

Cultural Perceptions of Equivocation and Directness II: A Replication and Extension of the Dimensional Hypothesis

Richard Bello, J. Donald Ragsdale, Frances E. Brandau-Brown, & Terry Thibodeaux,
Sam Houston State University

Abstract

A paper we presented at last year's IAICS conference in Guadalajara, Mexico (*Cultural Perceptions of Equivocation and Directness: Dimensional or Unique?*) found that a dimensional approach likely would be productive for examining and understanding cross-cultural differences in the use of interpersonal equivocal messages. Therefore, in the present paper we extend and attempt to confirm that finding by applying Hall's and Hofstede's dimensions to an additional set of cultures, including that of China, Taiwan, Australia, and Colombia. We examine differences and similarities in the use of equivocal and indirect messages between groups of cultures (excluding those from last year's study) that differ in the most relevant dimensions, such as high/low context and individualism/collectivism. In this way, we hope to accomplish two key goals: 1) to continue to expand our documentation of cultural equivocation differences, and 2) to lend additional support to the tentatively established hypothesis that equivocation differences pattern themselves along cultural dimensions more than they do along idiosyncratic or unique aspects of cultures.

Cultural Perceptions of Equivocation and Directness II: A Replication and Extension of the Dimensional Hypothesis

We have argued elsewhere (see Bello, Ragsdale, Brandau-Brown, & Thibodeaux, 2004) that, although there has been relatively little empirical research done on the role that culture plays in influencing the use and perception of interpersonal equivocation (and its counterpart, directness), the studies that have been conducted and the relevant theoretical rationales suggest competing explanations. On the one hand, research on key dimensions of cultural difference, especially individualism/collectivism (Hofstede, 1991, 2001) and high-context/low-context (Hall, 1977), implies that these dimensions would be solid predictors of how equivocal and direct messages are used in conversation. For example, the face-negotiation theory of Ting-Toomey (1988) suggests that those in collectivistic cultures (where group concerns are paramount), who are attuned to others' face and mutual face, would be more likely to use equivocal and indirect conversational strategies in order to ease social difficulties and promote social harmony. The same theory argues that those from individualistic cultures (where individual concerns are paramount), who are attuned to how self-face is perceived, should be more likely to use direct conversational styles designed to enhance and repair that perception. Similarly, the theory underlying high- versus low-context differences suggests that people in high-context cultures would be more willing to use and be more tolerant of equivocal and indirect verbal messages, essentially because they are able to

use contextual and nonverbal cues to help them make appropriate interpretations of those verbal messages. That is, because they are more attuned to context during interpersonal interactions, they rely on that context more (including nonverbals) as part of the process of sending and understanding messages and less (than those in low-context cultures do) on explicitness of verbal codes.

Although the theory underlying these dimensional differences, as well as some empirically oriented studies (see, e.g., Bello et al., 2004), suggests that the dimensions should be good predictors of cultural tendencies toward equivocation or directness, other studies have reached mixed conclusions. For example, while the results found by Yeung, Levine, and Nishiyama (1999) support a dimensional orientation to equivocation, the results of a study conducted by Tanaka and Bell (1996) do not.

Complicating the situation even further is research, some of it quite recent, that examines how individuals *perceive themselves* regarding the individualism/collectivism dimension, that is, the degree to which they see themselves as either independent or interdependent (Kapoor, Hughes, Baldwin, & Blue, 2003; Kim, Hunter, Miyahara, Horvath, Bresnahan, & Yoon, 1996; Kim, Kim, Kam, & Shin, 2003; Markus & Kitayama, 1991.) While such studies do not discount the role of broad culture-level dimensions such as individualism/collectivism, they do suggest the possibility, among other things, that self-perceptions regarding this dimension are important mediators between the broader dimension and more specific conversational behaviors (constraints) related to degree of equivocation or directness. Some of these constraints include concern for clarity, concern for the other's feelings, and concern not to be negatively evaluated by the other.

Hofstede himself (1993) makes the point that all four of the original cultural dimensions that he identified account for a minority of the variance in behavior within the cultures studied. How much of the remaining variance is due to psychological mediators such as self-perceptions and how much is due to unique culture characteristics is an open question. In addition, there exists the issue of how much of this remaining variance is directly related to questions of equivocation versus directness.

For these reasons, there still exists a suspicion that a dimensional approach to understanding equivocation across cultures might be less productive than one that focuses on unique and idiosyncratic aspects of the cultures in question. Therefore, we propose to develop the research we began as part of the IAICS conference last year in Guadalajara, Mexico, in which we found that a dimensional approach likely would be productive for examining and understanding cross-cultural differences in the use of interpersonal equivocal messages. We propose to extend and attempt to confirm that finding by applying Hall's and Hofstede's dimensions to an additional set of cultures (excluding those from last year's study). We will be focused on the differences and similarities related to equivocation and directness between two groups of cultures that are dimensionally different from one another: China, Taiwan, and Colombia on the one hand, which are high-context and collectivistic, and Australia on the other hand, which is low-context and individualistic. In this way, we hope to accomplish two key goals: 1) to continue to expand our documentation of cultural equivocation differences, and 2) to lend additional support to the tentatively established hypothesis that equivocation differences pattern themselves along cultural dimensions more than they do along idiosyncratic or unique aspects of cultures. There is also the possibility of clarifying the apparently confusing role of uncertainty avoidance in the process (see discussion in Bello et

al., 2004) especially because Japan (last year) and China (this year) differ markedly on this dimension, as do China and Colombia which are dimensionally similar otherwise.

What follows is, first, an examination of the cultures of China and Taiwan as they concern the use of equivocation and directness in interpersonal communication. Next, the culture of Australia is analyzed for the same purpose. The last culture to be looked at is that of Colombia. The study concludes with an analysis and discussion of communication patterns and inconsistencies that have emerged through our literature review of these cultures.

Just as we observed last year in Guadalajara discussing these issues with respect to Mexico, it is daunting for a person who does not represent the culture about which he or she is speaking to draw conclusions about cultural characteristics. As before, we merely offer what we have drawn from the writings of those who have directly observed or measured the cultures about which we are speaking. That said, we wish to begin with Chinese culture, partly because of the location of this year's conference and partly because it is such an important culture to study. *Newsweek* has recently proclaimed in a special report that this is "China's Century," but scholars have long known the importance of Chinese culture. However, we want to clarify that we will actually discuss two Chinas, Taiwan or the Republic (ROC) and the People's Republic (PRC), since the two countries are not uniform with respect to cultural characteristics pertaining to the use of equivocation.

Following the pattern we established last year, we ground our discussion in the writings of Edward T. Hall (1977) and Geert Hofstede (1991, 2001). Specifically, we rely on Hall's concept of high- and low-context cultures and Hofstede's five dimensions of cross-cultural difference. A low-context culture, such as our own in the United States of America, prizes overt and explicit verbal messaging, while a high-context culture depends more upon nonverbal messaging, especially context, to explicate what is only covert or unexpressed in the verbal. Chinese culture, of course, is high-context. Accordingly, Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) have pointed to the indirect mode of communication as a major feature of Eastern communication systems. The indirect mode "refers to the use of verbal messages that camouflage and conceal speakers' true intentions in terms of their wants, needs, and goals in the discourse situation" (p. 100). The rationale for the indirect mode comes from the Chinese notion of *guanxi*. While there is no direct English equivalent of this idea, the terms which most nearly approximate it are *relational* and *interdependent*. When indirectness in the use of language is the norm because relationship is paramount, then equivocation would seem to be an acceptable, even normal, part of discourse.

From an American standpoint, however, there is a type of directness that would seem to contradict Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey's theory. Chinese speakers can be quite direct with respect to issues Americans would either avoid or speak about in euphemisms. "It is not considered rude to ask how old you are, how much you earn . . . and so on. Even questions as to why you are so fat or so thin or why you haven't married . . . are all considered perfectly legitimate" (Scurfield & Lianyi, 2003, p. 28). The cultural difference in this case, however, would seem to involve topics which are taboo rather than equivocation. Cultures, of course, have different sets of taboos, which would seem to be superordinate to equivocal language. The latter would only be at issue in the case of topics not taboo to talk about.

Hofstede's (1991, 2001; Lustig & Koester, 2003) dimensions of cultural differences permits us to elaborate on Hall's concepts. His original research on employees of IBM identified four such dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism-collectivism, and masculinity-femininity.¹ In collaboration with Bond (Hofstede, 2001),

Hofstede subsequently added a fifth dimension: long-term versus short-term orientation. Tellingly, this dimension is also referred to as the Confucian value, with the People's Republic measuring at the extreme long-term end of the continuum at 118 and the Republic of China measuring 87 (Hofstede, 2001). By contrast, the United States measures 29. In terms of power distance, the PRC measured 80, which indicates a preference for relatively large inequities between classes of people in terms of power. Both the ROC at 58 and the United States at 40 are much more egalitarian. This departure of Taiwan from the norm of the mainland may be explained in Hofstede's terms by a greater population on the mainland and a greater inequality in the distribution of wealth. It may also be the result of greater contact with Western culture, especially given the special relationship which has always existed between Taiwan and the United States.

In the ROC, there is a moderate level of uncertainty avoidance. Taiwan scored a 69 on this measure, although this score is by no means as extreme as that of a country like Greece, which scored 112. By contrast, uncertainty would not seem to be a problem to avoid by the PRC, which scored 30. For comparison, the United States score was 46. In terms of individualism, the United States score was 91 (Ranking: #1), while those of the PRC and Taiwan were 20 and 17 respectively. Collectivism in Chinese culture has been widely noted by numerous scholars. Finally, the PRC scores 66 on the masculinity measure, the United States 62, and Taiwan 45.

What additional insight into the use of equivocation do these four sets of scores provide? Of course, we can only speculate in the absence of specific studies about the use of equivocation in Chinese culture, but there are some few supporting findings in related studies. First, the collectivistic nature of Chinese culture in general itself includes the idea of *guanxi* discussed earlier, which would suggest an acceptance of frequent equivocation. In fact, Ng (1998) found that "among the Chinese, another way of honoring relationship with others is to avoid saying unpleasant or negative things directly. For instance, they seldom say no" (p. 76; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1989; Lewis, 1996).

In the PRC, uncertainty is tolerated to the extent that equivocation may not be problematic. In the ROC, however, there might be more difficulty, in that there is less tolerance for uncertainty even than in the United States. The other dimension which showed a noticeable difference between the PRC and the ROC, masculinity-femininity, suggests that on Taiwan women are regarded more positively than in either the PRC or the United States. This suggests perhaps a greater tendency toward accommodation compared to assertiveness, toward cooperation compared to competition, and therefore perhaps also a type of discourse which would reflect those tendencies. That might well include equivocation.

In his study of the relationships between culture and business leadership, Bjerke (1999) cited similar evidence for the suggestions we have offered. He cited the research of Yang (1991) and Chu (1991), indicating that deceptive speech is a characteristic of Chinese communication. "It is common for them to criticize someone who is not present, but through subtle hints indicate that the criticism is also meant to apply to someone who is" (Bjerke, 1999, p. 162). Additionally, "the Chinese also often speak in euphemisms and by circumlocution. This is especially true when they speak humbly" (p. 162). While we have not discussed it specifically, we think each of these dimensions is consistent with the comparatively longer-term orientation of Chinese culture where one speaks always with a view to ultimate relational effects. We suspect that research specifically designed to test our theoretical extensions will reveal similar support.

China and Australia are both vast countries with heavily populated urban areas, but that is about the extent of the similarity. The Chinese are a collectivist, high power distance, high-context culture while the Australians are an individualistic, low power distance, low-context culture. These differences result in very different cultural views, norms, and practices.

Australia is the world's largest island and it was originally populated by a small number of aborigines. In the mid-eighteenth century the British colonized the island and, hence, many of the customs and norms reflect those of British society. However, it was not long before the colonists began to think of themselves as separate and independent from British rule. The former British colony began the long process of becoming independent in 1890 (Ward, 1963), when Western Australia was established as self-governing. Similar to the United States, this country has a frontier spirit and values national identity. Although Hofstede (1977) ranked this country as highly individualistic, there is also a collectivist element. There is a dialectical tension between these views that is captured in the complex Australian cultures. For example, Australians value independence and individual responsibility. However, Ward (1963) noted that bush culture's subtle emphasis on community has also influenced the culture as a whole. This amalgam of individualism and collectivism is evidenced by the importance of "sticking with one's mates" and the "tall poppy syndrome," which demands the appropriate level of modesty for any achievements (Lewis, 1996). In other words, it's good to be proud of your individual achievements, but not too proud. According to Lewis, anyone who fails to be modest about his or her success "will be brought down to size through a variety of abusive techniques" (p. 183). The criticism of an individual who does not show humility and restraint in his or her success demonstrates this culture's tendency to eschew equivocation when it comes to enforcing social norms. The Australian-born actress, Nicole Kidman, is quite modest about her success when questioned in interviews. She often credits those around her and shifts the focus to effort and hard work in her film projects.

Further evidence of the complexity of Australian society can be seen in the dialectical tensions surrounding power distance. Klopff (1995) defined power distance as "the degree of inequality in power between a less powerful person and a more powerful one" (p.183). According to Lewis (1996) the idea that Australia has an egalitarian society is a myth. Australians value the idea of a classless society where everyone is treated equally. However, the early beginnings of this country were based on class differences. Many of those who first "immigrated" to Australia were prisoners and the soldiers and officials sent to administer them. Later, other poor immigrants came to take advantage of farming and labor opportunities. Ward (1963) asserts that the economic disparity between these immigrants resulted in a society that was "in some important respects, perhaps even more class-conscious than British society of the period" (p. 23). The division between the classes was probably accentuated by the small upper-middle class and a large labor class. Eventually, the working class members of society developed a strong sense of national pride and an egalitarian work ethic. As the population has become more urbanized, with more immigrants from other countries, the early elements of class-consciousness have faded. This multifaceted society still deals with the tension between the ideal of a classless society and the reality of a society with a variety of social strata. This can be seen in the Australian tendency to support the "underdog" across a variety of situations, as well as the premium placed on common sense and a healthy disregard for authority. It is interesting, in this regard, that among the most unforgivable of social sins in Australia are "scabbing" and "dobbing," in essence, snitching on one's mates (Lewis, 1996, p.

182). Recently, Klopff (1995) noted that Australia is ranked as one of the ten countries with the lowest power distance. Hofstede (2001) reported an index score of 36 for power distance in Australia. Low power distance is likely to result in candid and straightforward messages, because social status is not viewed as a constraint.

In addition to being a low power distance culture, Australia is also ranked as a low-context culture. High-context cultures, such as China, use verbal messages that are implicit where a large portion of the meaning is internalized in the communicators or in the context of the interaction. Conversely, in low-context cultures verbal messages must be explicit because they lack the situational and nonverbal cues to interpret the messages. Individuals in a low-context culture are likely to be impatient with indirect communication because they will see it as vague and avoidant. Lewis (1996) suggests that in Australia there is “no manual for correct behavior” and that the culture “lacks a clearly defined social and conversational map” (p. 182). These factors, combined with what Kim, Triandis, Kagitcibasi, Choi, and Yoon (1994) refer to as an Australian tendency to place little emphasis on harmony and agreeableness, seem likely to lead to many situations of open and unequivocal expression of one’s feelings. The Australian actor, Russell Crowe, was arrested in New York in 2005 for allegedly striking a hotel employee with a telephone. In talk show rounds that followed the arrest, he was candid about his behavior and apologized for his actions. Crowe’s open and honest discussion about the possible reasons for his behavior was characteristically Australian and appropriate for American audiences, since America is also a low-context culture.

Based on the extant literature it is reasonable to conclude that Australians prefer unequivocal communication. Australian culture is complex and not easily organized into discrete categories. Hence, it should be noted that these conclusions are generalizations about the culture as a whole and that there will be individual exceptions.

The next country we will analyze as to its use of equivocation is Colombia. Colombia can be clearly characterized as a high-context, collectivist culture (Manrai & Manrai, 1995). Examining Colombians’ use of the “you” pronouns, *tu/vos/usted*, provides evidence of this high-context nature. While a low-context culture such as the United States uses the simple straightforward “you” pronoun, the Colombian high-context culture not only differentiates between an informal (*tu*) and a formal usage (*usted*), but also has an intermediate form, *vos*. The appropriate form must be chosen based on context. There is evidence that these different uses are primarily dependent on various contextual factors such as regional differences and social status (Rey, 1994a; Rey, 1994b). Another example of equivocal usage is that *usted* can be used to convey solidarity (as with close friends and family) or non-solidarity (very formal use) (Uber, 1985). For those whose language has no equivalent of this diversity in the second-person pronoun, the typical Colombian use of *tu*, *vos*, or *usted* would be quite difficult to decipher.

As with many Hispanic cultures, Colombia is also highly collectivist in nature. Hofstede (1991) rates Colombia as 13 in individualism as compared to the U.S. at 91. This compares to other collectivist countries’ ratings such as China (20) and Taiwan (17). This is consistent with the “connectedness” described by Fitch (1991), not only among families and relations, but even extending to Colombians’ penchant for patronizing service providers with whom they have established a relationship. This high sense of connectedness, or Hofstede’s collectivism dimension, could be expected to extend to Colombian patterns of communication.

Forms of leave-taking illustrate not only this collectivist dynamic in Colombia, but also a level of equivocation as well. Fitch, using recordings of actual leave-taking portions of conversations, found a distinct pattern difference from that of the same situation in the United States. The typical leave-taking interaction in the United States would simply involve two steps. The guest announces his/her intention to leave, and the host expresses regret, but accepts the guest's desire for departure. The pattern in Colombia is typically much more complex. Fitch calls it the "*salsipuede*" or "leave if you can" ritual (Fitch, 1991, p. 218). The pattern consists of: (1) the guest states intent to leave, (2) the host asks the guest for reasons for wanting to leave, (3) the guest gives reasons, and (4) the host denies validity of reasons, or gives alternatives to refute reasons. For instance, to refute the guest's plea of tiredness, the host might respond with "you can rest all day tomorrow." Or a need to catch a late bus might result in the host volunteering someone to provide the guest transportation. Fitch examined several actual leave-taking episodes and concluded that this pattern was prevalent in Colombian culture. Even if the guests had not spoken to the host(s) during the entire gathering, to leave without engaging in this *salsipuede* ritual, or even to leave after only the first attempt, has repercussions for both the guest and the host.

The collectivist nature of the culture demands that the guest engage in the *salsipuede* ritual so as not to offend the host. Conversely, if the host does not join with the guest in this ritual, it would be considered a sign of boredom or even antagonism toward the guest. Therefore the collectivist nature of the culture requires the host to challenge the desire to leave. This ritual illustrates, then, Colombians' ties to other people. The widespread performance of this ritual reinforces the notion that departure from a social event does not only affect one person. *Salsipuede* also pays tribute to the "sacred object... [of] this ritual... the *vinculo*: the relationship formed, symbolically or concretely, during the social event" (Fitch, 1991, p. 220). Not to pay attention to the contextual significance of this departure ritual would be a social error.

Contrasted with the simple two-step departure pattern in the United States, this *salsipuede* is an illustration of at least one example of Colombian language equivocation. This common use of equivocation in leave taking is characterized by a lack of directness, an attention to context, and a strong embrace for the connectedness of people that is often lacking from U. S. leave-taking.

Conclusion

Several conclusions can be drawn from this paper's analysis of the use of equivocation and directness within the national cultures of China, Taiwan, Colombia, and Australia. Do the patterns uncovered support the previous hypothesis, only tentatively established (Bello et al., 2004), that a dimensional approach to such study is likely to be more productive than a strictly culture specific approach?

The answer appears to be yes. In a manner similar to established patterns in last year's study, this year's study suggests more equivocation-related communication similarities between dimensionally *similar* countries than between dimensionally divergent countries. The key dimensions around which these similarities emerged are high/low context, individualism/collectivism, and high/low power distance.

With regard to context, we see that the high-context cultures of China, Taiwan, and Colombia appear more predisposed to equivocal conversational strategies and behaviors than does low-context Australia. Evidence for this pattern can be found, for example, in that the

Chinese notion of *guanxi* and the degree of Colombian variation in second-person pronoun usage both stem largely from each culture's high-context orientation, and both imply relatively equivocal verbal messaging that relies on context for adequate interpretation. Contrast these concepts and practices to those of Australia, where a relative lack of social scripting and constraints produces a greater emphasis on open and direct expression of feelings and beliefs in everyday conversation.

Individualism/collectivism is another cultural dimension that produces similarly clustered results. The collectivism of cultures such as China, Taiwan, and Colombia appear to result in predominantly equivocal and indirect message behaviors, at least as contrasted to the individualism of Australia. For example, the sense of connectedness among individuals in these cultures is manifested in the Chinese and Taiwanese tendency for avoiding clearly stated unpleasanties and negative feelings. It is also shown in the Colombian preference for the relatively involved, complex, and indirect leave-taking ritual of *salsipuede*, which helps to protect face and feelings of both hosts and guests at social gatherings and demonstrates the value placed on the relationships formed at such gatherings. Again, contrast these tendencies to the penchant for unequivocal criticism of those who lack humility in their achievements in mostly individualistic Australia.

The final key dimension that demonstrates such clustered equivocation patterns is that of power distance, which is likely no coincidence considering that this dimension is highly correlated with individualism/collectivism (Lustig & Koester, 2003). Note, for example, that in the high power distance cultures of China and Colombia, there exists the kind of indirect conversational practices referred to above. At least part of the reason for these practices can be found in the social constraints present in more class-conscious societies, constraints that often inhibit direct, broad expression of feelings across social classes and groupings. In Australia, on the other hand, where class differences are present but culturally downplayed through low power distance, there is a strong, unequivocal pulling for the "underdog" in almost all sporting and other competitive arenas and a tendency to express one's self in a direct and broad manner that pays little attention to class and power differences.

Our literature review in this second study on equivocation and culture has, unfortunately, done little to aid our understanding of the role of the cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance, except perhaps in an inferential manner. The present study does not demonstrate patterns of equivocation and directness across cultures similar (and different) in uncertainty avoidance. For example, China (30) and Australia (51) are similar as low uncertainty avoidance cultures, but markedly different in their preferences for equivocal versus direct message behaviors. Colombia (80) and China are dissimilar regarding uncertainty avoidance, and yet more similar in equivocation usage than are China and Australia. Inferentially, this lack of consistency between uncertainty avoidance and equivocation practice suggests the dimension is not a good predictor of equivocation. It also suggests that uncertainty avoidance is perhaps better conceptualized as a dimension that has a tenuous connection to communication concerns, unless there exists an intervening variable we have yet to discover that would establish such a connection. Instead, perhaps this dimension is focused mostly on a culture's level of fear and anxiety regarding broader societal changes and the future these changes portend (see, for example, Lustig & Koester's 1994 discussion of the predictors of uncertainty avoidance).

The primary contribution of the present study has been to lend additional support to the working hypothesis that a culture dimensional approach to understanding message

equivocation and directness is more tenable than a culture specific approach. At the same time, it has served to extend our documentation of some of the differences in the use of equivocation and directness from culture to culture. With these goals accomplished, our concerns for future research directions include extending a similar dimensional analysis to a new set of cultures, collecting and analyzing data from members of appropriate cultures to further test the dimensional approach, and exploring the relationship of key dimensions to other communication variables and processes such as, for example, the management of privacy boundaries.

Notes

¹The original dataset (Hofstede, 1980), based on questionnaires completed by multinational employees of IBM, did not include index scores from China (PRC). Later, however, Hofstede (2001) *estimated* index scores for a number of countries not included in the original dataset. China was one of those countries, and it is those estimated index scores which we have used here. Hofstede (2001) says of the PRC estimates that they were based on his own research, in the case of masculinity-femininity, on his and Bond's research in the case of long-term orientation, and "on observation and an extensive literature" (p. 502) in the case of the other three. All index scores cited within are from Hofstede (2001).

References

- Bello, R., Ragsdale, J. D., Brandau-Brown, F. E., & Thibodeaux, T. (2004, July). Cultural perceptions of equivocation and directness: Dimensional or unique? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies, Guadalajara Mexico.
- Bjerke, B. (1999). *Business leadership and culture: National management styles in the global economy*. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.
- Chu, C. N. (1991). *The Asian mind game*. New York NY: Macmillan.
- Fitch, K. (1990/1991). A ritual for attempting leave-taking in Colombia. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 24, 209-224.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1989). Theoretical perspectives for studying intercultural communication. In M. K. Asante & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (pp. 17-46). Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. K., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Hall, E. T. (1977). *Beyond culture*. New York NY: Doubleday.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 81-94.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Kapoor, S., Hughes, P. C., Baldwin, J. R., and Blue, J. (2003). The relationship of individualism-collectivism and self-construals to communication styles in India and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(6) 683-700

- Kim, M. S., Hunter, J. E., Miyahara, A., Horvath, A. M., Bresnahan, M., & Yoon, H. J. (1996). Individual- vs. culture-level dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Effects on preferred conversational styles. *Communication Monographs*, 63(1) 29-49.
- Kim, J., Kim, M. S., Kam, K. Y., & Shin, H. C. (2003). Influence of self-construals on the perception of different self-presentation styles in Korea. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 6, 89-101.
- Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S. C., & Yoon, G. (1994). *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Klopf, D. W. (1995). *Intercultural encounters: The fundamentals of intercultural communication*. (4th ed.). Englewood CO: Morton.
- Lewis, R. D. (1996). *When cultures collide: Managing successfully across cultures*. London UK: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2003). *Intercultural competence*, 4th ed. Boston MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Manrai, L. A., & Manrai, A. K. (1995). Effects of cultural-context, gender, and acculturation on perceptions of work versus social/leisure time usage. *Journal of Business Research*, 32, 115-128.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Ng, R. M. C. (1998). The influence of collectivism-individualism on persuasion in Chinese and American cultures. *Critical Studies*, 12, 71-82.
- Rey, A. (1994a). Social correlates of the usage of the Spanish "you" subject pronouns in Colombia, II. *Hispanic Journal*, 15, 291-305.
- Rey, A. (1994b). Sociolinguistic determinants of address in Spanish: Colombia revisited. *MIFLC Review*, 4, 131-143.
- Scurfield, E., & Lianyi, S. (2003). *Teach yourself beginner's Chinese*. Chicago IL: McGraw-Hill.
- Tanaka, K. M., & Bell, R. A. (1996). Equivocation in America and Japan: A cross-national comparison of the effects of situational conflict and status. *Communication Research*, 23, 261-296.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Kim and W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication*. Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Uber, D. R. (1985). The dual function of *usted*: Forms of address in Bogotá, Columbia. *Hispania: A Journal Devoted to the Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese*, 68(2) 388-392.
- Ward, R. (1963). The social fabric. In A. L. McLeod (Ed.), *The pattern of Australian culture* (pp. 12-41). Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yang, B. (1991). *The ugly Chinaman and the crisis of Chinese culture*. St. Leonards AU: Allen & Unwin.
- Yeung, L. N. T., Levine, T. R., & Nishiyama, K. (1999). Information manipulation theory and perceptions of deception in Hong Kong. *Communication Reports*, 99, 1-11.