

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS:

A COMPARISON OF THAIS AND AMERICANS

By

ANCHALEE TUNSAGUL LEESAVAN

Bachelor of Arts
Chulalongkorn University
Bangkok, Thailand
1972

Master of Arts
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1977

Thesis
1977D
L487e
cop. 2



CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS

A COMPARISON OF THAIS AND AMERICANS

Thesis Approved:

Ailee Johnson
Thesis Adviser

J. D. Hryly

Fred Jewell

Paul Harper

John W. Cusack

Norman N. Durban
Dean of the Graduate College

997292

PREFACE

This study is concerned with discovering the relationship between communication patterns and cultural differences. Specifically, the study sought to determine whether there are differences between Thai and American students in their communication patterns.

Deepest appreciation is expressed to my adviser, Dr. Arlee Johnson for his encouragement and guidance throughout this study. His interest, suggestions, and concern have been invaluable and are gratefully acknowledged.

Recognition is also extended to the other committee members: Dr. Fred Tewell, Dr. Paul Harper, and Dr. John Creswell. Their encouragement and comments are sincerely appreciated. A special thanks is given to Dr. Jim Hughey for his ingenious assistance and direction during the development of this study.

To my beloved husband, Saroj Ron Leesavan, I am greatly indebted for his sacrifice, understanding, and support. To my family in Thailand, especially my father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. Maetee Tunsagul, and also my dear brother, Taweepan Tunsagul, I am grateful for their spiritual strength and support. Without them I would not have been able to complete my degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| Operational Definitions | 2 |
| Purpose of the Study | 2 |
| Specific Research Questions | 7 |
| Importance of the Study | 9 |
| Organization of the Report | 11 |
| Summary | 11 |
| II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 13 |
| Communication Sensitivity | 13 |
| Cross-Cultural Differences | 22 |
| Cultural Differences: Nonverbal Factors | 24 |
| Cultural Differences: Attitudinal and Personality Factors | 28 |
| Thai-American Comparisons | 33 |
| Summary | 36 |
| III. METHODOLOGY | 38 |
| Research Design | 38 |
| Selection and Description of the Sample | 39 |
| Description of the Instrument | 39 |
| Data Collection Procedures | 43 |
| Statistical Procedures | 54 |
| Limitation of the Study | 55 |
| Summary | 55 |
| IV. RESULTS | 57 |
| Overview | 57 |
| Review of Statistical Procedures | 57 |
| Findings | 58 |
| Question 1 | 58 |
| Question 2 | 59 |
| Question 3 | 59 |
| Question 4 | 63 |
| Question 5 | 65 |
| Question 6 | 65 |
| Question 7 | 67 |
| Question 8 | 67 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| Question 9 | 69 |
| Question 10 | 70 |
| Question 11 | 72 |
| Question 12 | 72 |
| Question 13 | 72 |
| Question 14 | 74 |
| Question 15 | 74 |
| Question 16 | 76 |
| Question 17 | 77 |
| Question 18 | 79 |
| Question 19 | 79 |
| Question 20 | 80 |
| Question 21 | 81 |
| Summary | 81 |
| V. CONCLUSIONS | 84 |
| Discussion | 88 |
| Possible Interpretations of Findings | 88 |
| Practical Interpretation of Findings | 90 |
| Recommendations for Future Research | 91 |
| Summary | 92 |
| A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY | 94 |
| APPENDIXES | 98 |
| APPENDIX A - A MODIFIED VERSION OF CONVERSATION SELF-REPORT INVENTORY | 99 |
| APPENDIX B - MEANS FOR THAIS AND AMERICANS ON FIFTY-TWO CONVERSATIONAL FACTORS | 112 |
| APPENDIX C - ITEMS INCLUDED IN EACH OF THE FIFTY-ONE FACTORS OR COMMUNICATION PATTERNS | 114 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| I. Smith's Sensitivity Theory | 18 |
| II. A Matched Set of Fifty Thai and Fifty American Students . . | 40 |
| III. Fifty-One Factors That Had Eigen Value Greater Than 1 (Significance of Variance) as Determined Through Factor Analysis | 44 |
| IV. Twenty-One Communication Groupings as Determined Through Thematic Analysis from Fifty-One Factors of CSRI | 50 |
| V. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Communication Sensitivity | 58 |
| VI. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 2 and 12 | 59 |
| VII. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 3, 15, 18, 22, 25, 26, 30, 35, 39, 45, 47 and 48 | 61 |
| VIII. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 38 and 46 | 64 |
| IX. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 5 | 65 |
| X. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 6, 28 and 37 | 66 |
| XI. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 9 and 21 | 68 |
| XII. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 10 and 36 | 69 |
| XIII. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 13, 32 and 50 | 70 |
| XIV. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 16 and 42 | 71 |

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| XV. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 17, 24 and 51 | 73 |
| XVI. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 19 and 49 | 73 |
| XVII. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 20 | 74 |
| XVIII. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 23 | 75 |
| XIX. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 27, 29 and 44 | 76 |
| XX. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 40 | 77 |
| XXI. One-Way ANOVAS Comparing Thais and Americans on Factors 41 and 43 | 78 |
| XXII. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 31 | 79 |
| XXIII. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 33 | 80 |
| XXIV. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 34 | 81 |
| XXV. One-Way ANOVA Comparing Thais and Americans on Factor 3 | 82 |
| XXVI. Summary of Significant Differences Between Thais and Americans on Communication Patterns | 83 |

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Most literature on communication supports the general proposition that various communication attitudes and behaviors of individuals in one culture differ from those of another (19, 21, 30, 39). However, much of the evidence supporting the nature of these differences is anecdotal in nature. For instance, writers like Hall provide illustrations drawn from their experiences that point to communication problems stemming from cultural differences in conceptualizing time, space, friendship, contractual agreements and status symbols (18). However, the job of quantifying the specific areas of difference has received virtually no concerted effort.¹

This study was undertaken to determine if quantitative support could be found for cultural differences in communication patterns. It was based on a comparison of the communication attitudes and behaviors of individuals from two selected cultures in order to isolate specific areas of differences. More specifically, the central research question examined by the study was: Are there differences in communication patterns between Thai and American students at an American university?

¹The author's search of Psychological Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts, ERIC, and Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1974 failed to find more than a few quantitative studies dealing specifically with cross-cultural differences in communication patterns.

Operational Definitions

Fifty Thais and 50 Americans at Oklahoma State University during the Fall Semester of 1976 were chosen to represent the two selected variations of culture, the independent variable. A detailed discussion of selection procedures is presented in Chapter III.

The Conversation Self-Report Inventory (SCRI) was used in operationalizing the dependent variable, communication patterns. (The items from this inventory are reproduced in Appendix A, and the inventory is discussed in depth in Chapter III.) The original forced-choice format of the inventory was recast into an agree-disagree format for the purpose of this research. In past research, the CSRI has been used exclusively to tap a single communication pattern, communication sensitivity (13, 16, 32, 48, 49). However, because of the way the inventory was initially constructed, it was felt that additional patterns of communication could be tapped (32). A factor analysis of the items cast in an agree-disagree format produced 51 subscales in addition to the sensitivity scale. Hence, the inventory allowed the researcher to investigate 52 relatively distinct communication patterns.

Purpose of the Study

Cultural differences in communication patterns are the main concern in this study. The main purposes of the research are:

1. to compare the communication sensitivity of Thai and American students at an American university; and
2. to compare Thai and American students in terms of the 51 additional communication patterns measured by the CSRI.

The first purpose was pursued because of the importance of the "communication sensitivity" construct to communication theory. John W. Keltner in his book, Interpersonal Speech-Communication: Elements and Structures, describes the person who is sensitive to other people as one who

. . . must understand the other person's set of values, increases the total use of all his senses in perceiving himself and other people, recognizes his own biases and values and to account for these when he judges what he observes, and be able to empathize with others; that is, he must be able to perceive another person's feelings, thoughts and behavior as if they were his own (25, pp. 28-29).

Nearly every type of communication behavior is dependent upon a sensitivity to people. In a continuing research program with students and colleagues, Jim D. Hughey and Arlee W. Johnson have studied the phenomenon of communication sensitivity over a six-year period. They cite the following as being supported by existing research:

1. The communication attitudes and behaviors self-disclosed by more sensitive communicators differ from the characteristics self-disclosed by less sensitive communicators.
2. People possessing more sensitive patterns of communication are better able to predict how others will respond in various situations than those possessing less sensitive patterns of communication. In other words, empirical evidence has validated the claim that a person's insight into another's behavior is related to how he communicates.
3. People participating in communication encounters with more sensitive communicators report they receive more satisfaction from the encounters than people participating in encounters with less sensitive communicators (24, pp. 382-383).

However, these conclusions are based upon American samples. The question arises: Is "communication sensitivity" a culture-free or culture-specific construct? Is it reasonable to speak of a person's communication sensitivity regardless of his/her culture or is the

construct appropriate only when speaking of Americans? It was hoped that this study would provide a partial answer to this question. If Americans scored significantly different from Thais on the communication sensitivity scale, there would be evidence that the construct is culture-specific; on the other hand, a lack of difference would provide evidence, though inconclusive, for it being a culture-free construct.

The second purpose was pursued because of the relationship postulated in the literature concerning culture and communication. To begin an examination of this postulated relationship the notion of "culture" and the concept of "communication" had to be considered.

Arensberg and Niehoff (2) define culture as

. . . the sum total of what individuals learn in common with other members of the group to which they belong. Basically, it is what an individual has learned from the people who reared him, most of which they learned from their elders. Culture knowledge also includes what the individual learns from his fellows and from his teachers when they formally or informally pass on group knowledge (p. 16).

Karl Deutsch (10) defines culture in the following way:

. . . Culture is based on the community of communication, consisting of socially stereotyped patterns of behavior, including habits of language and thoughts, and carried on through various forms of child rearing standardized in this culture (p. 37).

Arthur Smith (44) says that culture represents the manifold ways people see and organize phenomena. Culture grouping is defined as people sharing a common code, heritage, history, and social organization pattern. Culture is also a way of thinking; for example, people living in Western society learn according to Western cultural behavior.

Alfred G. Smith (43) also indicates that culture, above all, is what distinguishes human beings from other animals. Man is the only animal who creates and uses language propositionally, possesses

religion, appreciates art, and manufactures instruments of construction and destruction. These are learned and shared behaviors, and any behavior that is learned and shared is cultural (p. 7).

The author could cite definitions of the term culture ad infinitum. In fact scholars have tried to define this term from the year 1500 B.C. up to this day. Their definitions have been descriptive, philosophical, historical, psychological and normative. But the most acceptable definition, for the purpose of this study, could be that "culture" is the sum total of learned behaviors of a group of people living in a geographic area. These behaviors transmitted from generation to generation are generally considered to be the tradition of that people (42). The term culture includes the cumulative deposit of knowledge, experience, meanings, beliefs, values, attitudes, religions, concepts of self, conceptions of the universe, and self-universe relationships, hierarchies of status, role expectations, spatial relations, and time concepts acquired by a large group of people in the course of generations.

However, the principal force behind any culture is communication, for culture is transmitted from generation to generation through communication. The relationship between culture and communication is inevitable. Harms (21) supports this by saying that the cultural background of a communicator influences almost every detail and every pattern of his communication activities. Therefore, the relationship between culture and communication needs to be made explicit. But first the term communication will be defined.

Random House Dictionary (34) defines communication as the

. . . act or process of communicating, fact of being communicated; the imparting of interchange of thoughts, opinions, or information by speech, writing, or signs; something imparted,

interchanged or transmitted; a document or message imparted news, views, information, etc.; passage or an opportunity or means of passage, between places (p. 298).

The above definition is broad and inclusive.

Sereno and Mortensen (40) concur with that definition: "The term 'communication' may be defined as a process by which senders and receivers of messages interact in given social contexts" (p. 5).

Rogers (38) assumes the identical meaning: "Communication is the process by which messages are transferred from a source to the receiver" (p. 11).

Cherry (7) states: "Strictly, the word communication comes from the Latin communico--meaning share. Notice [I said] 'share,' 'I send messages.' Communication is essentially a social process" (p. 2). In other words, communication involves man adapting to his environment through the process of receiving and transmitting verbal and nonverbal messages at one or more levels of interaction (24). This study focuses on intercultural or cross-cultural communication. And cross-cultural communication means communication between peoples of different cultures. René Dubois (11) makes a related observation concerning the central relationship between culture and communication:

. . . clearly culture, if this word is defined as everything learned by experience and transmitted from one generation to the next, can reach high levels without elaborate technology. Culture is the expression of man's responses to the physical and human environment. These responses take the form of behavioral patterns and emotional relationships as well as the development of utilitarian objects (p. 38).

Dubois' idea indicates the relationship of culture and communication in terms of culture transmitted from generation to generation by means of communication.

Alfred G. Smith (43) also verifies the relationship of communication and culture by saying that culture is a code we learn and share, and learning and sharing require communication. Communication, in turn, requires coding and symbols which must be learned and shared. Therefore, communication and culture are inseparably intertwined.

The definitions provided imply that communication between communicators of similar cultural background will be easier, more reliable, faster, safer, etc., than communication between communicators of dissimilar cultural backgrounds. Culture is very complex, varying along many dimensions. For example, differences between Asian and Western cultures seem maximal. There seems to be the greatest number of cultural factors subject to variation. Physical appearance, religion, philosophy, social attitudes, language, heritage, basic conceptualizations of self and the universe are among the cultural factors that differ sharply. Given such a wide range of differences, one might expect that communication patterns utilized might also vary between these cultures.

Specific Research Questions

Fifty-two communication patterns derived from the CSRI were investigated. Because of the relatively large number of patterns, those patterns having similar themes were grouped together for presentational purposes. This resulted in 21 groupings and, hence, 21 primary research questions.

Question 1. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in reported communication sensitivity in a conversation?

Question 2. Is there a difference between Thai and American

students in insensitivity to people in a conversation?

Question 3. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in involvement in a conversation?

Question 4. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in verbal-nonverbal orientation in a conversation?

Question 5. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in correcting others in a conversation?

Question 6. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in expressing concern for understanding in a conversation?

Question 7. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being direct in a conversation?

Question 8. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in expressing communicative impatience in a conversation?

Question 9. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in revealing feelings in a conversation?

Question 10. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being relaxed or tense in a conversation?

Question 11. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in listening habits in a conversation?

Question 12. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in expressing concern for trust, frankness, and candor in a conversation?

Question 13. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being talkative in a conversation?

Question 14. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being tenacious in a conversation?

Question 15. Is there a difference between Thai and American

students in making communicative assumptions in a conversation?

Question 16. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in showing disregard for social conversation?

Question 17. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in handling difficult conversational situations?

Question 18. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being objective in a conversation?

Question 19. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in showing concern for agreement and influence in a conversation?

Question 20. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in acting logically in a conversation?

Question 21. Is there a difference between Thai and American students in reported self-confirmation?

Chapter II reviews the communication literature pertinent to these questions. From this review, where possible, expected differences are postulated for several of these questions.

Importance of the Study

As far as the author has been able to determine, there has been no research conducted on the differences in communication patterns between Thai and American students. Since cross-cultural communication is the author's main concern and since the author is one of a few Thais whose field of study is speech communication, she kept in mind that her study must be relevant and meaningful to herself as well as to her fellowmen. Also, it seemed highly possible that the research would be of inestimable value upon her return to Thailand.

The significance of this study could be summarized as follows:

First, the present study purports to gain a better understanding of communication pattern differences that are cultural in nature. The study itself could provide means for both Thais and Americans to gain awareness of their communication habits or communicative patterns. Therefore, people of both cultures could approach and communicate with each other with greater sensitivity and greater understanding.

Second, the research results could provide some insight into problems that international students have on an American campus. It is likely that most international students who come to pursue their education in America experience problems in adjusting. The problems could concern communication difficulties, cultural shock, personal problems, and/or professional problems. This has happened in Canada. Louis Y. Cheng (6) indicates that psychiatric problems of foreign residents in Canada can be classified under the headings of communication difficulties, cultural differences, personal problems, and professional problems. It has been found that each resident has a unique combination of problems; each derives his values from his cultural shift (6).

The experience of Mr. Fred Nome, Educational Attache, Royal Norwegian Consulate General, described below, also supports the existence of adjustment problems that most foreign students must face.

Mr. Nome related his experience as a foreign student in this country, starting with a discussion of problems experienced by him before coming because of the lack of information available about the educational system of the United States, the financial problems involved (compounded because European institutions do not charge tuition), arranging for a visa, deciding on a specific school to which to apply, etc. After arriving here, he experienced a period of cultural shock, which, together with what he felt to be a down-grading of his Norwegian credentials, made his initial adjustment rather difficult. His problems were intensified by his transfer to

another school and a change of goal, involving a change of major. All of this prepared him well for his current position, which involves assisting Norwegian students to make an easier transition to studying in this country.

Nr. Norm mentioned three areas where improvements might be made: (1) in preparing publications for foreign students that give more specific information about life in the United States, thus reducing the period of culture shock; (2) in giving more explicit definitions of terms used, differences in educational patterns in various countries and related problems of meshing them; and (3) in developing better trained foreign student advisers, especially in the smaller schools in the country, who can help foreign students to make smoother adjustments here (50, p. 496).

Mr. Nome's experience above also includes communication barriers and cultural differences that foreign students may have on American campuses. The present study may provide answers to these problems as far as communication is concerned.

Organization of the Report

The plan followed in this report is as follows. Chapter II will review what is currently known about communication sensitivity, as well as present a more far-reaching summary of communication pattern differences among various cultural groups. Chapter III describes the methodology and procedures utilized in this study. Chapter IV presents the results of the study, and Chapter V provides a discussion of these results and the conclusions of the study.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to determine communication pattern differences between Thai and American students at an American university. The significance of the study is first, the study will provide a better understanding of the impact of cultural differences in communication

patterns; second, the study may provide some answers to the problems of international students on an American campus.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of literature related to communication patterns, especially as they might vary among cultural groups. The organization of this chapter will be such that research and theory related to the communication sensitivity pattern will be discussed first. Then, cross-cultural differences in other communication patterns will be examined.¹

Communication Sensitivity

Communication sensitivity is an important concept for interpersonal communication. Writers since the time of Aristotle have indicated that differences in backgrounds, interests, motivation, and numerous other personality and psychological factors must be bridged for communication to be successful (32). With all the complexities, idiosyncrasies and inherent differences in the human animal, it is surprising that communication is so often successful. Rogers and Roethlisberger (37) contend that there are two patterns of communication men use to overcome any

¹Not all communication groupings measured by the CSRI will be covered in the review of literature because of the inability of the author to find literature related to them. Specifically, the groupings that will not be dealt with are: Grouping 6, Concern for Understanding; Grouping 11, Listening; Group 12, Trust, Frankness and Candor; Grouping 13, Talkativeness; Grouping 16, Social Convention; and Grouping 19, Concern for Agreement and Influence.

barriers. In explaining the position and theory of these two patterns, they attempt to catalog the underlying assumptions involved in each pattern. The pattern one communicator is sender-oriented; influence is his goal. On the other hand, the pattern two communicator is receiver-oriented and aims at understanding.

The behaviors of Rogers and Roethlisberger's pattern two communicator are those of the sensitive communicator. They define communication sensitivity in terms of the behaviors demonstrated by a sensitive communicator as contrasted with an insensitive communicator: ". . . for the latter is verbally rather than nonverbally oriented, evaluative rather than supportive, and concerned with getting the receiver to accept what the communicator has to say" (37, pp. 46-47). Rogers and Roethlisberger (37) indicate that a sensitivity to people and the factors involved in interpersonal communication are the answer to the barrier of individual differences.

Hart and Burks (22) look at communication sensitivity from a different perspective. They indicate that the sensitive person has, in their words, a "repertoire of selves," one of which is chosen by the individual for a given rhetorical situation. The choice making of the sensitive person is complex. He may well have in his repertoire of selves those capable of ranging across the whole continuum of possible responses. After deciding which self to cast in the transaction, the sensitive person makes other choices not solely on the basis of the perspective of the self, nor solely on the basis of the perspectives of others, but on the basis of an attempt to blend the perspectives. The ideas, feelings, and goals of self and those of others have to be taken into account together (22, pp. 179-180). In other words, Hart and

Burks point out the many roles the sensitive communicator plays by stating:

Sensitive persons are dialoguists, lovers, believers in shared choice. They don't want to control the choices of a transaction, or play the passive foil or the willing victim for any controller. They neither make the choice from their own perspective . . . nor adopt the choice from another person's perspective. Rather, they engage in a transaction, in a merging of perspectives out of which is to come a series of shared choices.

Sensitive persons clearly meet all six of the conditions Johannesen sets forth for the mode of dialogue: they're genuine (the selves they select are in their repertoire), they aim at accurate empathic understanding (checking it repeatedly in directions), they offer the other person unconditional positive regard (by granting self and the other the freedom to share choices, they embody presentness (those choices have not been foreordained but are made now), they work toward a spirit of mutual equality (neither taking another's prerogatives nor giving away their [sic] own, and they help establish a supportive psychological climate for themselves and for others (which is implied by the other five conditions) (pp. 180-181).

Moreover, Hart and Burks further explain that sensitive persons regard the transaction as bilateral. They look at the other person as a person, not as an object or as a victim, and they try to maximize that person's freedom of choice. Above all, sensitive communicators have potential for change and for growth. When people see a communicative transaction as a process, they can see themselves as processes too, as persons who can change and grow. Such people also can grant others the freedom to change and grow (22).

Closely allied with the ideas of Hart and Burks are Steinberg and Miller's (46). They recognize two fundamental orientations toward interpersonal communication: one is an orientation toward understanding the behaviors of others, and the other is an orientation toward controlling the behaviors of others. Most people are acquainted with some

understanders (sometimes known as "empathizers," "sympathizers," or "good friends") and some controllers (known as "operators," "manipulators," or "con artists"). They state that the term fundamental orientation represents a combination of the needs, intentions, and values of an individual. Most of people's needs, intentions, and values are products of their communication environments; they grow out of their associations with other persons (46). Steinberg and Miller also indicate the differences between controllers and understanders as follows:

Controllers manifest a basic need to assume command over other people . . . seeking power positions in all relationships . . . They develop a set of intentions in keeping with their needs; they formulate and execute communication strategies designed to put them in dominant positions. Basically, their values are self-seeking and selfish: they adopt a communication strategy that enables them to control communication situations . . . Controllers are continually in conflict with others (not necessarily open and heated conflict); since they see others as threats to their security, they are more comfortable giving orders than getting close to their fellow communicators.

Understanders have a basic need to figure out what they themselves, as well as other people, are like. They enjoy developing close personal relationships and prefer to keep conflict at a minimum. Thus, their intentions lead them to develop message strategies that maximize the probability of opening up honest relationships. When compared with controllers, their values tend to be unselfish, since they put the freedom of others roughly on a par with their own freedom (p. 135).

The description of controllers is similar to that of pattern one communicators of Rogers and Roethlisberger. However, the description of understanders is exactly the description of Hart and Burks' sensitive persons. In addition, Steinberg and Miller indicate that understanders are active listeners. Listening is a necessity for understanding. Understanders not only listen with ears; they listen with their eyes as well. They know that the nonverbal behavior of their companions is at

least as important as their verbal behavior, and sometimes more so. A person's facial expression, gestures, and body posture, combined with such cues as vocal intensity and tone of voice, provide the understander with many insights about the other communicator (46).

In conflict situations, understanders deal with conflict by trying to define the situation in mutually satisfying ways. They modify shared rule systems in all communication situations. Shared rule systems of Steinberg and Miller are equivalent to what Hart and Burks call shared choices.

Henry Clay Smith (45) establishes a rigorous and complete examination of the sensitive individual in his book Sensitivity to People. Smith defines sensitivity as "the ability to predict what a person will feel, say, and do about you, himself and others" (p. 3). Sensitivity in Smith's framework is a very complex interaction of many factors. To illustrate his theory, Smith sets up the hypothetical situation of a perceiver rating the intelligence of another person. The rating is based on six perceptual determinants. The first two concern the person doing the perceiving. The second two involve the interaction between the perceiver and the person being perceived. The last two are an indication of the perceiver's knowledge of the person he is perceiving. These six factors are:

1. A perceiver's level is his general tendency to rate others as low, average, or high; as poor, fair, or superior; as possessing few, some, or many desirable traits; or as deserving an F, C, or A grade.
2. A perceiver's spread is his general tendency to rate himself and others over a narrow or wide range. The narrow spread sticks close to his level, tending to give all people and all traits about the same rating. The wide spreader tends to rate at the extremes, rating people as very high, or very low, very good, or very bad . . .

3. The core idea of empathy is the ability to transfer one-self imaginatively into the feeling, thinking, and acting of another. It is the best-known, but most elusive idea in the field of sensitivity. We shall consistently use the term to mean the tendency of a perceiver to assume another person's feelings, thoughts, and behavior are similar to his own.
4. Observation is obviously an important determinant of sensitivity, for what we hear a person say and see him do has much to do with the inferences we make about him.
5. Our present judgements of an individual are influenced by our past judgements of the groups to which the individual belongs. Thus, the business executive who thinks that the typical union leader is egoistical and emotional is likely to have similar thoughts about each individual union leader he meets. We shall refer to this influence on our judgements as stereotyping.
6. Our level, spread, empathy, observations we make between groups exert an independent influence on the predictions we make about a person. What remains of our judgements is the influence of our differentiations between individuals (45, pp. 17-20).

The relationships of Smith's Sensitivity Theory are provided in Table I.

TABLE I
SMITH'S SENSITIVITY THEORY

| Judging Habits of the Perceiver | Interaction | His Knowledge of the Person |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|
| His level | His empathy | His stereotypes |
| His spread | His observations | His knowledge of the individual |

There are several pertinent conclusions to be reached from Smith's theory.

1. Sensitivity is a complex interaction of at least six factors.
2. Sensitivity involves the processes of perception, inference and role-taking.
3. Sensitivity may be improved through education.
4. The only true test of sensitivity is the accuracy of prediction of how a person will think and behave (p. 4).

A synthesis of these theories of sensitivity and application of them to communication confirm the following theoretical model. Sensitivity in communication involves an active, deliberate and open interaction by all parties. It requires the complete and competent exercise of the skills of perception, prediction and active role-taking. In other words, the key terms for communication sensitivity are accurate observations, empathy, correct stereotypes, knowledge of the individual, and correct inferences.

Following the development of theoretical notions related to communication sensitivity, will be an examination of research findings directly relevant to the construct.

After examining much of the data designed to describe demographically the sensitive communicator, Neal (32) describes the sensitive communication in this way:

. . . this communicator is socially active and takes a dominant, influential role in group communications. He tends to be more realistic and possess a degree of artistic ability. Perhaps the most significant possession of the sensitive communicator is his superior mental abilities and intelligence . . . He tends to be a mature young adult (age 22-28) rather than a late adolescent (age 17-21). He also reports having a relatively happy childhood. He seems to be capable of self-reporting his communication abilities. His personality variables indicate that the sensitive person is

sociable and has a high degree of presence in interpersonal settings. He is an individual who feels a degree of well-being about himself. Generally he is more responsible and tolerant . . . capable of creating a good impression and concerned with how others react to him . . . , and is concerned with the happiness and well-being of others. He is capable of leadership but disdains the power and autonomy that come with absolute leadership. The sensitive leader gives direction and momentum without creating any fear or dislike that could destroy effective communication (pp. 89-90).

Neal also indicates that females, more than males, are likely to be sensitive communicators.

In his research to determine the relationship between communication sensitivity and the production of conversation satisfaction, John Robert Evans (13) finds that sensitive interviewers produce significantly greater conversation satisfaction in their interviewees than do less sensitive interviewers. Evans characterizes the less sensitive individuals (those who attained very low scores on the Conversation Self-Report Inventory) as persuasive communicators.

As far as the relationship between sensitivity and satisfaction is concerned Robert D. Archibald (1) attempts to determine if the traits of flexibility, openness, and sensitivity found in high school teachers is associated with higher levels of satisfaction among students. Support was found for the hypothesis that the openness, flexibility, and sensitivity of a teacher's cognitive style and perceptual systems can have positive effects on the satisfaction and adjustment of students. Archibald concludes that:

However, without sensitivity to understand another and to resist the inclination to make strong and negative attributions based on unusual behavior, the 'concerned' teacher may be seen as paternalistic and unresponsive (abstract).

From the findings above it is accurate to say that sensitivity is a necessity for the success of most communication situations.

In the study of the relationship of communication sensitivity and insight (the ability to accurately predict the behaviors, feelings, etc. of others), Jane Roberts (35) finds that high-insight individuals attain significantly higher scores on communication sensitivity than do low-insight individuals.

In two studies, both Tucker and Wilson (49) find an inverse relationship between communication sensitivity and violence proneness. Their findings indicate that sensitive communicators are less prone to violence whereas less sensitive communicators are more prone to acts of violence. In a second study, conducted to seek the relationship between communication sensitivity and selected types of aggression, Tucker (48) proves an inverse relationship between communication sensitivity and physical aggression. More specifically, high and middle-level sensitivity groups report less physical aggression than a low communication sensitivity group. A similar inverse relationship also is found to exist between communication sensitivity and verbal aggression (pp. 92-93).

Larry Glidewell (16) conducted a study comparing the communication sensitivity of managers who differed in terms of their acceptance of various theoretical styles of management. His findings indicate that 9.9 managers, whose concern for work and for people are very high, are likely to be sensitive communicators whereas 1.1 managers, whose concern for work and for people are very low, are likely to be less sensitive communicators.

In a related study, Robert E. Hall (20) examined the relationship between Transactional Analysis ego grams, communication sensitivity and managerial decision-making style. His findings indicate that

. . . individuals with large Adult ego grams were not significantly more sensitive communicators. . . . Large Parents ego grams did significantly better on the managerial maze at gathering facts before making an ultimate decision. . . . People who successfully gathered facts before coming to a decision on the managerial maze were more sensitive communicators (abstract).

In short, Hall's evidence indicates that individuals who gather many facts before making a managerial decision are more sensitive communicators than those who gather fewer facts.

Research evidence related to communication sensitivity thus indicates that the sensitive communicator has greater insight into others and produces greater communication satisfaction for himself and others. He does this by possessing superior mental abilities and intelligence, making human relations assumptions about others, and gathering facts before making decisions.

No previous studies have attempted to find cultural differences in communication sensitivity. As a result of this omission, one of the chief purposes of this study was to find out if the concept of communication sensitivity as measured by the CSRI was culture-free or culture-specific.

Cross-Cultural Differences

As was stated in Chapter I, most of the support concerning culturally based communication differences comes from non-quantitative evidence. In this section the attempt is made to verbalize some of the generalizations drawn from the non-quantitative literature.

For most communicators, interchange is easier intraculturally than cross-culturally. Arthur L. Smith (44) states:

Culture, like communication, has fallen heir to a lifetime of definition and redefinition by anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists. . . . Culture represents the manifold ways people see and organize phenomena. Most usually, cultural grouping is defined as people sharing a common code, heritage, and social organization pattern. Cultural reality is expressed in a people's institutions, proverbs, ceremonies, religion, and polity, and can be identified as separate from the culture of another people (p. 25).

In other words, men in all societies respond to the same realities. The perception of these realities, however, manifests itself in various manners. In fact, to say that men all react to the same concrete realities might not be exactly correct because what one person perceives when focusing on a given phenomenon might be different from another's perception. Men's perceptives on realities can affect cross-cultural communication. Each person brings to the interpersonal relationship, as with other realities, a store of ideas, beliefs, habits, customs, and attitudes significantly different from those of other people. As people differ, individually and culturally, in their orientation to given realities, congruence on any phenomenon is difficult (8).

Arthur Smith (44) supports Church's idea that problems of communication are often seriously aggravated by the incongruence of cultural experiences. However, this is not to say that communicators must possess identical world views before they can have meaningful discussion; it is rather to argue that shared cultural influences and experiences among communicators produce more predictable results. Or, in other words, people who have learned and shared the same culture will have a higher probability of understanding each other than people who have different codes and behavioral standards (44, p. 28).

One good example of cross-cultural incongruity is given by Edward C. Stewart (47):

The experienced American overseas becomes very uncomfortable when he talks to an Arab or a Latin American whose face is only a short distance from his own. Their proximity merely expresses a more personalized manner of interacting with other people; it is a custom, however, that is incompatible with American habits (p. 281).

Stewart indicates that the cultural pattern presents the obstacles to the process of communication and cooperation overseas. The difficulty in cross-cultural communication and cooperation for U. S. advisors overseas lies primarily in the disparity and conflict between the advisor's own cultural pattern and that of his foreign counterpart, and only secondarily in the strangeness of the foreign ways. It certainly appears that the cross-cultural performance of the U. S. advisor would be enhanced if his area training included instruction on the U. S. cultural pattern as well as on the foreign pattern (p. 279).

A synthesis of Stewart's findings reveals that communication problems among cultural groups occur because of lack of understanding of cultural pattern differences as well as differences in personality and behavior of the communicators involved.

Cultural Differences: Nonverbal Factors

In this section the review of literature related to cultural differences in the nonverbal communication pattern will be examined first. Then, literature relevant to cultural differences in attitudinal and personality factors related to communication will be examined. Finally, previous research comparing the Thai and American cultures in areas pertinent to the present study will be reviewed. It should be noted that there are some quantitative studies in these areas. But none of the quantitative studies deals directly with communication patterns.

Albert Mehrabian (30) reported a large number of studies dealing with nonverbal communication. He argues that people approach things that they like and avoid others that they dislike. This immediacy principle allows people to infer feelings, not only from actual movements toward or away from people, things, and even ideas, but also from observation of abbreviated movements and gestures. Greater liking is conveyed by standing close instead of far away, leaning forward instead of back while seated, facing directly instead of turning to one side, touching, having eye contact, prolonging goodbyes, or during a greeting using gestures which imply a reaching out toward the other person who is at a distance (p. 22). Mehrabian also points out that people from different cultures differ in terms of the amount of self-disclosure they characteristically allow. Some people carefully and consistently guard against such disclosure by physically keeping their distance and appearing uninvolved. When forced to be close to others, they look away and sometimes shrink physically from the contact, giving the impression of acute anxiety and discomfort (p. 9).

Edward T. Hall (18, 19) described the social styles of various cultural groups. One striking difference between Arabs and Americans is that the former are more likely to stand closer, touch more, orient more directly, and speak louder; in other words, Arabs are more immediate. Latin Americans also prefer a closer talking distance than do North Americans. Thus, if a Latin American and a North American converse standing up, the Latin tends to move closer and the North American tends to back away, each seeking to maintain his own habitual distance (19). Engebretson and Fullmer (12) in investigating distance between dyads as a function of relationship, culture, sex, and conversational

content by using an adaptation of Kuethe's (1962) Felt Figure technique, conclude that relationship is the most powerful determinant of distance. Culture is also significant, but sex and content are not. Their samples were Native Japanese, Hawaii Japanese, with American Caucasians serving as the comparison group. As predicted, Native Japanese had greater distances than either Hawaii Japanese or American Caucasians. However, no differences were found between Hawaii Japanese and American Caucasians (p. 261).

Hollender et al. (23) studied the influence of cultural attitudes on the wish to be held. They distributed questionnaires to five groups of Asian women living in Kuala Lumpur, Malasia. Subjects (N = 190) were mostly in their twenties or thirties. The most striking differences found were those between two groups of Chinese, one Chinese-educated and the other English-educated. The Chinese-educated group failed to express their sensual needs. An English education overturned the traditional mode of response; subjects in this group scored highest in their wish to be held and lowest in their inclination to keep their body-contact desires secret. It is concluded that cultural, as well as psychological forces, exert a profound influence on the wish to be held.

Nonverbal cues such as proxemics or distance vary because of the functions and influences of cultural differences. Moreover, the actions or nonverbal behaviors of people are also reflected and influenced by the status differences they feel they possess. The clue to status differences is the degree of hesitation and discomfort. The way in which status differences affect people's interactions tend to be even more pronounced in the more authoritarian and traditional Middle Eastern or

Oriental cultures (30, p. 25). In these cultures, there is an important and pervasive influence on nonverbal behaviors due to the greater and more open respect for tradition, the wisdom of old age, and social position. In the Middle East, the uneasiness about turning one's back on friends is illustrated by formalities and going through an entrance. There are many arguments at the thresholds or entrances, as each of two peers insists that the other should enjoy the privilege of going first. The admiration in a friendship is constantly reiterated through such acts, which convey one's humble and respectful attitude towards his friends and his elders (p. 26). Mehrabian also confirms that experiments have shown that more submissive persons speak in a softer voice in interacting with a stranger (31). He made an acute observation that when the Oriental musicians bowed, the principal performer did not bow quite so low as the others of that musical ensemble. In the Orient, the significance of bowing and its relation to status is obvious (30). For example, in Thailand youngsters bow lower to elders as the sign of age and respect.

Dominance or status shown through nonverbal behavior seems to be based on the feeling of power or fearlessness. Power coexists with large size (expansive versus small and controlled postures and movements), and height (for example, standing upright versus bowing). Absence of fear is implied by the relaxation versus tension and by the ability to turn one's back to another. By and large, people's nonverbal behaviors are reflected and influenced by the status differences they feel they possess (30).

Since the acceptable standards for nonverbal behaviors vary, certain behaviors that are normal for other cultures but alien in our

own can assume great importance for us. Alternatively, a behavior that seems common and insignificant in our culture may have great implications for foreigners or people in other countries. The differences in the interpretation of a certain behavior arise from the different cultural standards that have been set to define what is acceptable and what is not.

The cultural differences in nonverbal behavior which have been found would, of course, suggest that Thais and Americans would differ in terms of the verbal-nonverbal pattern of communication (see Table IV, Grouping 4). This pattern deals directly with such variables as touching behavior, visual directness and nonverbal expressiveness. There are other patterns for which the nonverbal findings discussed may also have some relevance. For example, Grouping 8 deals with variables related to nonverbal behavior in terms of the amount of time consumed by a conversation and the communicator's responses to elapsed time in the forms of tiredness and hurrying the conversation along. Grouping 9 is also related to nonverbal behavior in terms of controlling the expression of emotions by appearing calm. Grouping 10 also deals with degree of relaxation in terms of the communicator being relaxed as opposed to being conscious of posture.

In summary, the author would expect to find differences between Thais and Americans in Groupings 4, 8, 9, and 10.

Cultural Differences: Attitudinal and Personality Factors

The variables that will be considered in this section are (1) hostility, aggression and conflict, and (2) anxiety and self esteem.

Hostility grows out of competitiveness engendered by defensive communication. The blocking of any goal-directed behavior may arouse hostile and aggressive tendencies which are reflected in interpersonal communication. However, contemporary man has come to disapprove of fighting as a means of handling hostility (5). But there are other adjustive techniques available in reducing hostility and aggression:

1. Verbal aggression is an outlet for hostility. It is avoided by the good communicator.
2. Rationalization. When an individual finds that he cannot achieve the goal he wants, he adjusts to the situation by rationalizing--by speaking of the unattainable goal as an undesirable one.
3. Negativism. Another way one may react when experiencing hostility is to reject all or any part of proposals made to him. Some persons assume a general attitude of hostility and mistrust. Such behavior indicates a general attitude of rigidity and fear of any new idea. There is some indication that extreme rigidity and negativism is associated with low intelligence, low ability in role-taking, and high anxiety (5, pp. 90-91).

Various studies have examined hostility, aggression, and anxiety. Hostility and aggression are emotional states common to all people regardless of cultural differences. It is interesting to examine cross-cultural studies of hostility and aggression to see if the manner of expression varies among cultures. Green and Santori (17) conducted a cross-cultural study comparing the structure of hostile attitudes and aggressive behavior of two national groups, English and Italian, taking into account the national stereotypes involved. Their findings are:

While the two groups do not differ greatly in their overall level and general pattern of scoring on a questionnaire, there are nevertheless divergencies that reflect the differing norms of the two societies. In particular, the hostility/aggressive Italian has to contend with a display motive that seems to permeate his culture pattern and contributes to the stereotype of the 'Latin temperament.' Correspondingly, the stereotype of the perfidious, hypocritical Englishman is lent

credence, in that revenge cloaked in moral guise and world-weary cynicism and contempt are more apparent. . . . (17, p. 22).

Green and Santori conclude that, although culture patterns may be fruitfully compared in terms of the ways of handling and expressing hostility/aggression, it is meaningless to describe one culture pattern as more or less hostile/aggressive than another in any absolute terms since no external criterion exists that is not in some sense arbitrary. Das Gupta's study (9) indicates that generally American men show more aggression than Indian men and American women more than Indian women.

Brehmer et al. (4) performed a cross-national comparison with respect to conflict behavior in five countries: Czechoslovakia, Greece, Japan, Sweden, and the United States. No reliable cross-national differences were found. In addition, it was shown that the differences found between European and American subjects with respect to conflict behavior in an earlier study were due to procedural differences. Brehmer et al. conclude that cognitive conflict (conflict due to differences in beliefs) are independent of cultural factors.

The research findings relevant to cultural differences in hostility, aggression and conflict are mixed. For this reason, hypotheses related to whether Thais or Americans will differ in Groupings related to hostility, aggression and conflict seem unwarranted. Specifically Groupings 2, 5 and 7 seem to be relevant here. Grouping 2 deals with insensitivity which may be expressed either through insensitive aggression or indifference. Grouping 5 involves correcting others which certainly requires a degree of self-assertiveness that borders on aggression, at least verbal aggression. Grouping 7 is entitled "Being Direct" and includes the factor of being forthright versus being brusque

and insulting which situation again seems to be related to verbal aggression.

R. Lynn (29) advances the theory that there are measurable differences in the level of anxiety among the populations of the advanced Western nations. The method he proposed for the measurement of a nation's anxiety level is to:

1. take a number of epidemiological and demographic indices including the rates of mental illness, suicide, vehicle accidents, coronary heart disease, tobacco consumption, alcoholism, and calorie intake;
2. intercorrelate and factor analyze them to reveal the existence of an underlying general factor;
3. interpret the general factor as anxiety; and
4. score the nations with the highest anxiety levels (29).

The nations with the highest anxiety levels found in Lynn's study are Japan, Germany, Austria, and Italy. Those with the lowest anxiety levels are the United States, New Zealand, England and Ireland.

Closely related to Lynn's study is Paschal and Kuo's (33). Paschal and Kuo at Ball State University conducted a cross-cultural study of test anxiety, manifest anxiety, and self-esteem factors in the self-concept among American and Chinese college students. Sixty subjects were selected from students at Ball State University and 60 subjects from the National Chengshi University in Taiwan. Twenty-three males and 37 females constituted each group. Subjects were matched with respect to age, sex, grade equivalents, and birth order. They responded to the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and its translation. A 2 x 2 x 3 factorial multivariate analysis of variance tested seven null hypotheses.

The seven dependent variables were number of deviant signs, manifest anxiety, self-esteem, net conflict, total conflict, variability, and test anxiety. Results indicate that Chinese subjects are considerably more anxious, more variable, more compartmentalized, and more conflict-dominated than American subjects. The variability in self-esteem seems to cancel out the gross differences between students groups.

As another part of this review of literature, self-confirmation was considered as a pattern of communication. This relates to the favorableness of a person's perception of self. Frederick Koenig (28) examined the definition of self in France and Sweden. He found that Swedish students show greater social independence in their responses compared to the French, by having fewer consensual responses. However, both have fewer consensual responses than had been shown by United States students in an earlier investigation.

P. S. Fry (15) conducted a cross-cultural study on self-evaluations. He used 75 Canadian and 75 Asian-Indian 11 to 12 year-old pre-adolescents, and 25 to 30 year-old adults to assess the hypothesis that with increasing age individuals reveal increasing differentiation in categories of personal characteristics when evaluating themselves. Results of this study show a linear increase in variance with age in both cultural samples and confirm the findings of earlier investigations with American born subjects. It was found, however, that compared with Canadians, Asians have significantly lower mean summation self-evaluation scores and lower mean variance scores at each age level.

A review of the cultural differences found in anxiety and self-concept variables seems relevant to a number of the patterns dealt with in this study. Grouping 10 entitled "Being Relaxed or Tense" seems to

have some relationship to the findings on anxiety differences among cultures. One outcome of differing levels of anxiety should be the individual's degree of relaxation or tension.

Thus, the studies reviewed above provide support for the notion that culture influences the degree to which human beings evaluate themselves favorably or unfavorably. Grouping 21, self-confirmation, deals directly with the favorableness of the subject's description of himself. Among other groupings related to self-conception are Groupings 14, 15, 18, and 20. All of these groupings involve subjects reporting favorable characteristics of self: being steadfast (Grouping 14), inviting criticism from others (Grouping 15), being objective or open-minded in a conversation (Grouping 18), and seldom acting illogically (Grouping 20).

In summary, it would seem that research findings related to cultural differences in anxiety and self-conception provide some support for hypothesizing differences between cultural groups on a wide range of communication patterns.

Thai-American Comparisons

Prior to this present study, a comparison of Thais and Americans, an important review of previous research concerning differences and similarities between these two cultures was made. Ampai Siripipat (41) in her dissertation, A Comparison of Self Concepts of Thai and American High School Students, used 60 Thais and 60 Americans. Each group consisted of two academic groups (college-bound versus non-college-bound) with 30 students each. Each group of 30 consisted of 15 males and 15

females. The bases for comparison were the 12 measures yielded by the Counseling Form of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS): Total Positive Score, Identity, Self Satisfaction, Behavior, Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self, Social Self, Self Criticism, Variability Score and Distribution Score. Each of the 12 self concept indices was subjected to a 2 x 2 x 3 factorial analysis of variance.

The results of her study reveal no significant differences between the Thai and the American students on the Total Positive Score--the overall self esteem index. The finding of no difference is confirmed by Fitts and Hammer (14) who point out that the variables such as age, sex, race, and education do not cause significant self concept differences across groups. However, analysis of subscores show significant differences on two measures: Identity (how the individual sees himself) and Self Criticism in which the American students show more favorable sense of identity in that they are more open and capable of self criticism. Siripipat concludes that the climate of freedom in the American school or family may have had a part in making American students more capable of self criticism than the Thai students as shown by subscore comparisons (41, pp. 65-66).

Further analysis shows that the American college-bound students (CB) rate themselves higher than the Thai college-bound on three dimensions: Behavior (how an individual acts), Physical Self, and Moral-Ethical Self. Although significant, the differences on the respective subscores between countries are not extreme. Moreover, the Thai students as a group do not differ in the degree of their consistency and certainty of self concept from the American students. The

Variability Score indicates that the subjects of both samples are emotionally healthy, well-integrated individuals (41, p. 66).

The findings of Siripipat's investigation lead to the conclusion that, despite cultural differences, the American and the Thai high school students, in general, do not differ in terms of self esteem, personal worth, consistency, or certainty of self concept. In determining differences between sexes, female students perceive themselves favorably on two dimensions: Moral-Ethical Self and Social Self. Siripipat also points out that this result is in concert with the findings of Graves and Davidson and Lang (41). Since females mature both physically and socially at an earlier age than males, this factor probably contributes to higher means for females. The college-bound (CB) and the non-college-bound (NCB) do not differ in their self perceptions in any aspect. In other words, their academic differences do not make a difference in their self perceptions. However, among the Thai sample, the Thai NCB students, despite their lower academic achievement, do not necessarily suffer from lower self esteem (41, p. 70).

The reader will note that results relevant to cultural differences and self-evaluations when Thais and Americans are compared do not support findings obtained when other cultural groups are compared. Furthermore, when dealing with self-evaluations in conversational behavior, no conclusions can be inferred concerning Thai-American differences in self-concepts.

Another communication grouping included in this study is Involvement. Wohl et al. (51) in their study, Some Personality Characteristics of Thai and American University Students, utilized the Test of Social Insight (TSI) for a cross-cultural comparison of American and

Thai university students. Their data indicate that Thai subjects (N = 280) score significantly higher on the withdrawal, passivity, competitiveness and aggressivity subscales of the TSI than American subjects (N = 239). However, American students exhibit significantly greater cooperative tendencies than Thai students.

The findings of Wohl's study which compared Thai and American groups provide support for hypothesizing differences in Grouping 3 (Involvement). Certainly, one would expect Thais to be more passive than Americans. Wohl's findings also provide support for finding differences between Thais and Americans in Grouping 17 (Handling Difficult Conversational Situations). Specifically, one would expect Thais to report handling such situations by avoidance more than Americans.

Summary

The review of literature is divided into two parts:

1. Communication Sensitivity was examined as a central communication pattern. Previous research related to the communication sensitivity construct was summarized. No prediction of differences was justified.

2. The literature of cross-cultural differences in communication patterns also was examined. This review led to the expectation that some differences in communication patterns of Thais and Americans would be found, especially in the following groupings: Grouping 3 (Involvement), Grouping 4 (Verbal-Nonverbal Orientation), Grouping 8 (Communicative Impatience), Grouping 9 (Feelings), Grouping 10 (Relaxed or Tense), and Grouping 17 (Handling Difficult Conversational Situations).

Because of the limited amount of hard empirical evidence concerning cross-cultural-differences in communication patterns, further research related to such differences seems warranted.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures used in this study including the development of the research instrument. This chapter is organized in the following sequence: Research Design, Selection and Description of the Sample, Description of the Instrument, Data Collection Procedures, Statistical Procedures, and Limitations of the Study.

Research Design

The research design used in this present study was ex post facto in nature. Here the dependent variable, communication pattern, was examined as a function of the independent variable, student nationality, an attribute variable.

The author recognized some weaknesses of ex post facto research. It does not permit the manipulation or control of the variables under study. Also, ex post facto allows neither random selection of subjects nor random assignment of subjects to treatment groups. This may result in the risk of improper interpretation. However, as Kerlinger (27) points out, the most important social, scientific, and educational research problems do not lend themselves to experimentation even though many of them do lend themselves to controlled inquiry of the ex post facto kind.

Despite the nature of these weaknesses the author proceeded to use the ex post facto research to test the hypotheses in this study while treating the results and interpretation of the data with great care and caution.

Selection and Description of the Sample

A sample consisting of all Thai students attending Oklahoma State University during the Fall Semester, 1976, was used in this study together with a matched set of American students. The list of all Thai students was obtained from the directory of the Thai Student Association at Oklahoma State University. Then, a matched set of 50 American students at Oklahoma State University was sought. The factors considered in matching subjects of both groups were sex, age, educational level, and major field of study.

The number of students by sex, age, educational level, and major field of study who comprised the 100 subjects of the study (50 Thais and 50 Americans) are shown in Table II.

Description of the Instrument

The research tool for the present study was a modified version of the Conversation Self-Report Inventory (CSRI) (see Appendix A). Neal (32) suggests that the CSRI is the only known self-report inventory for communication sensitivity. Neal also reports construct validity was established with a hypothesis that suggested students in advanced speech classes would attain significantly higher scores on the CSRI than would students in a basic speech course. The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .001 level.

TABLE II
A MATCHED SET OF FIFTY THAI AND FIFTY AMERICAN STUDENTS

| Factors | Group | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| | Thai | | American | |
| | Male n=38 | Female n=12 | Male n=38 | Female n=12 |
| Age: | | | | |
| 20 to 30 years | 30 | 11 | 30 | 11 |
| 30 to 40 years | 8 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| Educational Level: | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 |
| Master's | 16 | 5 | 16 | 5 |
| Doctoral | 13 | 4 | 13 | 4 |
| Major Field of Study: | | | | |
| Engineering | 18 | 1 | 18 | 1 |
| Education | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Business | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Agriculture | 5 | 1* | 5 | 1* |
| Computer Science | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Home Economics | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Political Science | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| English | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Statistics | 1** | 0 | 1** | 0 |

*Efforts were made to find as close a match as possible. Because there was no American female who was a doctoral candidate in Agriculture the American subject chosen was a female faculty member in the Agronomy Department at O.S.U. who held the doctoral degree. Ages of the two subjects were approximately equal.

**Because there was no Statistics doctoral student whose age matched the Thai subject, the matched American subject was a faculty member of the O.S.U. Statistics Department.

Predictive validity was established by Roberts (35) in a study that found high-insight individuals attained significantly higher scores on communication sensitivity than did low-insight individuals. Neal (32) also found that individuals attaining high scores on communication sensitivity also attained significantly greater scores on a test of nonverbal perception than did individuals with low communication sensitivity scores.

Neal (32), using a battery of inventories as the outside criteria, related demographic, personality and nonverbal perception correlates to CSRI and found that it does have concurrent validity. Twenty-three of the 33 relationships hypothesized to be significant were significant.

Evans (13) found that sensitive interviewers produced significantly greater satisfaction in their interviewees than did less sensitive interviewers.

The current form, the OSU-CSRI, has a Kuder-Richardson-20 reliability estimate of .80 with speech students at O.S.U. (N = 625) (26). In consideration of the apparent validity and the fact that the CSRI is the only known self-report inventory for communication sensitivity, the use of the modified version of the CSRI in this study would appear to be justified.

The CSRI was designed to measure the sensitivity of an individual in the roles of a transmitter and a receiver. The duality was effected by placing statements of sensitive behaviors and attitudes in a forced-choice format along with statements describing attitudes and behaviors that are not part of the sensitivity pattern. These statements, as well as the sensitivity statements, were originally formed by asking groups of people to describe the communication attitudes and behaviors of human

beings. The CSRI has been refined a number of times to eliminate items that are never chosen by subjects as descriptive of their own attitudes and behaviors. Thus, statements in the forced-choice format of the CSRI can be said to cover comprehensively the various possible communication patterns in statements that people find useful for describing their own communication attitudes and behaviors. In summary, the CSRI measures communication habits or communication patterns of individuals in the conversation.

The author modified the CSRI so that each alternative within the forced-choice format of the original instrument became a separate Likert-type item to be rated. Therefore, the modified version of the CSRI in this study consisted of 160 Likert-type items. The scale allowed subjects five choices for each item (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Uncertain or Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree). Simplicity, accuracy, and relevancy were kept in mind in modifying and rewriting the instrument.

Although the instrument was written in English, the author made every effort to be present while Thai subjects completed the instrument and provided translations for them when necessary.

Factor analysis was utilized as a way of determining the nature of communication patterns other than communication sensitivity contained in the 160 items. Data for factor analysis were collected from 755 Oklahoma State students who took the basic speech course, Introduction to Speech Communication, at Oklahoma State University, during the Fall Semester, 1976. All data were collected during the first two weeks of classes. Factor analysis of the data was accomplished by using the factor analysis program of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) on

Oklahoma State IBM 370 computer. The User's Guide for this program describes the factor analysis procedure utilized in this way:

The technique of principal components analysis is used to aid in determining an appropriate number of factors. A matrix of factor loadings is produced and printed; that matrix then undergoes a rigid (orthogonal) rotation determined by Kaiser's varimax criterion (3, p. 201).

From the 160 variables analyzed, the factor analysis yielded 51 factors. The total of 51 factors are shown in Table III. Appendix C presents each factor together with the item statement that forms the factor. Criteria used to determine which items should be included in a given factor were as follows:

1. All items in the inventory were placed in one or more factors.
2. A loading of .30 or greater (absolute value) on a given factor automatically included the item in that factor.
3. Those items that had no loading of .30 or greater were placed in the factor(s) in which they had the greatest loading (the smallest loading of these items was .21 with most of the loadings being .25 or greater).

For presentational purposes, the 51 factors were then analyzed using a thematic analysis. This analysis placed factors that dealt with the same theme into a single grouping. A total of 20 groupings of communication were derived using this analysis. Communication sensitivity was considered an additional grouping. A description of these 21 groupings of communication, along with an indicator-name and the numbers of the factor(s) included in each grouping, is provided in Table IV.

Data Collection Procedures

The first draft of a modified version of the CSRI was prepared in

TABLE III

FIFTY-ONE FACTORS THAT HAD EIGEN VALUE GREATER THAN 1
(SIGNIFICANCE OF VARIANCE) AS DETERMINED
THROUGH FACTOR ANALYSIS

| Factor Number and Descriptor-Name | Items Included in the Factor (See Appendix A) | Factor Loading |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| 1. Favorable Description | 73 | +.30 |
| | 74 | +.70 |
| | 77 | +.34 |
| | 78 | +.60 |
| | 79 | +.58 |
| | 80 | +.37 |
| | 153 | +.62 |
| 2. Insensitive Aggression | 72 | +.61 |
| | 75 | +.69 |
| | 76 | +.70 |
| | 80 | +.32 |
| | 92 | +.38 |
| | 116 | +.38 |
| | 130 | +.37 |
| | 147 | +.47 |
| | 154 | +.45 |
| | 156 | +.66 |
| | 158 | +.26 |
| | 26 | +.41 |
| 3. Passive Versus Active Involvement | 25 | +.40 |
| | 36 | +.34 |
| | 82 | -.34 |
| | 83 | -.39 |
| | 109 | +.68 |
| | 29 | +.25 |
| 4. Verbal-Nonverbal Orientation | 16 | +.73 |
| | 21 | +.70 |
| | 22 | -.72 |
| | 66 | -.40 |
| | 67 | -.49 |
| | 93 | -.64 |
| 5. Correcting Others | 54 | -.73 |
| | 102 | -.75 |
| | 103 | -.57 |
| | 104 | -.33 |
| | 91 | -.29 |

TABLE III (Continued)

| Factor Number and Descriptor-Name | Items Included in the Factor (See Appendix A) | Loading Factor |
|---|---|-------------------|
| 6. Self-Interest Versus Concern for Understanding | 98 | -.63 |
| | 99 | -.34 |
| | 111 | -.31 |
| | 119 | -.51 |
| | 133 | +.28 |
| 7. Non-Touch Versus Leaning Toward Other Person | 148 | -.68 |
| | 129 | +.23 |
| 8. Not Being Distracted Versus Distracted by Other's Nonverbal Mannerism | 23 | -.67 |
| | 131 | +.73 |
| 9. Being Agreeably Direct Versus Being Incoherent | 13 | -.48 |
| | 19 | +.62 |
| | 25 | -.36 |
| | 35 | -.64 |
| | 87 | +.32 |
| | 130 | -.38 |
| | 142 | -.58 |
| | 11 | +.25 |
| 10. Getting Tired or Seldom Commenting If a Conversa- tion Goes on Too Long | 10 | -.29 |
| | 33 | +.25 |
| | 121 | -.58 |
| | 124 | -.69 |
| | 55 | -.27 |
| 11. Visual Directness Versus Non- Directness | 105 | -.29 |
| | 5 | +.49 |
| | 27 | +.83 |
| | 53 | +.83 |
| 12. Indifference | 144 | -.74 |
| | 69 | +.45 |
| | 70 | +.55 |
| | 94 | +.38 |
| | 145 | +.80 |
| | 150 | +.77 |
| 13. Consciously Controlling Emotions by Appearing Calm | 151 | +.31 |
| | 7 | -.51 |
| | 9 | -.61 |
| | 24 | -.46 |
| | 81 | -.50 |
| | 49 | -.29 |

TABLE III (Continued)

| Factor Number and Descriptor-Name | Items Included in the Factor (See Appendix A) | Loading Factor |
|--|---|-------------------|
| 14. Nonverbal Feedback | 17 | + .82 |
| | 120 | + .76 |
| 15. Passive and Non-Authentic | 43 | - .40 |
| | 157 | - .60 |
| | 159 | - .54 |
| 16. Being Relaxed Versus Being Conscious of Posture | 51 | + .65 |
| | 64 | - .64 |
| | 50 | + .27 |
| 17. Self-Centered Listening | 125 | + .47 |
| | 126 | + .69 |
| | 128 | + .31 |
| 18. Other-Centered Versus Self- Centered Involvement | 88 | - .33 |
| | 117 | + .30 |
| | 122 | - .67 |
| | 123 | + .35 |
| 19. Nontrusting | 132 | - .53 |
| | 160 | - .60 |
| | 57 | - .25 |
| | 62 | - .29 |
| 20. Being Brief Versus Being Talkative | 84 | - .57 |
| | 89 | - .57 |
| | 141 | + .60 |
| | 13 | - .33 |
| 21. Being Forthright Versus Being Brusk and Insulting | 1 | + .41 |
| | 38 | - .43 |
| | 113 | - .31 |
| 22. Non-Involvement Versus Empathy | 37 | + .40 |
| | 38 | + .38 |
| | 39 | - .75 |
| | 86 | - .30 |
| 23. Being Steadfast | 46 | + .75 |
| 24. Not Listening to Untrusted Versus Listening to Anyone | 31 | - .70 |
| | 57 | + .27 |
| | 112 | - .21 |

TABLE III (Continued)

| Factor Number and Descriptor-Name | Items Included in the Factor (See Appendix A) | Loading Factor |
|---|---|-------------------|
| 25. Other Involvement (Transmitter Behavior) | 28 | -.37 |
| | 101 | -.33 |
| | 115 | -.70 |
| | 118 | -.32 |
| | 137 | -.38 |
| 26. Other Involvement (Receiver Behavior) | 28 | +.35 |
| | 41 | +.60 |
| | 56 | +.31 |
| | 65 | +.50 |
| | 18 | +.28 |
| | 52 | +.27 |
| 27. Reduce Tension by Inviting Criticism From Others | 106 | +.71 |
| | 125 | +.31 |
| 28. Use of Repetition | 90 | -.39 |
| | 114 | -.77 |
| 29. Inappropriate Assumptions (Subject of Conversation is More Important Than the Way it is Being Discussed) | 108 | +.68 |
| | 110 | +.28 |
| | 134 | +.29 |
| 30. Other Involvement Versus Verbal Involvement | 36 | -.38 |
| | 44 | -.55 |
| | 45 | +.31 |
| | 136 | +.29 |
| 31. Being Open-Minded | 48 | -.39 |
| | 58 | -.72 |
| | 60 | -.27 |
| 32. Revealing Inward Feelings | 71 | +.35 |
| | 95 | +.73 |
| 33. People Can Change Their Mind and Concern for Agreement | 3 | +.66 |
| | 4 | +.73 |
| 34. Seldom Act Illogically | 155 | +.72 |
| 35. Superiority | 97 | +.57 |
| | 152 | +.31 |
| | 42 | +.28 |
| | 149 | +.47 |

TABLE III (Continued)

| Factor Number and Descriptor-Name | Items Included in the Factor (See Appendix A) | Loading Factor |
|---|---|-------------------|
| 36. Hurry Conversation and Speak in a Crisp Business Like Manner | 40 | -.71 |
| | 32 | -.30 |
| 37. Use of Words | 56 | -.32 |
| | 61 | -.65 |
| | 138 | -.52 |
| | 139 | -.32 |
| 38. Verbal Orientation | 63 | +.75 |
| | 30 | +.29 |
| 39. Accept Ideas of Others and Build on Them Versus Find It Difficult to Accept Others' Ideas | 8 | +.73 |
| | 20 | -.33 |
| 40. Disregard for Social Convention | 47 | +.77 |
| 41. Avoidance of Difficult Situations | 12 | -.32 |
| | 135 | -.66 |
| | 146 | -.38 |
| | 151 | -.30 |
| | 143 | -.27 |
| 42. Physically Tense | 100 | +.68 |
| 43. Avoidance of Information | 14 | +.35 |
| | 140 | +.63 |
| 44. Inappropriate Assumptions (Silence Means that Others Understand) | 107 | -.66 |
| 45. Being Non-Authentic Versus Authentic | 6 | +.69 |
| | 59 | -.33 |
| | 146 | +.32 |
| 46. Being Inobtrusive Versus Maintaining Hand Movements | 67 | -.54 |
| | 68 | +.72 |
| 47. Empathy | 34 | +.64 |
| 48. Concern for Reaction of Others | 15 | -.73 |
| | 26 | -.31 |

TABLE III (Continued)

| Factor Number and Descriptor-Name | Items Included in the Factor (See Appendix A) | Loading Factor |
|---|---|-------------------|
| 49. Concern for Frankness and Candor | 1 | -.35 |
| | 45 | -.33 |
| | 85 | -.57 |
| | 87 | -.57 |
| | 96 | -.72 |
| | 99 | -.46 |
| 50. Consider Communication as Affective Exchange | 2 | +.70 |
| | 111 | +.34 |
| | 118 | +.33 |
| 51. Other-Centered Listening Rationale | 127 | -.71 |
| | 128 | -.37 |

*Based on a rigid orthogonal rotation determined by Kaiser's varimax criterion.

August, 1976, and distributed to ten Thai students at Oklahoma State University (5 males and 5 females) as a pilot study. This was done in order to check the reliability of the instrument and to determine whether Ss had any problem in filling out the questionnaire. The finding was that the Thai Ss had a problem of translating and understanding certain words and phrases in the instrument. For this reason, the questionnaire was quite time consuming for the Thai Ss. The author solved this problem by translating those phrases and words that seemed most troublesome. She also decided to be present while the Thai subjects completed the instrument to explain instructions and answer any questions the subjects might have.

TABLE IV
 TWENTY-ONE COMMUNICATION GROUPINGS AS DETERMINED
 THROUGH THEMATIC ANALYSIS FROM FIFTY-ONE
 FACTORS OF CSRI

| Grouping Number and Descriptor-Name | Verbal Description of Content of Factors in the Grouping | Factors Included in the Grouping |
|--|---|---|
| Grouping 1: Reported Communication Sensitivity | Reported Communication Sensitivity | 0 |
| Grouping 2: Insensitivity | Insensitive Aggression Insensitive Indifference | 2 12 |
| Grouping 3: Involvement | Being Passive vs. Active Passive and Non-Authentic Other-Centered vs. Self-Centered Noninvolvement vs. Empathy Other Involvement (Transmitter Behavior) Other Involvement (Receiver Behavior) Concern for Other Involvement vs. Verbal Involvement Superiority Accepting vs. Finding It Difficult to Accept Ideas of Others Being Non-Authentic vs. Authentic Empathy Concern for Reaction of Others | 3 15 18 22 25 26 30 35 39 45 47 48 |
| Grouping 4: Verbal-Nonverbal Orientation | Verbal vs. Nonverbal Non-Touch vs. Leaning Toward Other Person Not Being Distracted vs. Distracted by Others' Nonverbal Mannerism Visual Directness vs. Non- Directness Nonverbal Feedback Verbal Orientation Being Inobtrusive vs. Maintaining Hand Movements | 4 7 8 11 14 38 46 |

TABLE IV (Continued)

| Grouping Number and Descriptor-Name | Verbal Description of Content of Factors in the Grouping | Factors Included in the Grouping |
|---|---|---|
| Grouping 5: Correcting Others | Correcting Others | 5 |
| Grouping 6: Concern for Under- standing | Self-Interest vs. Concern for Understanding Use of Repetition Use of Words | 6 28 37 |
| Grouping 7: Being Direct | Being Agreeably Direct vs. Incoherent Being Forthright vs. Brusky and Insulting | 9 21 |
| Grouping 8: Communicative Impatience | Getting Tired or Seldom Comment- ing If a Conversation Goes on Too Long Hurrying a Conversation and Speaking in a Crisp Business-Like Manner | 10 36 |
| Grouping 9: Feelings | Consciously Controlling Emotions by Appearing Calm Revealing Inward Feelings Considering Communication as Affective Exchange | 13 32 50 |
| Grouping 10: Relaxed or Tense | Being Relaxed vs. Conscious of Posture Physically Tense | 16 42 |
| Grouping 11: Listening | Self-Centered Listening Rationale Not Listening to Untrusted Per- sons vs. Listening to Anyone Other-Centered Listening Rationale | 17 24 51 |

TABLE IV (Continued)

| Grouping Number and Descriptor-Name | Verbal Description of Content of Factors in the Grouping | Factors Included in the Grouping |
|--|--|---|
| Grouping 12: Trust, Frankness, and Candor | Nontrusting Concern for Frankness and Candor | 19 49 |
| Grouping 13: Being Talkative | Being Brief vs. Talkative | 20 |
| Grouping 14: Tenacity | Being Steadfast | 23 |
| Grouping 15: Communicative Assumptions | Reducing Tension by Inviting Criticism from Others Inappropriate Assumption (The Subject of a Conversation Is More Important than the Way It Is Being Discussed) Inappropriate Assumption (Silence Means Others Understand) | 27 29 44 |
| Grouping 16: Social Convention | Showing Disregard for Social Convention | 40 |
| Grouping 17: Handling Difficult Conversational Situations | Avoidance of Situation Avoidance of Information | 41 43 |
| Grouping 18: Objectivity | Being Open-Minded in a Conversation | 31 |
| Grouping 19: Concern for Agreement and Influence | People Can Change Their Mind and Show Concern for Agreement | 33 |
| Grouping 20: Acting Logically | Seldom Acting Illogically | 34 |

TABLE IV (Continued)

| Grouping Number and Descriptor-Name | Verbal Description of Content of Factors in the Grouping | Factors Included in the Grouping |
|--|--|---|
| Grouping 21: Reported Self- Confirmation | Favorable Description | 1 |

There were two forms, Form A and Form B, of the questionnaire. Both forms consisted of the same 160 items. However, the order of the items was varied in the two forms so that item Number 1 in Form A was item Number 81 in Form B and vice versa. One reason for using two forms was to prevent unreliable and invalid responses of close friends or husbands and wives that took the questionnaire at the same time. A second reason for using the two forms was to spread the effects of fatigue over the entire instrument rather than concentrating it on the same items uniformly.

In September, 1976, the author distributed the questionnaires and the standardized answer form to 50 Thai students individually at their residences. The author explained the instructions orally to each subject and wrote the instructions in Thai for them. Most of the subjects filled out the questionnaire in the author's presence. A few Thais filled out the questionnaire without the assistance of the author in their own residences. The author picked up the completed questionnaires one week later.

After collecting the data from Thai Ss, the author started searching for American Ss that would match the Thai Ss based upon their sex, age, educational level, and their major field of study. To expedite this search the author sought help from the Graduate College and the Registrar's Office. In practice, however, it turned out to be more feasible to go to each department under study and ask for subject of that sex, age, and educational level. The department gave the author the telephone numbers of potential American Ss. Therefore, the author made contact with most of American subjects personally.

To find a matched set of American Ss was a long and time-consuming process. However, American Ss and their departments were very cooperative. With American Ss the author distributed a 160-item questionnaire with a standardized answer form to each individually. The author also explained to American subjects the instructions and the rationale behind this research. The author then picked up the completed questionnaires one week later. Data collection from the American sample was completed in October, 1976.

Statistical Procedures

The statistical analysis procedures utilized in this study consisted of the tasks performed after the data had been collected. The data analysis procedures were divided into two steps: (1) the preliminary preparation and coding procedures, and (2) the hypothesis testing procedures.

Preliminary preparation of the data consisted first of transferring subject responses to computer cards for the total of 100 Ss (50 Thais and 50 Americans). Next, the cards were run through the computer to get

a listing for use in verifying the accuracy of the coding. Factor scores on each of the 51 factors (see Table III) were derived using the following process. Only those items which loaded on a factor were utilized in computing a factor score. The size of the factor loading was ignored; only the sign was considered. Thus, if an item loaded positively on a given factor, the subject's rating of that item was added to his score for that factor. If an item loaded negatively on the factor, the subject's rating of that item was subtracted from his score on the factor. To determine a subject's score on factor seven, for example, his rating of item number 148 (Form A) was subtracted from his rating of item number 129.

Fifty-two one way analyses of variance were performed corresponding to the 51 factors derived from the factor analysis plus the communication sensitivity pattern. The results provided a comparison between Thai and American students on the 52 conversational factors (see Appendix B).

Limitation of the Study

This study utilized Thai and American students at Oklahoma State University as subjects. Therefore, the sample may not represent the Thai or American populations as a whole. Then too, conclusions cannot be drawn for Thai and American cultures in general. The reader should also note that the Thai subjects were students at an American university and thus may not be representative of Thais without such experiences.

Summary

This chapter described methodology and procedures used in this

study. The research design utilized was ex post facto.

The sample of 50 Thai and 50 American students was taken from students attending Oklahoma State University during the Fall Semester, 1976. These two groups were matched on the basis of sex, age, educational level, and their major field of study.

The modified version of the Conversation Self-Report Inventory (CSRI) consisting of 160 Likert-type items with the rating scale of 1 through 5 was the instrument used. A factor analysis of the data yielded 51 factors to which the communication sensitivity factor was added. Factor scores for each subject were computed. One-way analysis of variance was then used to compare scores of Thai and American subjects on the 52 factors.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

This chapter presents the results obtained by comparing Thai and American students on each of the 52 communication patterns. Following a brief review of statistical procedures utilized in the study, general findings pertaining to each question are presented.

Review of Statistical Procedures

This study utilized two cultural groups of samples: Thai and American. In addition to the communication sensitivity scale, factor analysis on the data obtained from 755 Oklahoma State University students yielded 51 scales. A factor score for each subject was obtained by adding to the factor score if the factor loading of the item had a positive value and by subtracting from the factor score if the factor loading of the item had a negative value. The major statistical analysis, one-way analysis of variance, was then performed in order to determine whether Thais and Americans differed with respect to each of the communication factors or patterns. The .05 level of significance was used in deciding whether the groups differed from each other.

Findings

The research problem addressed by this study was: Are there differences in communication patterns between Thai and American students at an American university? Findings for each question are discussed separately.

Question 1

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in reported communication sensitivity in a conversation? Results of the analysis of variance performed on this pattern indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students in their reported communication sensitivity (see Table V).

TABLE V
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON COMMUNICATION SENSITIVITY

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 92.160 | 92.160 | 0.584 | 0.547 |
| Residual | 98 | 15460.200 | 157.757 | | |

p < .05

Question 2

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in insensitivity to people in a conversation? This question deals with Factors 2 and 12 which are labeled "insensitive aggression" and "insensitive indifference" respectively. Results from analyses of variance on Factors 2 and 12 indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students in insensitivity (see Table VI).

TABLE VI
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 2 AND 12

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 2:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 3.610 | 3.610 | 0.125 | 0.723 |
| Residual | 98 | 2808.900 | 28.662 | | |
| <u>Factor 12:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 13.690 | 13.690 | 1.510 | 0.219 |
| Residual | 98 | 888.420 | 9.065 | | |

p < .05

Question 3

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in involvement in a conversation? This grouping involves comparison of Factors 3,

15, 18, 22, 25, 26, 30, 35, 39, 45, 47, and 48. The review of the literature indicates that differences should be found in this grouping. Tests performed on these factors provide partial support for a difference between Thai and American students in involvement. Table VII presents the results for all 12 comparisons.

No significant differences between Thai and American students were found on Factors 15 (Being Passive vs. Non-Authentic), 18 (Other-Centered vs. Self-Centered), 25 (Other Involvement: Transmitter Behavior), 26 (Other Involvement: Receiver Behavior), 35 (Superiority), 39 (Accepting vs. Finding It Difficult to Accept Ideas of Others), 45 (Being Non-Authentic vs. Authentic), 47 (Empathy), and 48 (Concern for Reaction of Others).

However, there are significant differences between Thai and American students on Factors 3, 22, and 30. On Factor 3, which relates to being "passive vs. active," the mean score of the Thai group is 5.040 whereas that of the American group is 2.780. The higher mean score indicates a higher level of passivity for the Thai sample. This difference is significant and indicates that Thai students are more passive than American students in a conversation. On Factor 22 (Non-Involvement vs. Empathy) the mean score for the Thai sample is -0.440 whereas that of the American sample is 0.600. A greater score indicates a higher level of non-involvement. Therefore, American students are more non-involved in a conversation than Thais. In other words, the results reveal that Thai students are more empathetic to others in a conversation than American students. On Factor 30 (Concern for Other Involvement vs. Verbal Involvement) the mean score of the Thai sample is 2.140 whereas that of the American sample is 2.920. The higher score

TABLE VII

ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS ON FACTORS
3, 15, 18, 22, 25, 26, 30, 35, 39, 45, 47 AND 48

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 3:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 127.690 | 127.690 | 19.177 | 0.0001 |
| Residual | 98 | 652.500 | 6.658 | | |
| <u>Factor 15:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 8.410 | 8.410 | 2.201 | 0.137 |
| Residual | 98 | 374.340 | 3.819 | | |
| <u>Factor 18:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 6.250 | 6.250 | 2.086 | 0.148 |
| Residual | 98 | 293.540 | 2.995 | | |
| <u>Factor 22:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 27.040 | 27.040 | 5.426 | 0.020 |
| Residual | 98 | 488.320 | 4.982 | | |
| <u>Factor 25:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 0.490 | 0.490 | 0.105 | 0.745 |
| Residual | 98 | 456.100 | 4.654 | | |
| <u>Factor 26:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 12.960 | 12.960 | 1.793 | 0.180 |
| Residual | 98 | 708.040 | 7.224 | | |
| <u>Factor 30:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 15.210 | 15.210 | 4.576 | 0.032 |
| Residual | 98 | 325.700 | 3.323 | | |
| <u>Factor 35:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 1.690 | 1.690 | 0.553 | 0.534 |
| Residual | 98 | 299.060 | 3.051 | | |

TABLE VII (Continued)

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 39:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 4.840 | 4.840 | 2.502 | 0.112 |
| Residual | 98 | 189.520 | 1.933 | | |
| <u>Factor 45:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 1.440 | 1.440 | 0.413 | 0.529 |
| Residual | 98 | 341.520 | 3.484 | | |
| <u>Factor 47:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 0.160 | 0.160 | 0.221 | 0.644 |
| Residual | 98 | 70.840 | 0.722 | | |
| <u>Factor 48:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 1.690 | 1.690 | 1.149 | 0.286 |
| Residual | 98 | 144.020 | 1.469 | | |

p < .05

indicates more concern for other involvement. Thus, American students are more other involved (they choose topics that will interest others; they convey truthful information and expect others to do the same) whereas Thai students evidence more verbal involvement (they react to the words rather than the ideas of the others; they appear indifferent to what is going on in a conversation).

Overall, of the 12 tests conducted, three are significant; nine are not.

Question 4

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in verbal-nonverbal orientation in a conversation? This grouping involves Factors 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 38, and 46. A review of the available literature led to the expectation that Thais and Americans would differ with respect to this grouping. Analyses of variance performed on these factors give partial support for a difference between Thai and American students in verbal-nonverbal orientation.

No significant differences between Thai and American students on Factors 4 (Verbal vs. Nonverbal Orientation), 7 (Non-Touch vs. Leaning Toward Other Person), 11 (Visual Directness vs. Non-Directness), 14 (Nonverbal Feedback) and 38 (Verbal Orientation) are found at the .05 level of significance.

However, analysis of variance tests indicates significant differences between Thai and American students on Factors 8 and 46. On Factor 8, which is related to "not being distracted versus being distracted by others' nonverbal mannerism," the mean score for the Thai sample is 0.140 whereas that of the American sample is -0.660. This difference is significant and indicates that American students are more easily distracted by others' nonverbal mannerisms than Thai students. On Factor 46, which has been labeled "being inobtrusive versus maintaining hand movements," the mean score of the Thai group is 0.060 whereas that of the American group is -0.660. This significant difference reveals that American students utilize more hand movements than Thai students.

Overall, of the seven tests conducted, two indicate significant differences; five do not (see Table VIII).

TABLE VIII
 ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS ON FACTORS
 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 38 AND 46

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 4:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 44.890 | 44.890 | 3.320 | 0.067 |
| Residual | 98 | 1324.820 | 13.518 | | |
| <u>Factor 7:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 0.490 | 0.490 | 0.169 | 0.668 |
| Residual | 98 | 253.300 | 2.584 | | |
| <u>Factor 8:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 16.000 | 16.000 | 6.554 | 0.011 |
| Residual | 98 | 239.240 | 2.441 | | |
| <u>Factor 11:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 25.000 | 25.000 | 3.352 | 0.066 |
| Residual | 98 | 730.840 | 7.457 | | |
| <u>Factor 14:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 4.840 | 4.840 | 2.009 | 0.155 |
| Residual | 98 | 236.000 | 2.408 | | |
| <u>Factor 38:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 4.000 | 4.000 | 1.593 | 0.207 |
| Residual | 98 | 245.960 | 2.509 | | |
| <u>Factor 46:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 12.960 | 12.960 | 5.473 | 0.020 |
| Residual | 98 | 231.040 | 2.367 | | |

p < .05

Question 5

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in correcting others in a conversation? This question deals with Factor 5. The result from analysis of variance performed on Factor 5, which is related to "correcting others," indicates that there is a significant difference between Thai and American students in correcting others in a conversation (see Table IX). The mean score of the Thai group is -14.960 whereas that of the American group is -13.100. This difference indicates that Thai students are more likely than American students to correct the other's language errors and supply the right words for others in a conversation.

TABLE IX
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 5

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 86.490 | 86.490 | 11.416 | 0.001 |
| Residual | 98 | 742.420 | 7.575 | | |

p < .05

Question 6

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in

expressing concern for understanding in a conversation? This grouping involves Factors 6, 28, and 27. Analysis-of-variance results provide partial support for a difference between Thai and American students in expressing concern for understanding in a conversation (see Table X).

TABLE X
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 6, 28 AND 37

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 6:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 17.640 | 17.640 | 4.499 | 0.034 |
| Residual | 98 | 384.200 | 3.920 | | |
| <u>Factor 28:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 0.490 | 0.490 | 0.238 | 0.632 |
| Residual | 98 | 201.220 | 2.053 | | |
| <u>Factor 37:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 32.490 | 32.490 | 7.696 | 0.006 |
| Residual | 98 | 413.700 | 4.221 | | |

p < .05

Results indicate that there is no difference between Thai and American students on Factor 28 which is related to the use of repetition in a conversation. However, tests reveal significant differences between Thai and American students on Factors 6 and 37. Factor 6 relates to "self-interest versus understanding." On this factor the mean

score of the Thai group is -12.620 whereas that of the American group is -13.460. This difference supports the conclusion that American students evidence greater concern for understanding than Thai students while Thai students evidence greater concern for self-interest than American students.

On Factor 37 which is related to the "use of words," the mean score of the Thai group is -14.020 whereas that of the American group is -15.160. This difference indicates that American students are more careful than Thai students in their use of words (for example, using words that are meaningful to others and speaking within others' frame of reference).

Two of the three relevant comparisons in grouping 6 show significant differences.

Question 7

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being direct in a conversation? This grouping involves Factors 9 and 21. Factor 9 is related to "being agreeably direct versus incoherent," and Factor 21 deals with "being forthright versus brusque and insulting." Analysis-of-variance results for both factors show that there are no differences between Thai and American students in being direct in a conversation as shown in Table XI.

Question 8

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in expressing communicative impatience in a conversation? This grouping involves Factors 10 and 36. Data reviewed in Chapter II led to the

conclusion that Thais and Americans would differ with respect to this grouping. Analysis-of-variance results for both factors provide partial support for a difference (see Table XII).

TABLE XI
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 9 AND 21

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 9:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 22.090 | 22.090 | 1.413 | 0.235 |
| Residual | 98 | 1531.700 | 15.629 | | |
| <u>Factor 21:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 8.410 | 8.410 | 2.593 | 0.106 |
| Residual | 98 | 317.780 | 3.242 | | |

p < .05

On Factor 36, which is related to "trying to hurry a conversation and speaking in a crisp business-like manner," the analysis-of-variance results indicate that there is no difference between Thai and American students.

However, on Factor 10, which deals with "getting tired or seldom commenting if a conversation goes on too long," the mean score of the Thai group is -13.340 whereas that of the American group is -11.640. This significant difference indicates that Thai students are more likely

than American students to get tired or seldom comment if a conversation goes on too long.

Grouping 8 finds one of the differences significant but not the other.

TABLE XII
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 10 AND 36

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 10:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 72.250 | 72.250 | 14.546 | 0.0005 |
| Residual | 98 | 486.740 | 4.966 | | |
| <u>Factor 36</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 0.810 | 0.810 | 0.403 | 0.5330 |
| Residual | 98 | 196.500 | 2.005 | | |

p < .05

Question 9

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in revealing feelings in a conversation? This grouping includes Factors 13, 32 and 50. The review of literature provided support for expecting Thais and Americans to differ with respect to this grouping. Factor 13 relates to "consciously controlling emotions by appearing calm;" Factor 32 deals with "revealing inward feelings toward others;" and Factor 50

regards "considering communication as affective exchange." Overall, analysis-of-variance results shown in Table XIII indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students in revealing feelings in a conversation.

TABLE XIII
ONE-WAYS ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 13, 32 AND 50

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Values | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| <u>Factor 13:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 11.560 | 11.560 | 1.823 | 0.176 |
| Residual | 98 | 621.280 | 6.339 | | |
| <u>Factor 32:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 4.000 | 4.000 | 2.094 | 0.147 |
| Residual | 98 | 187.160 | 1.909 | | |
| <u>Factor 50:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 6.760 | 6.760 | 2.307 | 0.128 |
| Residual | 98 | 287.080 | 2.929 | | |

p < .05

Question 10

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being relaxed or tense in a conversation? This grouping deals with Factors 16 and 42. Based on the review of literature, differences between Thais

and Americans were predicted. Analysis-of-variance results provide partial support for a difference between Thai and American students in terms of being relaxed or tense in a conversation (see Table XIV).

TABLE XIV
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 16 AND 42

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 16:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 10.890 | 10.890 | 3.450 | 0.062 |
| Residual | 98 | 309.300 | 3.156 | | |
| <u>Factor 42:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 15.210 | 15.210 | 18.683 | 0.0001 |
| Residual | 98 | 79.780 | 0.814 | | |

p < .05

The finding indicates that there is no difference between Thai and American students on Factor 16 which relates to "being relaxed versus conscious of posture."

However, there is a significant difference between Thai and American students on Factor 42 which concerns "being physically tense" in a conversation. The mean score of the Thai sample is 2.600 whereas that of the American sample is 3.380. The higher score of the American group indicates that American students are more likely than Thai

students to be physically tense in a conversation.

Overall, one of the two relevant tests reveals a significant difference.

Question 11

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in listening habits in a conversation? This grouping deals with Factors 17, 24, and 51. Results of the analyses of variance performed on these factors, which relate to "self-centered listening rationale," "not listening to untrusted persons versus listening to anyone," and "other-centered listening rationale" respectively, indicate that there are no differences between Thai and American students in terms of these conversational listening habits as shown in Table XV.

Question 12

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in expressing concern for trust, frankness, and candor in a conversation? This grouping involves Factors 19 and 49, which are related to "non-trusting" and "showing concern for frankness and candor" respectively. Results indicate that there are no differences between Thai and American students in expressing concern for trust, frankness, and candor in a conversation as shown in Table XVI.

Question 13

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being talkative in a conversation? This grouping deals with Factor 20, which is related to "being brief versus talkative." Results of the analysis

TABLE XV
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 17, 24 AND 51

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 17:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 6.250 | 6.250 | 1.900 | 0.167 |
| Residual | 98 | 322.340 | 3.289 | | |
| <u>Factor 24:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 6.760 | 6.760 | 3.334 | 0.067 |
| Residual | 98 | 198.680 | 2.027 | | |
| <u>Factor 51:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 0.090 | 0.090 | 0.042 | 0.830 |
| Residual | 98 | 205.220 | 2.094 | | |

p < .05

TABLE XVI
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 19 AND 49

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 19:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 2.560 | 2.560 | 0.555 | 0.535 |
| Residual | 98 | 451.680 | 4.608 | | |
| <u>Factor 49:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 0.250 | 0.250 | 0.032 | 0.851 |
| Residual | 98 | 755.540 | 7.709 | | |

p < .05

of variance performed on this factor indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students in being talkative in a conversation (see Table XVII).

TABLE XVII
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 20

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 20.250 | 20.250 | 3.825 | 0.0503 |
| Residual | 98 | 518.740 | 5.293 | | |

$p < .05$

Question 14

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being tenacious in a conversation? This question deals with Factor 23, which is related to "being steadfast" in a conversation. Results indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students in being tenacious in a conversation (see Table XVIII).

Question 15

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in making communicative assumptions in a conversation? This grouping involves

Factors 27, 29 and 44. Results of the tests performed on these factors provide partial support for a cultural difference (see Table XIX).

TABLE XVIII
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 23

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 1.440 | 1.440 | 2.185 | 0.138 |
| Residual | 98 | 64.560 | 0.658 | | |

$p < .05$

The results indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students on Factor 29 which is related to "making the inappropriate assumption that the subject of a conversation is more important than the way it is being discussed."

However, there is a significant difference between Thai and American students on Factors 27 and 44. Factor 27 deals with "reducing tensions by inviting criticism from others." The mean score of the Thai group is 7.920 whereas that of the American group is 7.080. The higher score for the Thai sample indicates that Thais are more likely than Americans to reduce tensions by inviting criticisms from others.

Factor 44 deals with "making the inappropriate assumption that silence means others understand." The mean score of the Thai group is

-2.500 whereas that of the American group is -2.140. This significant difference supports the inference that Thais are more likely than Americans to make the inappropriate assumption that silence means others understand what has been said in a conversation.

TABLE XIX
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 27, 29 AND 44

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 27:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 17.640 | 17.640 | 9.858 | 0.002 |
| Residual | 98 | 175.360 | 1.789 | | |
| <u>Factor 29:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 1.690 | 1.690 | 0.500 | 0.511 |
| Residual | 98 | 331.060 | 3.378 | | |
| <u>Factor 44:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 3.240 | 3.240 | 5.823 | 0.016 |
| Residual | 98 | 54.520 | 0.556 | | |

p < .05

In Grouping 15 two of the three relevant tests are significant.

Question 16

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in showing disregard for social convention? This question deals with Factor 40,

which is related to showing disregard for social convention. Results shown in Table XX indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students on this matter.

TABLE XX
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 40

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.320 | 0.252 |
| Residual | 98 | 74.240 | 0.757 | | |

p < .05

Question 17

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in handling difficult conversational situations? This grouping involves Factors 41 and 43. Previous research findings led to the expectation that Thais and American would differ with respect to this grouping. Results of the analyses of variance performed on these factors provide partial support for the existence of a difference between Thai and American students in handling difficult conversational situations (see Table XXI).

There is no significant difference between Thai and American students on Factor 43 which is related to "avoidance of information" in a conversation. In other words, Thais and Americans do not differ in

handling difficult conversational situations by avoiding giving information.

TABLE XXI
ONE-WAY ANOVAS COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTORS 41 AND 43

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|-------------------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| <u>Factor 41:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 31.360 | 31.360 | 3.864 | 0.049 |
| Residual | 98 | 795.280 | 8.115 | | |
| <u>Factor 43:</u> | | | | | |
| Group | 1 | 3.240 | 3.240 | 1.849 | 0.173 |
| Residual | 98 | 171.720 | 1.752 | | |

p < .05

There is, however, a significant difference between Thai and American students on Factor 41 which is related to "avoidance of the situations." The mean score of the Thai group is -15.000 whereas that of the American group is -13.880. This difference indicates that Thais are more likely than Americans to handle difficult conversational situations by avoiding the situations.

Thus, Grouping 17 indicates a cultural difference from the comparison made on Factor 41 but not the comparison made on Factor 43.

Question 18

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in being objective in a conversation? This question deals with Factor 31 which is related to "being open-minded" in a conversation. Results of the analysis of variance performed on this factor indicate that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students in terms of being objective in a conversation (see Table XXII).

TABLE XXII
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 31

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 0.360 | 0.360 | 0.151 | 0.700 |
| Residual | 98 | 233.640 | 2.384 | | |

p < .05

Question 19

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in showing concern for agreement and influence in a conversation? This question involves Factor 33 which deals with the notion that "people can change their mind and show concern for agreement." The findings indicate that there is a significant difference between Thai and American students in

showing concern for agreement and influence in a conversation (see Table XXIII). The mean score of the Thai sample is 6.700 while that of the American sample is 4.940. The higher score for the Thai sample indicates that Thai students are more likely than American students to show concern for agreement and influence in a conversation.

TABLE XXIII
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 33

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 77.440 | 77.440 | 30.685 | 0.0001 |
| Residual | 98 | 247.320 | 2.523 | | |

$p < .05$

Question 20

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in acting logically in a conversation? This question deals with Factor 34 which is related to the behavior of "seldom acting illogically." Results of the analysis of variance performed on this factor indicate that there is a significant difference between Thai and American students in acting logically (see Table XXIV). The mean score of the Thai group is 3.040 whereas that of the American group is 3.440. The higher mean score of

the American sample indicates that Americans are more likely than Thais to act logically in a conversation.

Question 20 finds a difference significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXIV
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 34

| Source | DF | Squares | Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|---------|--------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 4.000 | 4.000 | 5.010 | 0.025 |
| Residual | 98 | 78.240 | 0.798 | | |

p < .05

Question 21

Is there a difference between Thai and American students in reported self confirmation? This question deals with Factor 3 which is related to "favorable description" of the subject's self concept. Analysis of variance performed on Factor 3 indicates that there is no significant difference between Thai and American students in reported self-confirmation (see Table XXV).

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the statistical analysis. The statistical procedures were briefly reviewed. Findings pertaining

to each question were presented.

TABLE XXV
ONE-WAY ANOVA COMPARING THAIS AND AMERICANS
ON FACTOR 3

| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F-Value | Prob > F |
|----------|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Group | 1 | 3.610 | 3.610 | 0.324 | 0.577 |
| Residual | | 1090.500 | 11.127 | | |

$p < .05$

Significant differences for Grouping 3 (Involvement), 4 (Verbal-Nonverbal), 8 (Communicative Impatience), 9 (Feelings), 10 (Being Relaxed or Tense), and 17 (Handling Difficult Conversational Situations) were predicted. Significant differences were found in all these groupings except for Grouping 9.

Significant differences found are summarized in Table XXVI below. As can be seen 15 or 28.8% of the 52 factors tested were significant.

TABLE XXVI

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THAIS AND
AMERICANS ON COMMUNICATION PATTERNS

| Grouping (Number and Name) | Factor (Number and Name) |
|---|---|
| 3 (Involvement) | 3 Passive vs. Active 22 Non-Involvement vs. Empathy 30 Other Involvement vs. Verbal-Involvement |
| 4 (Verbal-Nonverbal) | 8 Not Being Distracted vs. Being Distracted by Others' Nonverbal Mannerisms 46 Being Inobtrusive vs. Maintaining Hand Movements |
| 5 (Correcting Others) | 5 Correcting Others |
| 6 (Concern for Under- standing) | 6 Self-Interest vs. Concern for Under- standing 37 Use of Words |
| 8 (Communicative Impatience) | 10 Getting Tired or Seldom Commenting if Conversation Goes on Too Long |
| 10 (Being Relaxed or Tense) | 42 Physically Tense |
| 15 (Communicative Assumptions) | 27 Reduce Tension by Inviting Criticism from Others 44 Inappropriate Assumptions (Silence Means Others Understand) |
| 17 (Handling Difficult Conversational Situations) | 41 Avoidance of Difficult Situations |
| 19 (Concern for Agreement and Influence) | 33 People Can Change Their Mind and Concern for Agreement |
| 20 (Acting Logically) | 34 Seldom Act Illogically |

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This study sought an answer to the following question: "Are there differences in communication patterns between Thai and American students at an American university?" Fifty-one empirically derived factors of communication were organized into 20 different communication groupings. Communication sensitivity was considered an additional grouping. Research questions were formulated with the expectation that Thais and Americans would differ in a significant number of cases. Fifteen differences were significant, and 37 were nonsignificant.

The results of this study showed that Thais and Americans differ in these three communication groupings: Correcting Others (Grouping 5), Concern for Agreement and Influence (Grouping 19) and Acting Logically (Grouping 20). Specifically, Thais were more likely than Americans to correct others in a conversation; Thais were more likely than Americans to show concern for agreement and influence in a conversation; however, Americans were more concerned than Thais with acting logically in a conversation.

The seven communication groupings which had factors where Thais and Americans were significantly different were: Involvement (Grouping 3), Verbal-Nonverbal Orientation (Grouping 4), Concern for Understanding (Grouping 6), Communicative Impatience (Grouping 8), Being Relaxed or Tense (Grouping 10), Communicative Assumptions (Grouping 15), and

Handling Difficult Conversational Situations (Grouping 17).

In terms of involvement, the results revealed that Thais were more passive than Americans. However, Americans were more likely to be non-involved if the conversation exceeded its expected time limits; on the other hand, Thais tended to be more empathetic in such situations. Furthermore, Americans were more likely to show concern for getting others involved in the conversation while Thais showed more concern for involving themselves with the words used in the conversation. However, no difference between Thais and Americans were found in "being passive and non-authentic," "other-involvement (receiver behavior)," "superiority," "other-centered vs. self-centered," "being non-authentic vs. authentic," "empathy," and "concern for reaction of others."

In terms of verbal-nonverbal orientation, the results indicated that Americans were more likely to be distracted by others' nonverbal mannerisms in a conversation than Thais. Also, Americans were more likely than Thais to maintain hand movements in a conversation. However, no differences between Thais and Americans were found in "verbal vs. nonverbal orientation," "non-touch vs. leaning toward other person," "visual directness vs. non-directness," "nonverbal feedback," and "verbal orientation."

In terms of concern for understanding, there were differences between Thais and Americans in "self interest vs. understanding" and "use of words." The results revealed that Americans were more likely to be seeking understanding than Thais, who showed greater self interest. Moreover, Americans were more likely to carefully use words that were meaningful to the background of others. However, there was no difference between Thais and Americans in the "use of repetition" in a

conversation.

In terms of communicative impatience, Thais were more likely than Americans to get tired or seldom comment if a conversation went on too long. However, there was no difference between Thais and Americans in "hurrying a conversation along and speaking in a crisp business-like manner."

In terms of being relaxed or tense, Americans were more likely than Thais to be physically tense in a conversation. However, there was no difference between Thais and Americans in "being relaxed as opposed to conscious of posture."

In terms of communicative assumptions, results revealed that Thais were more likely than Americans to "reduce tensions by inviting others' criticism." Also, Thais were more likely than Americans to make the assumption that "silence means the other understands" what has been said in a conversation. There was, however, no difference between Thais and Americans in making the assumption that "the subject of a conversation is more important than the way it is being discussed."

In terms of handling difficult conversational situations, Thais were more likely than Americans to handle difficult conversational situations by "avoiding the situations." There was, however, no difference between Thais and Americans in "handling difficult conversational situations by avoiding the information."

Eleven groupings provided no significant difference. They were as follows:

1. Communication Sensitivity (Grouping 1). There was no difference between Thais and Americans in "reported communication sensitivity";
2. Insensitivity (Grouping 2). There were no differences between

Thais and Americans in either "insensitive aggression" or "insensitive indifference";

3. Being Direct (Grouping 7). There were no differences between Thais and Americans in "being agreeably direct as opposed to incoherent," and "being forthright as opposed to brusque and insulting";

4. Feelings (Grouping 9). There were no differences between Thais and Americans in "consciously controlling emotions," "revealing inward feelings," and "considering communication as affective exchange";

5. Listening (Grouping 11). There were no differences between Thais and Americans in having a "self-centered listening rationale," "not listening to untrusted persons as opposed to listening to anyone," and having an "other-centered listening rationale";

6. Trust, Frankness, and Candor (Grouping 12). There were no differences between Thais and Americans in being "nontrusting," and having "concern for frankness and candor";

7. Talkativeness (Grouping 13). There was no difference between Thais and Americans in "being brief as opposed to talkative";

8. Tenacity (Grouping 14). There was no difference between Thais and Americans in "being steadfast" in a conversation;

9. Social Convention (Grouping 16). There was no difference between Thais and Americans in "showing disregard for social convention";

10. Objectivity (Grouping 18). There was no difference between Thais and Americans in "being open-minded" in a conversation; and

11. Self-Confirmation (Grouping 21). There was no difference between Thais and Americans in "reported favorable description."

Discussion

Possible Interpretations of Findings

The first purpose of this study was to compare the communication sensitivity of Thais and Americans. Since no significant difference was found, partial, but inconclusive, support for communication sensitivity as a culture-free construct is provided. It seems reasonable to conclude that communication sensitivity is seen in approximately the same manner by both Thais and Americans.

In terms of communication patterns other than communication sensitivity, the differences found may well be attributed to the cultural differences between the two groups compared. Previous research comparing Thais and Americans provides a great deal of corroborating evidence for some of the conclusions of this study. For example, the findings that Thais were more likely than Americans to be passive in a conversation was supported by Wohl's research (51) which indicated that Thais were more withdrawn and passive than Americans. Moreover, this study found that Thais were less obtrusive than Americans. It may be that the Thais' passivity resulted in little use of hand gestures as opposed to the American pattern of maintaining hand movements in a conversation. Finally, the results revealed that Thais were more likely than Americans to handle difficult conversational situations by avoiding the situations. This finding could be verified by the Thais' personality characteristics of withdrawal and passivity previously discussed.

Also, Siripipat's finding (41) of no difference in overall self-esteem was supported by the finding of no difference in self-confirmation in this present study. In short, the results of this study imply that

cultural differences between Thais and Americans co-vary with differences in communication patterns.

Another interpretation is that the differences found in this study resulted from Thais' functioning in an unfamiliar culture, not from any actual differences in communication patterns normally utilized by Thais and Americans. In other words, the Thais used in this study may not represent Thais living in Thailand. For example, Thais may correct others in a conversation more than Americans because this behavior facilitates learning the language, customs and culture of the United States; it may not be the function of cultural differences at all. Furthermore, Thais may evidence greater verbal involvement than other involvement as a way of adjusting to the language problems they are experiencing; vocabulary building in English probably would be considerably more important to Thais than to Americans because of their lack of familiarity with English rather than actual cultural differences. In summary, the differences found in this study may stem from Thais' lack of familiarity with the language and culture in which they were operating rather than the cultural differences between the two groups.

One perspective as to the lack of differences between Thais and Americans found in this study is that they resulted from the Americanization of the Thai sample. The differences would have been found if the Thai sample had consisted of Thais who had not been exposed to American culture. Even a small change in Thai behaviors as a result of Americanization would have a major impact on some of the comparisons. One example is the finding of no difference between Thais and Americans

in "talkativeness." The results of this comparison for the talkativeness factor approaches significance in the direction of Americans being more talkative. Given the passiveness of the Thai group, the greater talkativeness of the Americans seems to make sense. However, the lack of a significant difference between Thais and Americans in this communication pattern may have resulted from the conscious or unconscious adoption of American communication patterns.

Practical Interpretation of Findings

The findings of differences between Thais and Americans may provide a better understanding of the impact of cultural differences in communication patterns. Moreover, these results may provide some answers to the problems of international students on an American campus. For example, understanding that Thais are more passive than Americans may assist Americans in avoiding the assumption that Thais do not participate in conversation because they lack knowledge. The findings of differences between Thais and Americans suggest possible constraints in curriculum planning for Thai students on an American campus. One significant constraint that needs to be considered in creating a learning environment will greatly affect what he/she will take from that experience. Some of the characteristics that are brought to the environment include the student's reason for taking the course; the knowledge, skills, and values already acquired by the learner; the level of motivation of the student; and the learning style preferences of each individual. An overriding consideration is the fact that each learner is first of all a human being who thinks and feels, has needs and goals, and lives in an environment of his/her own. The instructor must

constantly consider the human relations elements of a learning environment (36). This is related to the findings that Thai students, more than American students, correct others, show concern for agreement and influence, and report acting illogically in a conversation. Based on these findings an instructor may well want to consider developing instructional techniques for Thais which provide a greater degree of guidance and structure than is ordinarily given to American students. This greater direction will tend to meet the Thais' need for or concern about agreement without eliciting negative attitudes that American students have about avoiding correcting others and thinking of themselves as acting logically. Findings related to the greater passivity of Thais also might suggest the use of games and role-playing exercises to stimulate more active involvement in the part of Thai students. To decrease resistance to such methods an instructor might design teaching and learning methods that bring about active participation using writing skills and gradually integrating oral skills. Finally, one might hope that a practical outcome of this study will be improved understanding of communication patterns among cross-cultural groups, more specifically among various groups of international students at an American university.

Recommendations for Future Research

The possible interpretations of this study imply some suggestions for future research related to cultural differences in communication patterns. First, future research might include replication of the present study with a Thai sample composed of Thais who have never been abroad. Conducting research with such a group of Thais would eliminate the possibility of interpreting results in terms of Thais functioning

in an unfamiliar culture or having been Americanized.

Furthermore, it would be interesting and fruitful to compare other cultural groups to determine to what extent the differences found in the present study coincide with other cultural differences.

Summary

The general purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between cultural differences and communication patterns between Thais and Americans. Two primary objectives served as goals of this research: (1) to compare the communication sensitivity of Thais and Americans, and (2) to compare Thais and Americans in terms of communication patterns other than communication sensitivity.

Results revealed that Thais and Americans do not differ with respect to communication sensitivity. They do differ with respect to more than 28% of the patterns of communication studied in addition to communication sensitivity. The results of this study indicate that when a Thai and an American engage in conversation, one might expect problems in the following areas:

1. correcting others,
2. concern for agreement and influence,
3. concern for acting logically,
4. communicative involvement,
5. verbal-nonverbal orientation,
6. concern for understanding,
7. communicative impatience,
8. being relaxed versus tense,
9. communicative assumptions, and
10. ways of handling difficult conversational situations.

One would expect the Thais and Americans to have more or less congruent views concerning:

1. communication sensitivity,
2. self-confirmation,
3. communication insensitivity,
4. being relaxed,
5. feelings,
6. listening,
7. trust, frankness and candor,
8. talkativeness
9. tenacity,
10. social convention, and
11. objectivity.

A number of possible interpretations of the findings were presented in this chapter. The interpretations were as follows:

1. Differences found in communication patterns between Thai and American groups may be a function of cultural differences.

2. Differences found may be a function of Thais communicating in an unfamiliar culture using an unfamiliar language rather than actual differences in Thai and American communication patterns.

3. Lack of differences found may be a function of Americanization of the Thai sample rather than lack of differences in Thai and American communication patterns.

Suggestions for future research in the area of cultural differences in communication patterns centered around: (1) using cultural groups other than the Thai and American groups, and (2) using Thais who are functioning in their native culture and have never been abroad.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Archibald, Robert D. "The Relationship of Teacher's Cognitive Style to Minority Student Satisfaction." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Atlanta, Georgia, 1975.
- (2) Arensberg, Conrad W., and Arthur H. Niehoff. Introducing Social Change: A Manual for Community Development. Chicago: Aldine, 1971, 16.
- (3) Barr, Anthony James, and James Howard Goodnight. "A User's Guide to the Statistical Analysis System." Raleigh, N. C.: North Carolina State University, 1972, 201.
- (4) Brehmer, Brendt, et al. "A Cross-National Comparison of Cognitive Conflict." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 1 (1970), 5-20.
- (5) Brooks, William D. Speech Communication. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1974.
- (6) Cheng, Louis Y. "On Being a Foreign Psychiatric Resident." Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, Vol. 19 (1974), 523-527.
- (7) Cherry, Colin. World Communication: Threat or Promise?: A Socio-Technical Approach. New York: Wiley, 1971, 2.
- (8) Church, Joseph. Language and the Discovery of Reality. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, Inc., 1961, 138.
- (9) Das Gupta, J. C. "Aggression." Samiksa, Vol. 22 (1968), 119-159.
- (10) Deutsch, Karl W. Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966, 37.
- (11) Dubois, Rene. So Human and Animal. New York: Scribner, 1968, 38.
- (12) Engebretson, Darold, and Daniel Fullmer. "Cross-Cultural Differences in Territoriality: Interaction Distances of Native Japanese, Hawaii Japanese, and American Caucasians." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 1 (1970), 261-269.

- (13) Evans, John Robert. "A Study of the Relationship Between Communication Sensitivity and Conversation Effectiveness Within a Physical Education Setting." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1970.)
- (14) Fitts, William H., and William T. Hammer. "The Self Concept and Delinquency." Research Monograph, Vol. 1 (1969).
- (15) Fry, P. S. "The Development of Differentiation in Self-Evaluations: A Cross-Cultural Study." Journal of Psychology, Vol. 87 (1974), 193-202.
- (16) Glidewell, Larry Paul. "Managerial Styles and Communication Sensitivity." (Unpub. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1975.)
- (17) Green, R. T., and G. Santori. "A Cross-Cultural Study of Hostility and Aggression." Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 1 (1969), 13-22.
- (18) Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- (19) Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- (20) Hall, Robert E. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Transactional Analysis Ego Grams, Communication Sensitivity, and Managerial Types in a Business Organization." (Unpub. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1974).
- (21) Harms, L. S. Intercultural Communication. New York: Harper and Row, 1973, 30-41.
- (22) Hart, Roderick P., and Don M. Burks. "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction." Persons Communicating. Darnell and Brockriede, eds. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1976, 179-190.
- (23) Huang, Laykoon T., Robert Phares, and Marc H. Hollender. "The Wish to be Held: A Transcultural Study." Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 31 (1976), 41-43.
- (24) Hughey, Jim D., and Arlee W. Johnson. Speech Communication: Foundations and Challenges. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1975, 382-383.
- (25) Keltner, John W. Interpersonal Speech-Communication: Elements and Structures. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing, Inc., 1970, 28-29.

- (26) Kendall, E. "The Validity of Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 18 (1954), 429-432.
- (27) Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973, 392.
- (28) Koenig, Frederick. "Definition of Self in France and Sweden." Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Vol. 6 (1971), 257-258.
- (29) Lynn, R. National Difference in Anxiety. Dublin, Ireland: Economical and Social Research Institute, 1971.
- (30) Mehrabian, Albert. Silent Messages. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- (31) Mehrabian, Albert, and M. Williams. "Nonverbal Concomitants of Perceived and Intended Persuasiveness." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 13 (1969), 37-58.
- (32) Neal, William Patrick. "Demographic, Personality and Nonverbal Perception Correlates of Communication Sensitivity." (Unpub. M.S. thesis, University of New Mexico, 1970.)
- (33) Paschal, Billy and You-Yuh Kuo. "Anxiety and Self Concept Among American and Chinese College Students." College Student Journal, Vol. 7 (1973), 7-13.
- (34) Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged Edition. New York: Random House, 1966, 298.
- (35) Roberts, Jane. "An Investigation of the Relationship of Communication Behavior and Insight." (Unpub. Manuscript, University of New Mexico, 1969.)
- (36) Robl, Richard M., W. Deke Johnson, and John Creswell. Creating a Learning Environment: A Workbook for the Community Education Instructor. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1976.
- (37) Rogers, Carl, and F. J. Roethlisberger. "Barriers and Gateways to Communication." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 30 (1952), 46-47.
- (38) Rogers, E. M., and F. F. Shoemaker. Communication of Innovations. New York: Free Press, 1971, 11.
- (39) Samovar, Larry A., and Richard E. Porter. Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1972, 33-34.
- (40) Sereno, Kenneth K., and C. David Mortensen, eds. Foundations of Communication Theory. New York: Harper and Row, 1970, 5.

- (41) Siripipat, Ampai. "A Comparison of Self Concepts of Thai and American High School Students." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1972.)
- (42) Sitaram, K. S. "Intercultural Communication: The What and Why of It." International Communication Association, Division V: Intercultural Communication Division, Minneapolis, Minn. (1970), 2.
- (43) Smith, Alfred G. Communication and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966, 7.
- (44) Smith, Arthur. Transracial Communication. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1973.
- (45) Smith, Henry Clay. Sensitivity to People. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- (46) Steinberg, Mark, and Gerald R. Miller. "Interpersonal Communication: A Sharing Process." Communication and Behavior. Hanneman and McEwen, eds. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975, 126-148.
- (47) Stewart, Edward C. "American Advisors Overseas." Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Samovar and Porter, eds. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1972, 279-285.
- (48) Tucker, Patricia Tullis. "The Relationship Between Communication Sensitivity and Selected Types of Aggression." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976.)
- (49) Tucker, Patricia Tullis, and Debbie Wilson. "The Relationship Between Communication Sensitivity and Violence Proneness." (Unpub. Manuscript, Oklahoma State University, 1974.)
- (50) Wiegers, Irene C., and others. "I Was a Foreign Student." College and University, Vol. 51 (1976), 496.
- (51) Wohl, Julian, et al. "Some Personality Characteristics of Thai and American University Students." Psychological Report, Vol. 27 (1970), 45-46.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

A MODIFIED VERSION OF CONVERSATION

SELF-REPORT INVENTORY

FORM 976A

A MODIFIED VERSION OF CSRI

On the following pages are statements concerning the way a person feels about and behaves in the most common of all communication situations--the conversation. Read each statement and then decide to what extent each statement is characteristic of your own feelings and behavior. Using the scale below and the response sheet, rate each statement in terms of the degree to which the statement is characteristic of you.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Uncertain or Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

Be sure to respond to every statement. Respond to the items in order. Do not skip around.

1. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when each speaker is direct and to the point.
2. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when an exchange of feelings on the matter takes place.
3. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when people change their minds on the topic in one way or another.
4. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when people agree on the issues in question.
5. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by making certain I am directly facing him.
6. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by acting as if I like the other person whether I do or not.
7. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by speaking with a pleasant tone of voice.
8. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by accepting his ideas and building on them.
9. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I try to control my emotions by maintaining a calm outward appearance.

10. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I find it difficult to disagree with another person by expressing my real opinions on the matter.
11. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I am able to disagree in an agreeable way.
12. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I become very biased when certain subjects are brought up.
13. In most conversations I often tend to ramble.
14. In most conversations I don't give much weight to information from a person I consider inexpert.
15. In most conversations I am concerned about how the other person will receive what I have to say.
16. In most conversations I place more reliance on the words I use to convey meaning than I do my vocal, facial, and hand expressions.
17. In most conversations I nod my head to indicate I understand the other person.
18. In most conversations I feel I can learn something from the other person if I really listen.
19. In most conversations I feel I am usually understood by others.
20. In most conversations I often find it difficult to accept other people's ideas.
21. In most conversations I am more concerned with the words a speaker uses than the emphasis in his voice and expression on his face.
22. In most conversations I depend on the speaker's vocal, facial, and hand expressions to explain the largest part of his meaning.
23. In most conversations I am distracted by a person's mannerisms, such as excessive eye-blinking.
24. In most conversations I consciously modulate the tone of my voice.
25. In most conversations I'm usually in the background and seldom in the "spot light."
26. In most conversations I'm filled with nervous energy.
27. In most conversations I look the other person directly in the eye when we talk.
28. In most conversations I show enthusiasm for the other person and his ideas.

29. In most conversations I try to abstain from letting others know what I think about what is being said.
30. In most conversations I find myself using other people's ideas without indicating the source of them.
31. In most conversations I listen to a person even if I think he doesn't really have anything to say.
32. In most conversations I speak in a crisp, business-like manner.
33. In most conversations I avoid repeating what I've said before.
34. In most conversations I find it very easy to mentally experience whatever the other person is describing.
35. In most conversations I fail to really explain my views.
36. In most conversations I appear to be indifferent about what's going on.
37. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often become quiet and uncommunicative.
38. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often tell him, "I'm busy now, contact me later."
39. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often try to see things from the other person's viewpoint.
40. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often try to hurry things along so we can get the conversation over with.
41. In most conversations I express interest in the subject at hand.
42. In most conversations I accurately "size-up" what is really going on.
43. In most conversations I can make the other person think I'm listening while I'm really thinking of something else.
44. In most conversations I react to the words the speaker uses rather than the ideas he expresses.
45. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I convey truthful information and expect others to do the same.
46. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I hold to my views steadfastly.

47. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I show a disregard for social convention.
48. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I am able to remain open-minded throughout the conversation.
49. In most conversations my ability to improvise is a real asset.
50. In most conversations I use quite a bit of slang.
51. In most conversations my posture is very relaxed.
52. In most conversations I am eager to listen.
53. In most conversations I look directly at the other person.
54. In most conversations I try to help the other person out by correcting the language he uses.
55. In most conversations I am rather easily distracted from what the speaker is saying by other things occurring at the same time.
56. In most conversations I try to involve the other person as much as possible.
57. In most conversations I tend to "tune out" on people I can't trust.
58. In most conversations I am very objective about the views I express.
59. In most conversations I let my expectations become apparent to other people.
60. In most conversations I avoid prejudging what the other person is saying.
61. In most conversations I use words that are meaningful in terms of the other person's background.
62. In most conversations I don't talk when subjects come up that I don't know about.
63. In most conversations I believe a large vocabulary helps conversational effectiveness.
64. In most conversations I am conscious of my posture.
65. In most conversations I ask the other person for his ideas frequently.
66. In most conversations I use a great deal of vocal expression.

67. In most conversations I use my hands a lot to help express my meanings.
68. In most conversations I try to keep my hand movements inobtrusive.
69. In MANY conversations, I actually have a hard time understanding others.
70. In MANY conversations, I actually tend to get bored.
71. In MANY conversations, I actually invite criticism from the other person.
72. In MANY conversations, I actually tend to get hostile.
73. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I use varied and interesting vocabulary words.
74. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I am considerate.
75. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I am critical of the views others express.
76. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I over-react when certain subjects are brought up.
77. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I have good vocal quality.
78. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I'm adaptable.
79. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I appear to be neat and well-groomed.
80. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I express my ideas in a dynamic manner.
81. In most conversations, I usually make a point to appear calm.
82. In most conversations, I usually get totally involved in what I am talking about or listening to.
83. In most conversations, I usually uphold my opinions with vigor.
84. In most conversations, I usually talk quite a bit about myself.
85. In most conversations I communicate better to those who are frank and honest.
86. In most conversations I feel I have failed to communicate unless the other person understands and accepts my ideas.

87. In most conversations I am very direct and to the point.
88. In most conversations I talk with the other person, not at him.
89. In most conversations I am extremely eager to talk.
90. In most conversations I reassure the other person that I understand him by restating what he says.
91. In most conversations I interrupt others when I have something important to contribute.
92. In most conversations I tend to be dogmatic when I know I am right.
93. In most conversations I place as much reliance on my vocal, facial, and hand expressions to convey meaning as I do the words I use.
94. In most conversations I don't listen very closely.
95. In most conversations I make no attempt to hide my emotions from other people.
96. In most conversations I am extremely frank and honest.
97. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view my views and opinions usually "win out" in the end.
98. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view I think being understood is more important than convincing the other person I am correct.
99. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view I convey truthful information and expect others to do the same.
100. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view I am not completely relaxed--I possess some muscle tension.
101. In most conversations I try to bolster up the ego of the other person whenever I can.
102. In most conversations I try to help the other person out by correcting his mistakes.
103. In most conversations when the other person is searching for the right word, I usually supply just the one he was looking for.
104. In most conversations I seldom hesitate giving specific advice on personal problems.

105. In most conversations, I believe telling a person what he wants to hear helps put him at ease.
106. In most conversations, I believe emotional tensions can be reduced by letting the other person have his say.
107. In most conversations, I believe silence from the other person usually means he understands me.
108. In most conversations, I believe the subject of conversation is more important than the way it is talked about.
109. In most conversations, I am as objective as possible by not getting very involved in what is going on.
110. In most conversations I listen primarily for facts.
111. In most conversations I listen primarily for ideas and underlying feelings.
112. In most conversations I don't often give encouragement to the other person.
113. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I find it difficult to give my opinions in a way that doesn't insult the other person.
114. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I repeat my statements so that he will catch my intended meaning.
115. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I try to find out his expectations and point out areas of common agreement.
116. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I compete with him to win the dominant position.
117. In most conversations I can tell if a person is really listening by his facial expressions.
118. In most conversations I let the tone of my voice reflect my mood and the mood of the conversation.
119. In most conversations I think it is more important to understand the other person's ideas than to be convinced he's right.
120. In most conversations I nod my head to indicate I understand the other person.
121. After a conversation has been going on for some time I get very tired if it drags on too long.

122. After a conversation has been going on for some time I let the other person use as much time as it takes to make his point clear.
123. After a conversation has been going on for some time when I know what the other person is going to say next, I interject my comment before he completely finishes his comment.
124. After a conversation has been going on for some time I seldom comment on what is being said.
125. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that it will appear I am interested in what he is saying.
126. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that I will know what to say next.
127. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that I can tell what he doesn't understand.
128. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that he will be more receptive when I ask questions.
129. In most conversations I try to avoid touching the other person.
130. In most conversations I tend to make inappropriate comments.
131. In most conversations I am not distracted by the other person's mannerisms.
132. In most conversations I tend to be suspicious of other people's motives.
133. In most conversations I tell people things that interest me because this is the same information that usually interests them.
134. In most conversations I assume that I will understand the other person and he will understand me.
135. In most conversations I try to change the subject when a topic comes up which disturbs me.
136. In most conversations I choose topics of conversations which will interest the other person.
137. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by presenting my ideas in an organized manner.
138. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by speaking in terms of the other person's frame of reference.
139. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by speaking distinctly and loudly enough to be heard by all participants.

140. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by avoiding revealing information which will be unfavorably received by others.
141. In MANY conversations I make each contribution as brief as possible.
142. In MANY conversations people have a hard time trying to understand me.
143. In MANY conversations I don't talk to people who represent a threat to me.
144. In MANY conversations I find it difficult or impossible to look the other person in the eye.
145. In MANY conversations I could care less about what is being said.
146. In MANY conversations I usually answer troublesome questions in a round-about way.
147. In MANY conversations I seem to build hostility in the other person by not agreeing with him.
148. In MANY conversations I lean toward the other person when I am speaking or listening.
149. In MANY conversations people have indicated that I speak above the listener's level of understanding.
150. In MANY conversations I am really not interested in what is being said.
151. In MANY conversations I attempt to turn the conversation to subjects that interest me.
152. In MANY conversations I am the one to clarify troublesome points.
153. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I'm a thoughtful conversationalist.
154. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I fail to follow the main topic of conversation.
155. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I seldom act illogically.
156. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I force my viewpoint on the listener.
157. In SOME conversations I feel like I'm being forced to speak by others when I would prefer to listen.

158. In SOME conversations people have accused me of conveying false information.
159. In SOME conversations I am often evasive.
160. In SOME conversations I find it very difficult to trust the other person.

BE SURE TO FILL IN ALL BLANKS BEFORE FINISHING.

Dear Friends:

Never before there has been any cross-cultural research done on Thais' and Americans' communication habits. At present, I am doing my dissertation by comparing communication habits of Thai and American students.

Please answer these questions as honestly as you can in terms of your own communication behaviors. Your contribution and cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Anchalee Tunsagul Leesavan
Speech Communication Major

Please Fill This Out

Sex: 1. Male _____

2. Female _____

Age: 1. Between 20-30 _____

2. Between 30-40 _____

Level of Education: 1. Undergraduate _____

2. Graduate:

a. Master's Degree _____

b. Doctoral Degree _____

Field of Study: Department of _____

College of _____

Form _____

ANSWER SHEET

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| 1. _____ | 25. _____ | 49. _____ | 73. _____ | 97. _____ | 121. _____ | 146. _____ |
| 2. _____ | 26. _____ | 50. _____ | 74. _____ | 98. _____ | 122. _____ | 147. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 27. _____ | 51. _____ | 75. _____ | 99. _____ | 123. _____ | 148. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 28. _____ | 52. _____ | 76. _____ | 100. _____ | 124. _____ | 149. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 29. _____ | 53. _____ | 77. _____ | 101. _____ | 125. _____ | 150. _____ |
| 6. _____ | 30. _____ | 54. _____ | 78. _____ | 102. _____ | 126. _____ | 151. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 31. _____ | 55. _____ | 79. _____ | 103. _____ | 127. _____ | 152. _____ |
| 8. _____ | 32. _____ | 56. _____ | 80. _____ | 104. _____ | 128. _____ | 153. _____ |
| 9. _____ | 33. _____ | 57. _____ | 81. _____ | 105. _____ | 129. _____ | 154. _____ |
| 10. _____ | 34. _____ | 58. _____ | 82. _____ | 106. _____ | 130. _____ | 155. _____ |
| 11. _____ | 35. _____ | 59. _____ | 83. _____ | 107. _____ | 131. _____ | 156. _____ |
| 12. _____ | 36. _____ | 60. _____ | 84. _____ | 108. _____ | 132. _____ | 157. _____ |
| 13. _____ | 37. _____ | 61. _____ | 85. _____ | 109. _____ | 133. _____ | 158. _____ |
| 14. _____ | 38. _____ | 62. _____ | 86. _____ | 110. _____ | 134. _____ | 159. _____ |
| 15. _____ | 39. _____ | 63. _____ | 87. _____ | 111. _____ | 135. _____ | 160. _____ |
| 16. _____ | 40. _____ | 64. _____ | 88. _____ | 112. _____ | 136. _____ | |
| 17. _____ | 41. _____ | 65. _____ | 89. _____ | 113. _____ | 137. _____ | |
| 18. _____ | 42. _____ | 66. _____ | 90. _____ | 114. _____ | 138. _____ | |
| 19. _____ | 43. _____ | 67. _____ | 91. _____ | 115. _____ | 139. _____ | |
| 20. _____ | 44. _____ | 68. _____ | 92. _____ | 116. _____ | 140. _____ | |
| 21. _____ | 45. _____ | 69. _____ | 93. _____ | 117. _____ | 141. _____ | |
| 22. _____ | 46. _____ | 70. _____ | 94. _____ | 118. _____ | 142. _____ | |
| 23. _____ | 47. _____ | 71. _____ | 95. _____ | 119. _____ | 143. _____ | |
| 24. _____ | 48. _____ | 72. _____ | 96. _____ | 120. _____ | 144. _____ | |

APPENDIX B

MEANS FOR THAIS AND AMERICANS ON FIFTY-TWO
CONVERSATIONAL FACTORS

Americans (N = 50)

| <u>F1</u> | <u>F2</u> | <u>F3</u> | <u>F4</u> | <u>F5</u> | <u>F6</u> | <u>F7</u> | <u>F8</u> | <u>F9</u> | <u>F10</u> | <u>F11</u> |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 22.480 | 33.620 | 2.780 | -6.900 | -13.100 | -13.460 | 0.820 | -0.660 | -0.640 | -11.640 | 9.540 |
| <u>F12</u> | <u>F13</u> | <u>F14</u> | <u>F15</u> | <u>F16</u> | <u>F17</u> | <u>F18</u> | <u>F19</u> | <u>F20</u> | <u>F21</u> | <u>F22</u> |
| 14.800 | -17.800 | 7.760 | -8.460 | 3.920 | 10.460 | -1.140 | -12.600 | -4.960 | -1.800 | 0.600 |
| <u>F23</u> | <u>F24</u> | <u>F25</u> | <u>F26</u> | <u>F27</u> | <u>F28</u> | <u>F29</u> | <u>F30</u> | <u>F31</u> | <u>F32</u> | <u>F33</u> |
| 2.880 | -2.580 | -17.640 | 22.260 | 7.080 | -6.200 | 9.520 | 2.920 | -10.740 | 5.580 | 4.940 |
| <u>F34</u> | <u>F35</u> | <u>F36</u> | <u>F37</u> | <u>F38</u> | <u>F39</u> | <u>F40</u> | <u>F41</u> | <u>F42</u> | <u>F43</u> | <u>F44</u> |
| 3.440 | 12.380 | -6.040 | -15.160 | 5.820 | 0.360 | 2.640 | -13.880 | 3.380 | 6.300 | -2.140 |
| <u>F45</u> | <u>F46</u> | <u>F47</u> | <u>F48</u> | <u>F49</u> | <u>F50</u> | <u>F51</u> | <u>CSENS</u> | | | |
| 2.360 | -0.660 | 3.340 | -6.400 | -23.060 | 11.220 | -6.900 | 137.460 | | | |

Thais (N = 50)

| <u>F1</u> | <u>F2</u> | <u>F3</u> | <u>F4</u> | <u>F5</u> | <u>F6</u> | <u>F7</u> | <u>F8</u> | <u>F9</u> | <u>F10</u> | <u>F11</u> |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 22.860 | 33.240 | 5.040 | -5.560 | -14.960 | -12.620 | 0.960 | 0.140 | -1.580 | -13.340 | 8.540 |
| <u>F12</u> | <u>F13</u> | <u>F14</u> | <u>F15</u> | <u>F16</u> | <u>F17</u> | <u>F18</u> | <u>F19</u> | <u>F20</u> | <u>F21</u> | <u>F22</u> |
| 15.540 | -17.120 | 7.320 | -9.040 | 3.260 | 10.960 | -1.640 | -12.920 | -4.060 | -2.380 | -0.440 |
| <u>F23</u> | <u>F24</u> | <u>F25</u> | <u>F26</u> | <u>F27</u> | <u>F28</u> | <u>F29</u> | <u>F30</u> | <u>F31</u> | <u>F32</u> | <u>F33</u> |
| 3.120 | -3.100 | -17.780 | 21.540 | 7.920 | -6.340 | 9.780 | 2.140 | -10.860 | 5.980 | 6.700 |
| <u>F34</u> | <u>F35</u> | <u>F36</u> | <u>F37</u> | <u>F38</u> | <u>F39</u> | <u>F40</u> | <u>F41</u> | <u>F42</u> | <u>F43</u> | <u>F44</u> |
| 3.040 | 12.120 | -6.220 | -14.020 | 6.220 | 0.800 | 2.840 | -15.000 | 2.600 | 6.660 | -2.500 |
| <u>F45</u> | <u>F46</u> | <u>F47</u> | <u>F48</u> | <u>F49</u> | <u>F50</u> | <u>F51</u> | <u>CSENS</u> | | | |
| 2.600 | 0.060 | 3.260 | -6.140 | -23.160 | 10.700 | -6.840 | 139.380 | | | |

Note: For positively loaded factors (Factors 1, 2, 12, 14, 17, 23, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 42, 43, 47, 50 and 52), the higher the mean score the more the factor characterizes the group. For negatively loaded factors (Factors 5, 10, 13, 15, 19, 25, 28, 31, 36, 37, 41, 44, 48, 49 and 51), the more negative the mean score the more the factor characterizes the group. For each factor of the form "X vs. Y," the more positive the mean score the more X characterizes the group; the more negative the mean score the more Y characterizes the group. Factors 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 30, 39, 45 and 46 are in the form "X vs. Y."

APPENDIX C

ITEMS INCLUDED IN EACH OF THE FIFTY-ONE
FACTORS OR COMMUNICATION PATTERNS

Factor 1: Favorable Description

Positively Loaded Items

73. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I use varied and interesting vocabulary words.
74. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I am considerate.
77. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I have good vocal quality.
78. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I'm adaptable.
79. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I appear to be neat and well-groomed.
80. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I express my ideas in a dynamic manner.
153. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I'm a thoughtful conversationalist.

Factor 2: Insensitive Aggression

Positively Loaded Items

72. In MANY conversations, I actually tend to get hostile.
75. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I am critical of the views others express.
76. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I over-react when certain subjects are brought up.
80. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I express my ideas in a dynamic manner.
92. In most conversations I tend to be dogmatic when I know I am right.
116. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I compete with him to win the dominant position.
130. In most conversations I tend to make inappropriate comments.

147. In MANY conversations I seem to build hostility in the other person by not agreeing with him.
154. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I fail to follow the main topic of conversation.
156. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I force my viewpoint on the listener.
158. In SOME conversations people have accused me of conveying false information.
12. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I become very biased when certain subjects are brought up.
26. In most conversations I'm filled with nervous energy.

Factor 3: Passive Versus Active Involvement

Positively Loaded Items

25. In most conversations I'm usually in the background and seldom in the "spot light."
36. In most conversations I appear to be indifferent about what's going on.
109. In most conversations I am as objective as possible by not getting very involved in what is going on.
29. In most conversations I try to abstain from letting others know what I think about what is being said.

Negatively Loaded Items

82. In most conversations, I usually get totally involved in what I am talking about or listening to.
83. In most conversations, I usually uphold my opinions with vigor.

Factor 4: Verbal Versus Nonverbal

Positively Loaded Items

16. In most conversations I place more reliance on the words I use to convey meaning than I do my vocal, facial, and hand expressions.

21. In most conversations I am more concerned with the words a speaker uses than the emphasis in his voice and expression on his face.

Negatively Loaded Items

22. In most conversations I depend on the speaker's vocal, facial, and hand expressions to explain the largest part of his meaning.
66. In most conversations I use a great deal of vocal expression.
67. In most conversations I use my hands a lot to help express my meanings.
93. In most conversations I place as much reliance on my vocal, facial, and hand expressions to convey meaning as I do the words I use.

Factor 5: Correcting Others

Negatively Loaded Items

54. In most conversations I try to help the other person out by correcting the language he uses.
102. In most conversations I try to help the other person out by correcting his mistakes.
103. In most conversations when the other person is searching for the right word, I usually supply just the one he was looking for.
104. In most conversations I seldom hesitate giving specific advice on personal problems.
91. In most conversations I interrupt others when I have something important to contribute.

Factor 6: Self-Interest Versus

Concern for Understanding

Positively Loaded Items

133. In most conversations I tell people about things that interest me because this is the same information that usually interests them.

Negatively Loaded Items

98. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view I think being understood is more important than convincing the other person I am correct.
99. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view I convey truthful information and expect others to do the same.
111. In most conversations I listen primarily for ideas and underlying feelings.
119. In most conversations I think it is more important to understand the other person's ideas than to be convinced he's right.

Factor 7: Non-Touch Versus Leaning

Toward Other Person

Positively Loaded Item

129. In most conversations I try to avoid touching the other person.

Negatively Loaded Item

148. In MANY conversations I lean toward the other person when I am speaking or listening.

Factor 8: Not Being Distracted Versus Being

Distracted by Others' Nonverbal Mannerisms

Positively Loaded Item

131. In most conversations I am not distracted by the other person's mannerisms.

Negatively Loaded Item

23. In most conversations I am distracted by a person's mannerisms, such as excessive eye-blinking.

Factor 9: Being Agreeably Direct Versus
Being Incoherent

Positively Loaded Items

- 19. In most conversations I feel I am usually understood by others.
- 87. In most conversations I am very direct and to the point.
- 11. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I am able to disagree in an agreeable way.
- 33. In most conversations I avoid repeating what I've said before.

Negatively Loaded Items

- 13. In most conversations I often tend to ramble.
- 25. In most conversations I'm usually in the background and seldom in the "spot light."
- 35. In most conversations I fail to really explain my views.
- 130. In most conversations I tend to make inappropriate comments.
- 142. In MANY conversations people have a hard time trying to understand me.
- 10. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I find it difficult to disagree with another person by expressing my real opinions on the matter.

Factor 10: Getting Tired or Seldom Commenting
a Conversation Goes on Too Long

Negatively Loaded Items

- 121. After a conversation has been going on for some time I get very tired if it drags on too long.
- 124. After a conversation has been going on for some time I seldom comment on what is being said.

55. In most conversations I am rather easily distracted from what the speaker is saying by other things occurring at the same time.
105. In most conversations, I believe telling a person what he wants to hear helps put him at ease.

Factor 11: Visual Directness Versus

Non-Directness

Positively Loaded Items

5. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by making certain I am directly facing him.
27. In most conversations I look the other person in the eye when we talk.
53. In most conversations I look directly at the other person.

Negatively Loaded Item

144. In MANY conversations I find it difficult or impossible to look the other person in the eye.

Factor 12: Indifference

Positively Loaded Items

69. In MANY conversations, I actually have a hard time understanding others.
70. In MANY conversations, I actually tend to get bored.
94. In most conversations I don't listen very closely.
145. In MANY conversations I could care less about what is being said.
150. In MANY conversations I am really not interested in what is being said.
151. In MANY conversations I attempt to turn the conversation to subjects that interest me.

Factor 13: Consciously Controlling Emotions

by Appearing Calm

Negatively Loaded Items

7. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by speaking with a pleasant tone of voice.
9. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I try to control my emotions by maintaining a calm outward appearance.
24. In most conversations I consciously modulate the tone of my voice.
81. In most conversations, I usually make a point to appear calm.
49. In most conversations my ability to improvise is a real asset.

Factor 14: Nonverbal Feedback

Positively Loaded Items

17. In most conversations I nod my head to indicate I understand the other person.
120. In most conversations I nod my head to indicate I understand the other person.

Factor 15: Passive and Non-Authentic

Negatively Loaded Items

43. In most conversations I can make the other person think I'm listening while I'm really thinking of something else.
157. In SOME conversations I feel like I'm being forced to speak by others when I would prefer to listen.
159. In SOME conversations I am often evasive.

Factor 16: Being Relaxed Versus Being
Conscious of Posture

Positively Loaded Items

- 51. In most conversations my posture is very relaxed.
- 50. In most conversations I use quite a bit of slang.

Negatively Loaded Item

- 64. In most conversations I am conscious of my posture.

Factor 17: Self-Centered Listening

Positively Loaded Items

- 125. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that it will appear I am interested in what he is saying.
- 126. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that I will know what to say next.
- 128. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that he will be more receptive when I ask questions.

Factor 18: Other-Centered Versus
Self-Centered Involvement

Positively Loaded Items

- 117. In most conversations I can tell if a person is really listening by his facial expressions.
- 123. After a conversation has been going on for some time when I know what the other person is going to say next, I interject my comment before he completely finishes his comment.

Negatively Loaded Items

88. In most conversations I talk with the other person, not at him.
122. After a conversation has been going on for some time I let the other person use as much time as it takes to make his point clear.

Factor 19: Nontrusting

Negatively Loaded Items

132. In most conversations I tend to be conscious of other people's motives.
160. In SOME conversations I find it very difficult to trust the other person.
57. In most conversations I tend to "tune out" on people I can't trust.
62. In most conversations I don't talk when subjects come up that I don't know about.

Factor 20: Being Brief Versus Being Talkative

Positively Loaded Item

141. In MANY conversations I make each contribution as brief as possible.

Negatively Loaded Items

84. In most conversations, I usually talk quite a bit about myself.
89. In most conversations I am extremely eager to talk.
13. In most conversations I often tend to ramble.

Factor 21: Being Forthright Versus

Being Brusks and Insulting

Positively Loaded Item

1. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when each speaker is direct and to the point.

Negatively Loaded Items

38. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often tell him, "I'm busy now, contact me later."
113. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I find it difficult to give my opinions in a way that doesn't insult the other person.

Factor 22: Non-Involvement Versus Empathy

Positively Loaded Items

37. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often become quiet and uncommunicative.
38. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often tell him, "I'm busy now, contact me later."

Negatively Loaded Items

39. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation I most often try to see things from the other person's viewpoint.
86. In most conversations I feel I have failed to communicate unless the other person understands and accepts my ideas.

Factor 23: Being Steadfast

Positively Loaded Item

46. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I hold to my views steadfastly.

Factor 24: Not Listening to Untrusted

Versus Listening to Anyone

Positively Loaded Item

57. In most conversations I tend to "tune out" on people I can't trust.

Negatively Loaded Items

31. In most conversations I listen to a person even if I think he doesn't really have anything to say.
112. In most conversations I don't often give encouragement to the other person.

Factor 25: Other Involvement

(Transmitter Behavior)

Negatively Loaded Items

28. In most conversations I show enthusiasm for the other person and his ideas.
101. In most conversations I try to bolster up the ego of the other person whenever I can.
115. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I try to find out his expectations and point out areas of common agreement.
118. In most conversations I let the tone of my voice reflect my mood and the mood of the conversation.

137. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by presenting my ideas in an organized manner.

Factor 26: Other Involvement

(Receiver Behavior)

Positively Loaded Items

28. In most conversations I show enthusiasm for the other person and his ideas.
41. In most conversations I express interest in the subject at hand.
56. In most conversations I try to involve the other person as much as possible.
65. In most conversations I ask the other person for his ideas frequently.
18. In most conversations I feel I can learn something from the other person if I really listen.
52. In most conversations I am eager to listen.

Factor 27: Reduce Tension by Inviting

Criticism from Others

Positively Loaded Items

106. In most conversations, I believe emotional tensions can be reduced by letting the other person have his say.
125. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that it will appear I am interested in what he is saying.

Factor 28: Use of Repetition

Negatively Loaded Items

90. In most conversations I reassure the other person that I understand him by restating what he says.

114. In most conversations, when I feel friction developing between me and the other person I repeat my statements so that he will catch my intended meaning.

Factor 29: Inappropriate Assumptions (Subject
of Conversation is More Important Than the
Way It Is Being Discussed)

Positively Loaded Items

108. In most conversations, I believe the subject of conversation is more important than the way it is talked about.
110. In most conversations I listen primarily for facts.
134. In most conversations I assume that I will understand the other person and he will understand me.

Factor 30: Other Involvement Versus
Verbal Involvement

Positively Loaded Items

45. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I convey truthful information and expect others to do the same.
136. In most conversations I choose topics of conversations which will interest the other person.

Negatively Loaded Items

36. In most conversations I appear to be indifferent about what's going on.
44. In most conversations I react to the words the speaker uses rather than the ideas he expresses.

Factor 31: Being Open-Minded

Negatively Loaded Items

48. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I am able to remain open-minded throughout the conversation.
58. In most conversations I am very objective about the views I express.
60. In most conversations I avoid prejudging what the other person is saying.

Factor 32: Revealing Inward Feelings

Positively Loaded Items

71. In MANY conversations, I actually invite criticism from the other person.
95. In most conversations I make no attempt to hide my emotions from other people.

Factor 33: People Can Change Their Mind
and Concern for AgreementPositively Loaded Items

3. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when people change their minds on the topic in one way or another.
4. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when people agree on the issues in question.

Factor 34: Seldom Act Illogically

Positively Loaded Item

155. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that I seldom act illogically.

Factor 35: Superiority

Positively Loaded Items

- 97. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view my views and opinions usually "win out" in the end.
- 152. In MANY conversations I am the one to clarify troublesome points.
- 42. In most conversations I accurately "size-up" what is really going on.
- 149. In MANY conversations people have indicated that I speak above the listeners level of understanding.

Factor 36: Hurry Conversation and Speak

in a Business-Like Manner

Negatively Loaded Items

- 40. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often try to hurry things along so we can get the conversation over with.
- 32. In most conversations I speak in a crisp, business-like manner.

Factor 37: Use of Words

Negatively Loaded Items

- 56. In most conversations I try to involve the other person as much as possible.
- 61. In most conversations I use words that are meaningful in terms of the other person's background.
- 138. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by speaking in terms of the other person's frame of reference.
- 139. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by speaking distinctly and loudly enough to be heard by all participants.

Factor 38: Verbal Orientation

Positively Loaded Items

63. In most conversations I believe a large vocabulary helps conversation effectiveness.
30. In most conversations I find myself using other people's ideas without indicating the source of them.

Factor 39: Accept Ideas of Others and Build on
Them Versus Find It Difficult to
Accept Others' Ideas

Positively Loaded Item

8. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by accepting his ideas and building on them.

Negatively Loaded Item

20. In most conversations I often find it difficult to accept other people's ideas.

Factor 40: Disregard for Social Convention

Positively Loaded Item

47. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I show a disregard for social convention.

Factor 41: Avoidance of Difficult Situations

Negatively Loaded Items

12. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about I become very biased when certain subjects are brought up.

135. In most conversations I try to change the subject when a topic comes up which disturbs me.
146. In MANY conversations I usually answer troublesome questions in a round-about way.
151. In MANY conversations I attempt to turn the conversation to subjects that interest me.
143. In MANY conversations I don't talk to people who represent a threat to me.

Factor 42: Physically Tense

Positively Loaded Item

100. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view I am not completely relaxed--I possess some muscle tension.

Factor 43: Avoidance of Information

Positively Loaded Items

14. In most conversations I don't give much weight to information from a person I consider inexpert.
140. In most conversations, I try to avoid misunderstanding by avoiding revealing information which will be unfavorably received by others.

Factor 44: Inappropriate Assumptions (Silence
Means That Others Understand)

Negatively Loaded Item

107. In most conversations, I believe silence from the other person usually means he understands me.

Factor 45: Being Non-Authentic

Versus Authentic

Positively Loaded Items

6. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by acting as if I like the other person whether I do or not.
146. In MANY conversations I usually answer troublesome questions in a round-about way.

Negatively Loaded Item

59. In most conversations I let my expectations become apparent to other people.

Factor 46: Being Inobtrusive Versus

Maintaining Hand Movements

Positively Loaded Items

68. In most conversations I try to keep my hand movements inobtrusive.
34. In most conversations I find it very easy to mentally experience whatever the other person is describing.

Negatively Loaded Item

67. In most conversations I use my hands a lot to help express my meanings.

Factor 47: Empathy

Positively Loaded Item

34. In most conversations I find it very easy to mentally experience whatever the other person is describing.

Factor 48: Concern for Reaction of Others

Negatively Loaded Items

15. In most conversations I am concerned about how the other person will receive what I have to say.
26. In most conversations I'm filled with nervous energy.

Factor 49: Concern for Frankness and Candor

Negatively Loaded Items

1. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when each speaker is direct and to the point.
45. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed I convey truthful information and expect others to do the same.
85. In most conversations I communicate better to those who are frank and brusque.
87. In most conversations I am very direct and to the point.
96. In most conversations I am extremely frank and honest.
99. In most conversations, when I present an argument for a certain point of view I convey truthful information and expect others to do the same.

Factor 50: Consider Communication as

Affective Exchange

Positively Loaded Items

2. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when an exchange of feelings on the matter takes place.
111. In most conversations I listen primarily for ideas and underlying feelings.

118. In most conversations I let the tone of my voice reflect my mood and the mood of the conversation.

Factor 51: Other-Centered Listening Rationale

Negatively Loaded Items

127. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that I can tell what he doesn't understand.
128. In most conversations, I listen to the other person's questions so that he will be more receptive when I ask questions.

See factor loading for each item in Table III.

VITA

Anchalee Tunsagul Leesavan

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS: A COMPARISON OF THAIS AND AMERICANS

Major Field: Higher Education

Minor: Speech

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Maehongson, Thailand, January 16, 1949, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Maetee Tunsagul.

Education: Graduated from Regina Coeli High School, Chiangmai, Thailand, 1967; graduated from Santana High School, Santee, California, 1968; received the Bachelor of Arts degree in English from Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand in 1972; received the Master of Arts degree in Theatre Arts from the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky in 1973; attended Oklahoma State University, 1974-1977; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in May 1977.

Professional Experience: Educational consultant for Kasigorn Bank, Bangkok, Thailand in 1972; graduate teaching assistant in Speech 1713 at Oklahoma State University, Spring 1975; graduate teaching assistant in Speech 2713 at Oklahoma State University, 1975-1977.