

Meaning Differences for Nonverbal Cues: Easier or More Difficult for the Intercultural Listener?

Terry H. Ostermeier

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Introduction

As cultural diversity becomes more likely a characteristic of individuals with whom we will interact, it is becoming increasingly necessary to develop or improve our intercultural speaking and listening knowledge and skills. Students presently in the educational system will have even greater demands placed on their intercultural communication abilities. A specific task facing educators involved in the subject area of listening is to devise means to maximize the learning of effective intercultural listening skills for students. Experiential learning is often cited as one of the more likely successful approaches to accomplish this objective.

Project Description

The author of this paper is employing an experiential student project in a university intercultural communication course in which listening is a primary focus of the participants in intercultural interviews. The project especially centers upon the student's perceptions of nonverbal cues as they affect the listening process in the interviews.

When interviewing someone from a cultural outside the United States, it is stipulated that the person must have been in this country for

preferably one year or less. The experience must be structured as two or more interview sessions, not just one. A different location for each of the sessions is encouraged. Activities other than simply sitting across the table in a classroom or lounge are urged, also. Meeting in the university center, going out to eat at an informal restaurant, or inviting the person over for lunch are examples of varied situations which appear to facilitate the desired experiences intended for the project. Two types of information are sought from the intercultural interviews. One type is the information exchanged by the participants about the cultural and communication process in the respective cultures. A second type of information is what is gained by both participants by observing and reflecting upon the actual communication experience in the interviews. Listening and, in particular, the affect of certain nonverbal cues on listening is an aspect emphasized. To assist the student interviewer gain insight into how the communication is going, suggestions are given as to how to focus on the nonverbal cues in the interviews (Ostermeier 1993:4).

The author of this paper has been collecting data on the student experiences as an on-going project and has reported on two stages at international conferences in 1992 and 1993. In 1992, data was presented which reflected upon the over-all responses of the student interviewers to the intercultural interview experience.

Data Reported in 1992

The information may be summarized as follows:

1. The Interviewers:
 - a. Of the 170 students enrolled in sections of the course, 59 (35%) engaged in interviews.
 - b. 36 females and 23 males participated.
 - c. Males showed a 2 to 1 preference to interview males; females were evenly divided between males and females.
2. The Interviewees:
 - a. Represented 32 countries from Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East.
 - b. 34 males were interviewed and 25 females.

Ostermeier

3. Four major themes emerged in statements by the interviewer on a nonverbal questionnaire employed in the project or in the paper submitted by each student.
 - a. Gained more insight into the culture than would through reading or lectures alone.
 - b. Perceived a reduction in inaccurate views about the other culture as well as in prejudice.
 - c. Developed personal friendships which often continued beyond the interview project.
 - d. Achieved greater appreciation of listening skills needed to listen interculturally. (Ostermeier 1992)

Data Reported in 1993

At a 1993 conference, a paper was presented which described the nature of the American student interviewer's perceptions of the nonverbal cues in the intercultural interviews. A brief summary of major findings presented in that paper follows.

A total of 103 individuals from cultures representing Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East were interviewed by American university students. Each of the interviewers described his or her perceptions of five nonverbal cues employed by the international person on a five point scale which indicated the degree of similarity or difference with the behavior of Americans. The five nonverbal cues were; voice, space, eye behavior, facial expressions, and hand gestures. In addition, the American students were to elaborate on the nature of any differences. Students reported they perceived the following characteristics for the cultural areas of the world indicated.

Middle Eastern

- very different with hand gestures (more expansive, different).
- very different eye behavior (more eye contact and gaze).
- very different use of voice (faster rate).
- very different facial expressions (more emotion, smiling).
- moderately different use of space (closer).

Latin American

- very different use of voice (softer, slower rate).
- very different eye behavior (less eye contact).

Ostermeier

- very different facial expressions (less emotion, more smiling).
- moderately different in space (closer).
- moderately different in hand gestures (fewer, smaller).

African

- very different use of voice (softer and slower).
- moderately different use of space (closer).
- moderately different eye behavior (less eye gaze).
- moderately different facial expressions (more smiling).
- moderately different hand gestures (no consensus on descriptors).

Asian

- moderately different use of voice (softer, slower).
- moderately different facial expressions (less emotion, more smiling).
- slightly different use of space (closer).
- slightly different eye behavior (less eye contact, gaze).
- slightly different in hand gestures (fewer in number and type, smaller).

European

- slightly different in voice (softer, faster).
- slightly different in space (closer).
- slightly different eye behavior (more eye contact, gaze).
- slightly different facial expressions (less emotion, more smiling).
- slightly different hand gestures (no consensus on descriptors).

It was apparent that American student interviewers perceived differences in various degrees in the use of nonverbal cues by the international persons. It was also evident that the differences in cues varied in magnitude of impact depending on the particular cultural area of the world, ranging from the Middle East exhibiting the most, to the Latin Americans, Africans, Asians and finally the Europeans the least (Ostermeier 1993).

Purpose of this Paper

The focus of this paper is to report and discuss the observations of American student interviewers as to their perceptions of the impact of differences in meanings for

the specified nonverbal cues on listening in intercultural interviews, the third stage of the on-going project.

Nonverbal Cues in Intercultural Listening

Prior to assessing the operation of nonverbal cues in listening in the intercultural interviews, a brief picture of nonverbal cues from the literature is warranted. An account will now be presented of the nature of nonverbal cues in intercultural communication and, in particular, in intercultural listening, and the extent of the impact on the use of nonverbal cues and/or meanings for those cues across different cultures.

It is noted that while verbal languages are primarily informative, nonverbal languages are usually relational or meta-communicational (telling us something about the communication situation). Competence in nonverbal languages is equivalent to that in verbal languages; it is the user's knowledge of the codes and when they are appropriately used. You are competent in kinesics, haptics, proxemics, etc., to the extent that you:

- 1) know what behaviors are appropriate for a given relationship;
- 2) know when someone is not behaving correctly; and
- 3) understand the message encoded into a particular behavior

(Borden 1991: 173-4).

Thomlison (1991: 112) maintains that the use of voice and body language take on special significance when cultural variations are involved because they are predominantly used unconsciously. An awareness of nonverbal factors will significantly increase listening effectiveness since they play such a dominant role in the communication process.

Oludaja (1992: 11) goes on to indicate that nonverbal behaviors are the most fundamental means of relating and conveying meanings, particularly in cross cultural encounters. While certain nonverbal behaviors have been identified as universal in their expressive modes, meanings are not universal. Hence, much misunderstanding can occur in cross-cultural communication if communicators fail to give due attention to all available cues. In order to minimize the occurrence of misunderstandings, the cross-cultural communicator should make a genuine effort to listen with his ears, with his eyes, and with his heart.

Martin and Hammer (1989) studied a variety of cultures and identified those nonverbal behaviors most often associated with communication competence. The three nonverbal behaviors most strongly associated in cultures were direct eye contact, listening carefully, and smiling. Those three nonverbal behaviors were consistently found to be much more

important than any other in making a successful impression in a foreign culture.

According to Richmond, McCroskey, and Payne (1991: 308) the nonverbal behaviors of a culture are as important, if not more important, to understanding the culture as is the language of the culture. In fact, many believe the study of the nonverbal behavior of various cultures is much more valuable to the American who may need to travel widely than is the study of foreign languages. This brief examination not only emphasizes the importance of the use of nonverbal cues in the intercultural communication process but also indicates the potential adverse impact misinterpretations of the nonverbal cues can have in listening to someone from a different culture.

The Five Nonverbal Cues

The preceding section of the paper has looked at nonverbal cues from a general perspective as to their nature and impact. At this point, information will be presented concerning the potential for misunderstanding the five nonverbal cues which are the focus of the student intercultural interview project - voice, conversational eye behavior, facial expressions, and hand gestures.

Discussing one aspect of voice, Lee and Baxter (1992: 384) point out that the effect of speech rate on perceptions of speaker credibility depends on the cultural background of the audience and the gender of the speaker. In Korea relatively unfavorable source credibility judgments result when a male speaker communicates rapidly, whereas in the United States the opposite result is obtained. For females, on the other hand, there are few statistically significant effects of speech rate on the judgments of speaker credibility.

Levine and Adelman (1993) offer observations concerning three of the five nonverbal cues - conversational space, eye behavior, and facial expressions. Less space in the American culture may be associated with either greater intimacy or aggressive behavior. A person whose "space" has been intruded upon by another may feel threatened and react defensively. In cultures where close physical contact is acceptable and even desirable, Americans may be perceived as cold and distant (109-110). Eye contact is important because insufficient or excessive eye contact can create communication barriers. In relationships, it serves to show intimacy, attention, and influence. Patterns of eye contact are different across cultures.

Ostermeier

Some Americans feel uncomfortable with the "gaze" that is sometimes associated with Arab or Indian communication patterns. Yet too little eye contact may also be viewed negatively, because it may convey a lack of interest, inattention, or even mistrust. In contrast, in many other parts of the world (especially in Asian countries), a person's lack of eye contact toward an authority figure signifies respect and deference (106-8). Our faces reveal emotions and attitudes, but we should not attempt to "read" people from other cultures as we would "read" someone from our own culture. The fact that members of one culture do not express their emotions as openly as do members of another culture does not mean that they do not experience emotions. Rather, there are cultural restraints on the amount of nonverbal expressiveness permitted. For example, in public and more formal situations many Japanese do not show their emotions as freely as Americans do (105-6).

Pertaining to gestures, Carbaugh (1990: 343) states that body alignment, body positioning and body movement (including gestures) are not only different in form and amount but they may not be synchronized with speech in the same way. It should be apparent that there is cultural variability in the ways that verbal and nonverbal modes of communication function together in the regulation of talk. And the contributions of the listener to such regulation will vary in keeping with the differences in the over- all system.

The preceding affirms the strong potential for misunderstandings with the five nonverbal cues. Poyatos (1988: 83-6) reinforces the complexity of this when he explains that there are actually three forms of cross cultural misunderstanding - misinterpretation, partial comprehension, and lack of comprehension. The first form is where the listener creates a different meaning for the nonverbal cue than the communicator. The second occurs when a sign is incompletely understood, ranging from a slightly wrong interpretation to one that contains only a minimal fraction of the intended meaning. The third form of misunderstanding takes place when a listener fails to attribute any meaning or even fails to perceive the sign.

Data Collection Questionnaire

American university student interviewers completed the Nonverbal Communication Questionnaire (see Appendix A). While data generated from all parts of the questionnaire are used to some extent in the discussion of the results presented in this paper, the responses to 2c and 2d are the

primary focus. Cultural areas of the world represented in the sample of 103 persons were: Africa (13), Asia (44), Europe (24), Latin America (14), and the Middle East (8).

Results

Use of Voice

For the international persons interviewed, 78.6% of the American student interviewers volunteered comments concerning how they perceived their listening was affected by the voice of the international person.

1. Nature of the affect of voice on listening.
 - a. 35.8% said it was easier to listen.
 - b. 55.6% said it was more difficult.
 - c. 8.6% said the voice had no impact either way.
2. For those who found it easier to listen, what explanation was given for their opinion?
 - a. 86.2% said the voice encouraged them to listen more intently.
 - b. 13.8% said the voice more effectively revealed their feelings.
3. For those who found it more difficult to listen:
 - a. 40% said it was too much effort to concentrate.
 - b. 20% said they missed too much of what was said.
 - c. 15.5% said they couldn't hear what was said.
 - d. 11.1% said the tone of voice was too threatening.
 - e. 6.7% said the voice caused them to feel tense.
 - f. 6.7% said the voice conveyed disinterest.
4. Major types of impact on listening according to cultural area of the international interviewees.
 - a. All of the responses about Africans under "easier to listen" were in the category 2a "encouraged me to listen".
 - b. Under "more difficult to listen", all of the responses but one under 3d "threatening tone" were describing Middle Easterners. All of the responses under 3c "couldn't hear" pertained to Asians.
5. The American interviewers stated the softer voice and slower rate made it easier to listen to Africans but said the same characteristics made

it more difficult to listen to Latin Americans. The faster rate made it more difficult to listen to Middle Easterners. The interviewers placed the Asians in two opposite categories. Over one-third claimed the softer to listen while two-thirds found it more difficult to listen.

Conversational Space

A total of 62.1% of the interviewers expressed observations as to whether and how the use of space in the conversations affected listening.

1. Nature of the affect of space on listening.
 - a. 9.4% said use of space made it easier to listen.
 - b. 48.4% said it made it more difficult.
 - c. 42.2% said space had no noticeable impact.
2. If it was easier to listen, what was the explanation?
 - a. 50% said meanings were communicated more effectively.
 - b. 30% said the space expressed closeness to them.
 - c. 20% said it made them feel more relaxed.
3. Of those who found it was more difficult to listen:
 - a. 58.1% said the space made them feel uncomfortable.
 - b. 19.3% said it was distracting.
 - c. 16.3% said it intimidated them.
 - d. 6.5% said it expressed disinterest in them.
4. Major forms of impact of space related to cultural area:

All of the responses but two under "more difficult to listen" about Asians were in category 3a "made me feel uncomfortable". All of the responses about Middle Easterners were under 3b or 3c "distracted or intimidated me".
5. The American interviewers perceived the closer conversational space made it easier to listen to Africans but more difficult to listen to Latin Americans. While a majority of the interviewers (60%) observed no impact on listening due to the slightly closer spatial distance for Asians, all of the interviewers who said it had an affect found it more difficult to listen.

Eye Behavior

Expressing observations about the affect of eye behavior on listening were 54.4% of the interviewers.

1. Nature of the affect of eye behavior on listening.
 - a. 44.65% said it was easier.
 - b. 44.65% said it was more difficult.
 - c. 10.7% said eye behavior had no impact.

2. Of those who found it easier to listen:
 - a. 36% said it caused them to put more effort into their listening.
 - b. 24% said it held their attention better.
 - c. 16% said it made them feel more comfortable.
 - d. 12% said it helped them use more eye contact.
 - e. 12% said it expressed more interest in them.

3. Of those who found it more difficult to listen:
 - a. 36% said eye behavior made them uncomfortable.
 - b. 32% said they felt threatened.
 - c. 16% said the lack of eye contact was distracting.
 - d. 12% said it communicated disinterest in them.
 - e. 4% said they found the eye behavior annoying.

4. Major types of impact related to cultural area:
 - a. All but one of the responses about Africans under "easier to listen" were in the category 2a "encouraged me to listen".
 - b. All of the responses under "more difficult to listen" about Middle Easterners and Europeans were 3a and 3b "expressed threat or made me feel uncomfortable". All of the responses about Asians were under 3c, 3d, and 3e "distracting, annoying, disinterested".

5. Interviewers said the slightly greater use of eye contact and slightly longer duration for eye contact made it more difficult to listen to Europeans. The considerably more frequent eye contact and gazing by Middle Easterners made it more

difficult to listen. There was no consensus among interviewers on the ease/difficulty listening to Africans, Asians, or Latin Americans due to their use of eye behavior.

Facial Expressions

A total of 53.4% of the interviewers volunteered comments about the affect of facial expressions on listening to international interviewees.

1. Nature of affect of facial expressions on listening.
 - a. 49.1% said facial expressions made it easier to listen.
 - b. 34.5% said it made it more difficult.
 - c. 16.4 % said it had no impact.

2. Of those who perceived listening was easier:
 - a. 33.4% said the facial expressions showed a strong interest in them and what they were saying.
 - b. 25.9% said it made them feel good.
 - c. 18.5% said it communicated effective feedback.
 - d. 14.8% said it showed concern for them as a person.
 - e. 3.7% said it kept them attentive.
 - f. 3.7% said it made them feel more credible.

3. Of those who found it more difficult to listen:
 - a. 42.1% said the facial expressions were distracting.
 - b. 36.8% said it caused them to worry whether they were misinterpreting the interviewees' feelings.
 - c. 15.8% said it didn't communicate interest in them.
 - d. 5.3% said it showed little concern for them.

4. Major forms of impact related to cultural area.
 - a. All of the responses under 3c "didn't communicate interest" under "made it more difficult" were ascribed to Asians.
 - b. All of the comments describing Europeans were under "easier to listen," either 2a "projected strong interest" or 2b "made them feel good."

5. American student interviewers felt the greater use of smiling by Africans and the showing of less emotion but greater use of smiling by Europeans made it easier to

listen to those two cultural groups. On the other hand, the less frequent showing of emotion and the greater use of smiling by Asians was perceived to cause more difficulty listening to them.

Hand Gestures

Stating observations about the affect of hand gestures on listening were 59.2% of the interviewers.

1. Nature of the affect of hand gestures on listening.
 - a. 31.1% said it was easier to listen.
 - b. 24.6% said it was more difficult.
 - c. 44.3% said it had no impact.

2. Of those who felt the gestures made it easier to listen:
 - a. 63.2% said their use expressed more complete meaning.
 - b. 26.3% said it kept their attention and interest.
 - c. 10.5% said it induced them to concentrate.

3. Of those who believed it made it more difficult:
 - a. 43.8% said they were distracted by the hand gestures.
 - b. 37.5% said they were distracted by no gestures being used.
 - c. 12.5% said it caused them to be confused about meanings.
 - d. 6.3% said the gestures made the interviewees look uncomfortable and made them feel uncomfortable.

4. Major forms of impact related to cultural area of world.
 - a. All of the explanations under "made it easier to listen" directed toward Latin Americans were for category 2a "expressed more complete meaning." All but one for Europeans were in the same category. All of the comments under 2c "kept my attention and interest" were about Asians.
 - b. All of the comments under "more difficult to listen" expressed about Middle Easterners were for category 3a "distracted by gestures." All but one of those attributed to Asians were under 2b "distracted by no gestures."

5. The interviewers stated that when Asians did use hand gestures, while they were less frequent and smaller in size, it made it easier to listen to them. The expressive gesturing, more different in types, and more expansive in size made it more difficult to listen to Middle Easterners.

Discussion of Results

Use of Voice

Overwhelmingly, the explanation given by those interviewers who found the use of voice made it easier to listen was that it encouraged them to listen more intently. Most interviewers, however, found the use of voice made it more difficult to listen. By a two to one margin, the most frequent explanation for the difficulty was that it forced them to exert too much effort to listen. For those finding difficulty in listening, the result was far more likely to be an adverse affect on their understanding the message (expressed by 75% under 3a,b,c) rather than being perceived as something negative directed at them personally (25% under 3d,e,f). While the preceding observation can be made as a generalization, it was not a uniform effect for all cultural groups. The negative impression created by the voice of Middle Easterners was more likely to be considered by listeners as a negative feeling directed at them personally. Responses of American interviewers revealed that merely because two different cultural groups might be perceived as using their voice similarly, the effects on the American listeners may not be the same. For example, it was perceived that both Africans and Latin Americans used softer volume and slower rates. Yet, the listeners maintained these characteristics made it easier to listen to Africans but more difficult to listen to Latin Americans. One possible explanation is that voice obviously is only one nonverbal cue which interacts with other nonverbal cues as well as language. Perhaps the voice interacts in different ways with other nonverbal cues with these two cultural groups.

Use of Conversational Space

Most interviewers, by a four to one margin, indicated the different meanings for the use of conversational space by international persons resulted in it being more difficult to listen to them. For the smaller percentage of those saying it made it easier to listen, the most cited explanation by a two to one margin was that the use space helped convey meanings more effectively. For those considering it more difficult to listen, the most

cited explanation was that it made them feel uncomfortable or uneasy. Over-all, over 80% of these explanations claimed that the

perceived negative effect was directed at them personally and not that it was an adverse reaction about what they were saying.

Use of Eye Behavior

Interviewers were almost evenly divided over whether the use of eye behavior made it easier or more difficult to listen. The most frequent explanation given for being easier to listen was that it encouraged them to put more effort into their listening. For those perceiving greater difficulty in listening, there were two equally mentioned explanations - "made me feel uncomfortable" or "felt threatened by the direct eye contact." Once again, most of the statements (two-thirds) indicating an adverse effect on listening were perceptions of negative reactions to them personally not perceptions as negative responses to what they were saying. For eye behavior, there was consistency between cultural areas using eye behavior in similar ways and the reaction of the interviewers. More frequent eye contact and eye contact of longer duration made it more difficult to listen to Middle Easterners and Europeans. There was no clear tendency toward easier or more difficult for Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans.

Use of Facial Expressions

Most interviewers suggested the use of facial expressions by international persons made it easier to listen. One-third of the interviewers believed it made it easier because the particular use of facial expressions projected a strong interest in them and their comments. One-fourth said it made them feel good. In essence, nearly three-fourths of the explanations focused on how the listeners felt the facial expressions affected them personally. For those who found difficulty in listening, they stated they found the expressions distracting or the facial expressions caused them to be concerned that they may be misinterpreting the feelings of the international person. The greater use of smiling caused different results. Interviewers reported smiling made it easier to listen to Europeans and Africans but more difficult to listen to Asians.

Use of Hand Gestures

While most interviewers felt the use of gestures had little or no impact on listening, of those who felt it did have an affect, a slight

majority said it made it easier to listen. For those saying it made it easier, by far the reason most often given was that it helped express more complete meaning for what was being communicated. Of those claiming the gestures made it more difficult, 80% stated their use caused a distraction. Either they were distracted by the gestures employed or were distracted because no gestures were employed! By cultural area, the most evident finding was that the over-all lack of gestures made it actually easier to listen to Asians but the excessive gesture use by Middle Easterners made it more difficult to listen to them.

Conclusions

It would appear that the type of nonverbal cue may make it easier or more difficult to listen. Listeners reported that differences in meanings for voice and conversational space made it more likely to be difficult to listen to the international persons. On the other hand, they felt differences in the meanings for facial expressions and hand gestures made it more likely to be easier to listen. Differences in meanings for eye behavior were no more likely to be a help or a hindrance to listening. The adverse impact on listening due to differences in nonverbal cue meanings may be in the perception of the listener that something negative is being directed at them personally or it may be the perception that something negative is being directed at what they are saying. Either outcome, of course, could result in misunderstandings between the participants. The differences in meanings for nonverbal cues appear more likely to make it easier or more difficult to listen depending on the cultural area of the world of the international person. From these interviews, differences in meanings would seem more likely to make it more difficult to listen to persons from the Middle East and Latin America. On the other hand, differences in these cues seem to make it easier to listen to Africans. Nonverbal differences appear to be as likely a help as a hindrance in listening to Asians and Europeans. These generalizations, of course, must be viewed in the context of the sample of 103 subjects being analyzed in the categories of cultural areas of the world. It is apparent that persons from one country within a particular cultural group may very well exhibit behaviors differently than persons from another country within the same cultural group. Thus, one always must be cautioned to be prepared to adapt to a particular country within a particular cultural area and, in fact, to that particular individual.

The experiences revealed in this student project would indicate that the differences in meanings for nonverbal cues among cultures doesn't necessarily make it more difficult to listen to someone from another culture. In the perceptions of listeners, it may make it easier to listen by motivating the listener to listen more carefully, to increase the attentiveness of the listener, to cause the listener to feel the other person has interest in them as a person and in what they say, and to encourage the listener to engage in more eye contact, thus possibly picking up more cues which might enable them to more accurately understand the message. On the other hand, one should not minimize the frequent significant negative impact on the listener which differences can and do have in intercultural communication. Listeners may perceive such differences to communicate a lack of attention or interest in them and what they are saying, to be distracting and, thus, make it to hard to concentrate, or to cause them to feel uncomfortable, intimidated, or even threatened. Such situations could make listening more difficult leading to various degrees of misunderstanding. An intercultural interview project such as the one which is the focus of this paper appears to give university students the opportunity to "experience" principles of listening relevant to gaining greater effectiveness in intercultural listening situations. Student response seems to indicate that they perceive such an activity to be more meaningful than perhaps some of the more traditional modes of university instruction.

Poyatos (1988: 101-2) may have captured the essence of the task faced by faculty and students when he observed that it is not difference that makes for divisiveness; rather, it is the lack of appreciation for diversity that interferes with successful cross cultural communication.

Appendix A NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Interviewing Someone From Another Culture

You should look over the following questionnaire items prior to having your interview sessions. This will enable you to be alert in your observations of these factors. Use one copy of this questionnaire to keep an on-going record after each interview. After your final interview, complete the second copy in final form typed or in ink and attach it to your paper;

Country/Culture_____ Sex____ Estimated Age Over 21? Yes No

Number of months the person has been in the U.S.A.?

USE OF VOICE:

1. Very Similar to Americans _____ Very Different _____

2. If the use of voice was different, check appropriate:
 - a. Volume _____louder _____softer than Americans
Rate _____ faster _____slower
 - b. Other (please specify):
 - c. What meanings were communicated by these differences?
 - d. In what ways do you feel these differences affected
your listening to the international person?

USE OF CONVERSATIONAL SPACE:

1. Very Similar to Americans _____ Very Different _____

2. If the use of space was different, check appropriate:
 - a. Distance between us _____closer _____further away
Changes in space _____ stayed same _____moved around
 - b. Other (please specify):
 - c. What meanings were communicated by these differences?
 - d. In what ways do you feel these differences affected
your listening to the international person?

USE OF EYES:

1. Very Similar to Americans _____ Very Different _____

2. If the use of eyes was different, check appropriate:
 - a. Frequency looking _____more _____less than Americans
Length of each glance _____shorter _____longer in time
Staring into my eyes _____more _____less
 - b. Other (please specify):

Ostermeier

- c. What meanings were communicated by these differences?
- d. In what ways do you feel these differences affected
your listening to the international person?

USE OF FACIAL EXPRESSIONS:

- 1. Very Similar to Americans _____ Very Different _____

- 2. If facial expressions were different, check appropriate:
 - a. Showing of emotion _____more _____less than Americans
Smiling _____more _____less
Showing interest _____more _____less
 - b. Other (please specify):
 - c. What meanings were communicated by these differences?
 - d. In what ways do you feel these differences affected
your listening to the international person?

USE OF HAND GESTURES:

- 1. Very Similar to Americans _____ Very Different _____

- 2. If hand gestures were different, check appropriate:
 - a. Frequency _____more _____less than Americans

Ostermeier

Types/Kinds _____more _____fewer

Size _____larger _____smaller

- b. Other (please specify):
- c. What meanings were communicated by these differences?
- d. In what ways do you feel these differences affected
your listening to the international person?

References

- Argyle, Michael, Monika Henderson, Michael Bond, Vicki Yuichi, and Alberta Contarello
 1986 Cross-Cultural Variations in Relationship Rules, *International Journal of Psychology*, 21. 287-315.
- Borden, George
 1991 *Cultural Orientation: An Approach to Understanding Inter-cultural Communication*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Carbaugh, Donal (ed.)
 1990 *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Klopf, Donald
 1991 *Intercultural Encounters*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Morton Publishing Company.
- Lee, Hyun, and Franklin Boster
 1992 Collectivism-Individualism in Perceptions of Speech Rate: A Cross-Cultural Comparison, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23.3. 377-88.
- Levine, Deena and Mara Adelman
 1993 *Beyond Language: Cross Cultural Communication*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Regents/Prentice-Hall.
- Martin, Judith and Mitchell Hammer
 1989 Behavioral Categories of Intercultural Communication Competence: Everyday Communicators' Perceptions, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13. 303-32.
- Oludaja, Bayo
 n.d. Listening to Nonverbal Cues Across Cultures, paper presented at the meeting of the International Listening Association, Seattle, WA, 1992.
- Ostermeier, Terry
 1986 Speech Norms: International Comparisons, in *Sprechkultur im Medienzeitalter*, Freyr Varwig (ed.), Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Scriptor Verlag GmbH.
 n.d. Learning Intercultural Listening Concepts Through Participating in Intercultural Communication Exercises/Simulations", paper presented at the International Listening Association Summer Conference, Toronto, Canada, 1987.
 1989 Perceptions of Cultural Values and Communicating Interculturally: A Simulation Experience, *World Communication Journal*. 18.1. 33-47.

Ostermeier

- n.d. The Intercultural Interview: An Experience in Intercultural Listening, paper presented at the meeting of the International Listening Association, Seattle, WA, 1992.
- 1993 Perception of Nonverbal Cues in Dialogic Listening in an Intercultural Interview, *Journal of the International Listening Association*, Special Issue.
- Poyatos, Fernando (ed.)
1988 *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Nonverbal Communication*, Toronto, Canada: C. J. Hogrefe.
- Richmond, Virginia, James McCroskey, and Steven Payne
1991 *Nonverbal Behavior in Interpersonal Relations*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Thomlison, Dean
1991 Intercultural Listening, in *Listening in Everyday Life: A Personal and Professional Approach*, Deborah Borisoff and Michael Purdy (eds.), New York: University Press of America.
- Wolff, Florence and Nadine Marsnik
1992 *Perceptive Listening*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Wolvin, Andrew
n.d. Culture as a Listening Variable, paper presented at the meeting of the International Listening Association Summer Conference, Toronto, Canada, 1987.