriateness of using the basic cultural knowledge and cultural values to delineate the content of intercultural awareness. Moreover, due to the lack of precision and consistency of the existing measurement instruments, future research should attempt to develop more valid and reliable instruments for the assessment of intercultural awareness.

## Summary and Conclusion

The trend of global interdependence has created an ever-shifting cultural, economic, ecological, and technological reality that defines the shrinking world of the twenty-first century.

Globalization demands the enhancement of intercultural communication among people from diverse cultures in order to survive in the twenty-first century. As a component of intercultural communication competence, intercultural awareness is an indispensable element for us to reach this global mindset. This article makes an effort to synthetically delineate the concept. This article first conceptualizes and explains why it is important to develop intercultural awareness in the global society. Three levels of intercultural awareness are discussed. Then two approaches for the study of intercultural awareness and models for learning the basic cultural knowledge and cultural values are explicated and evaluated. Instruments used to assess intercultural awareness are also discussed and appraised. Finally, we point out problems in the study of intercultural awareness due to conceptual and operational ambiguity and inconsistency, and suggest directions for future research in this area.

In conclusion, the indispensability of intercultural awareness for living meaningfully in global society demands intercultural communication scholars further explore and expand the scope and functions of the concept. To understand a culture through cognitive learning should be the foundation for individuals to reach intercultural communication competence. Accompanied with the ability of intercultural sensitivity and intercultural adroitness, intercultural awareness can help us develop multiple cultural identities that transform us from single-culture minded beings into "multiple persons." This will in turn ensure our ability to integrate various communication demands in the web of culture, ethnicity, race, gender, and religion.



## References


Adler, P. S. (1987). Culture shock and the cross-cultural learning experience. In L. F. Luce & E. C. Smith (eds.), *Toward internationalism.* Cambridge, MA: Newbury, 24-35.

Albert, R. D. (1986). Conceptual framework for the development and evaluation of cross-cultural orientation programs. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10,* 197-213.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *Study of values: Manual and test booklet.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Althen, H. (1988). *American ways.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Andersen, P. (1997). Cues of culture: The basis of intercultural differences in nonverbal communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 244-255.

Bamak, P. (1980). Role-playing. In D. S. Hoopes & P. Ventura (eds.), *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methodologies.* Washington DC: SIETAR, 7-10.

Barnlund, D. S. (1989). *Communication styles of Japanese and Americans: Images and reality.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Belay, G. (1993). Toward a paradigm shift for intercultural and international communication: New research directions. In S. A. Deetz (ed.), *Communication Yearbook 16.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 437-457.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10,* 179-196.

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16,* 413-436.

Blue, J., Kapoor, S., & Comadena, M. (1996-7). Using cultural values as a measure of intercultural sensitivity. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 6,* 77-94.

Bond, M. H. (1988). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 1009-1015.

Boulding, E. (1988). *Building a global civic culture.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Brislin, R. W., Landis, D., & Brandt, M. E. (1983). Conceptualizations of intercultural behavior and training. In D. Landis and R. W. Brislin (eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (Vol. 1). New York: Pergamon, 1-35.

Brown, D. E. (1991). *Human universals.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Campbell, R. J., Kagan, N., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1971). The development and validation of a scale to measure affective sensitivity (empathy). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18,* 407-412.

Cargile, A. C., & Giles, H. (1996). Intercultural communication training: Review, critique, and a new theoretical framework. *Communication Yearbook, 19,* 385-424.

Chen, G. M. (1988). *A comparative study of value orientations of Chinese and American families: A communication view.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Chen, G. M. (1995). *International e-mail debate and intercultural awareness.* Manuscript prepared for the grant project sponsored by FIPSI.
Chen, G. M., & Chung, J. (1997). The "five Asian dragons": Management behaviors and organizational communication. In L. A. Samovar and R. E. Porter (eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 317-328.
Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1996). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. *Communication Yearbook, 19,* 353-384.
Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1997a). Chinese conflict management and resolution: Overview and implications. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 7,* 1-16.
Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1997b). A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication, 1,* 1-16.
Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). *Foundations of intercultural communication.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
Chung, J. (1992, November). *Electronic mail usage in low-context and high-context cultures.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois.
Colby, B. N. (1975). Culture grammars. *Science, 187,* 913-919.
Condon, J. C. (1981). Values and ethics in communication across cultures: Some notes on the North American case. *Communication, 6,* 255-265.
Condon, J. C. (1985). *Good neighbors: Communicating with the Mexicans.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
Condon, J. C., & Yousef, F. (1975). *An introduction to intercultural communication.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
Cushner, K. (1989). Assessing the impact of a culture-general assimilator. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13,* 125-146.
Cushner, K., & Brislin, R. W. (1995). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Draguns, J. G. (1977). Problems of defining and comparing abnormal behavior across cultures. In L. L. Adler (ed.), *Issues in cross-cultural research.* New York: New York Academy of Science, 664-675.
Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review, 99,* 689-723.
Gardner, G. H. (1962). Cross-cultural communication. *Journal of Social Psychology, 58,* 241-256.
Gilgen, A. R., & Cho. J. H. (1979). Questionnaire to measure eastern and western thought. *Psychological Reports, 44,* 835-841.
Glenn, E. S., & Glenn, C. G. (1981). *Man and mankind: Conflict and communication between cultures.* New Jersey: Norwood.
Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M. R. (1983). Basic training design: Approaches to intercultural training. In D. Landis and R. W. Brislin (eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (Vol. 1). New York: Pergamon, 118-154.
Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Wiseman, R. (1991). Taming the beast: Designing a course in intercultural communication. *Communication Quarterly, 40,* 272-286.
Hall, E. T. (1959). *Silent language.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* Garden City, NY: Anchor.
Hall, E. T., & Whyte, W. F. (1963). Intercultural communication: A guide to men of action. *Practical Anthropology, 9,* 83-108.
Hanvey, R. G. (1987). Cross-culture awareness. In L. F. Luce & E. C. Smith (eds.), *Toward internationalism.* Cambridge, MA: Newbury, 13-23.
Harris, R. H., & Moran, R. T. (1989). *Managing cultural diferences.* Houston, TX: Gulf.
Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures in four dimensions. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 13,* 46-74.



Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
John, O. P. (1990). The "big five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research.* New York: Guilford, 66-100.
Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought pattern in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning, 16,* 1-20.
Kitao, K. (1981). The test of American culture. *Technology & Mediated Instruction, 15,* 25-45.
Kluckhohn, F. K. (1948). *Mirror of man.* New York: Harper Collins.
Kluckhohn, F. K. (1951). Values and value-orientation in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (eds.), *Toward a general theory of action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 388-433.
Kluckhohn, F. K., & Strodbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
Kohls, L. R. (1988). Models for comparing and contrasting cultures. In J. M. Reid (ed.), *Building the professional dimension of educational exchange.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 137-153.
Kume, T. (1985). Managerial attitudes toward decision-making: North American and Japan. In W. B. Gudykunst, L. P. Stewart, & S. Ting-Toomey (eds.), *Communication, culture, and organization processes.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 231-252.
Landis, D., & Bhagat, R. S. (1996). A model of intercultural behavior and training. In D. Landis & S. Bhagat (eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1-16.
Lanier, A. R. (1988). *Living in the U.S.A.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
Lipset, S. (1963). The value variations in social schemata. *American Sociological Review, 28,* 515-531.
Mansell, M. (1981). Transcultural experience and expressive response. *Communication Education, 30,* 93-108.
Maryuma, M. (1970). *Toward a cultural futurology.* Cultural Futurology Symposium, American Anthropology Association national meeting, Training Center for Community Programs, University of Minnesota.
Moran, R. T., & Stripp, W. G. (1991). *Dynamics of successful international business negotiations.* Houston, TX: Gulf.
Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7,* 177-182.
Okabe, R. (1983). Cultural assumptions of East and West. In W. B. Gudykunst (ed.), *Intercultural communication theory.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 21-44.
Oliver, R. T. (1962). *Culture and communication: The problem of penetrating national and cultural boundaries.* Springfield, IL: Thomas.
Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
Platt, S. D. (1985). A subculture of parasuicide? *Human Relations, 38,* 257-297.
Rokeach, M. (1967). *Value survey.* Sunnyvale, CA: Halgren Tests.
Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: Free Press.
Ruben, B. D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. *Group & Organization Studies, 1,* 334-354.
Ruben, B. D., & Kealey, D. J. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3,* 15-47.
Saville-Troike, M. (1978). *A guide to culture in the classroom.* Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates.
Schwartz, S. (1990). Individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21,* 139-157.
Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 1-65.

Schwartz, S., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,* 850-862.
Schwartz, S., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 878-891.
Schwartz, S., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26,* 92-116.
Seidel, G. (1981). Cross-cultural training procedures: Their theoretical framework and evaluation. In S. Bochner (ed.), *The mediating person: Bridge between cultures.* Cambridge, MA: Schenhman.
Shirts, G. (1973). *BAFA BAFA: A cross-cultural simulation.* Del Mar, CA: Simile.
Sitaram, K. S., & Haapanen, L. W. (1979). The role of values in intercultural communication. In M. K. Asante & C. A. Blake (eds.), *The handbook of intercultural communication.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 147-160.
Stewart, E. C., & Bennett, M. J. (1991). *American cultural patterns.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
Strack, S., & Lorr, M. (1990). Three approaches to interpersonal behavior and their common factors. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54,* 782-790.
Triandis, H. C. (1977). Theoretical framework for evaluation of cross-cultural training effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1,* 195-213.
Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clark, F. L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 19,* 395-415.
Turner, C. V. (1968). The Sinasina "big man" complex: A central cultural theme. *Practical Anthropology, 15,* 16-22.
Wei, Y. (1983). The importance of being KEQI: A note on communication difficulties. In R. A. Kapp (ed.), *Communicating with China.* Chicago, IL: Intercultural Press, 71-76.
Yum, J. O. (1989). *Communication sensitivity and empathy in culturally diverse organizations.* Paper presented at the 75th Annual Conference of Speech Communication Association, San Francisco.



# A Cultural Model of Deceptive Communication Motivation

*Min-Sun Kim*
*Department of Speech*
*University of Hawai'i at Manoa*
*Honolulu, Hawai'i USA*

*Karadeen Y. Kam*
*Department of Communication*
*University of Arizona*
*Tucson, Arizona USA*

*Theodore Singelis*
*Department of Psychology*
*University of California, Chico*
*Chico, California USA*

*R. Kelly Aune*
*Department of Speech*
*University of Hawai'i at Manoa*
*Honolulu, Hawai'i USA*

*Deception is more prevalent than our cultural morality implies. Moreover, like other strategic communication, deception is encoded to achieve a variety of communication goals, some beneficial to the communicator, others to the target. According to Miller and Stiff (1993), when "real world" communicators use words such as lie, liar, and deceptive they are not merely referring to the content of the message but also to the motives of communicators. Recent research has provided valuable insight into motivation for and predictors of interpersonal deceptive communication. However, the area of culture-based indicators remains largely unexplored. To that end, we develop a theoretical framework to explain the strategic use of deceptive messages by resorting to motives behind the use. First, we look at how deceptive communication has been defined in prior research. Then, we investigate some of the common motivations for using deceit in communication interactions. Next, we discuss the relationship between self-construals (i.e., interdependent and independent) and deceptive communication motivation. This review concludes with practical insights for future research in the domain of deceptive communication.*