



COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS

A Quarterly Information Service from the
Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture

Vol 7 (1986), No. 3

Intercultural Communication

The 1950s novel, *The Ugly American*, symbolized the mentality that generated the study of intercultural communication. The 'uglies' were the 'beautiful people' of the embassy set who made no effort to learn the language or culture and barely concealed their disdain for the 'locals' in rare excursions outside the golden ghetto of transplanted Western culture. The hero, a homely agronomist, went out among the peasants of Southeast Asia, gradually immersed himself in their culture and found he had much to learn from them. He alone communicated.

In the centuries of colonialism there have long been 'ugly imperialists', but the national independence movements of the post World War II period let people know that their cultures were not a mere receptacle for Westernization. They wanted equal cultural exchange. Militant movements among ethnic and racial minorities—American Blacks, Spanish Basques, Welsh and South India Tamils—rejected the notion that they were fodder for a national melting pot.

With the 1960s came massive overseas development efforts, and the technology of jet engines and satellite communications brought millions of people of different cultures into more intimate contact. The creation of the multinational corporation required that people of different cultures work together in the same organization.

In the 1960s the first university courses in intercultural communication were introduced, and this new field of communication studies took shape. This issue traces the efforts to form a separate area of research out of the traditions of cultural anthropology, linguistics, psychology and other fields.

REVIEW ARTICLE

I: Beginnings of the Field of Intercultural Communication

Edward T. Hall. *The Silent Language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co. 1959; *The Hidden Dimension*. Doubleday, 1966; *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976; *The Dance of Life: The Other Dimension of Time*. Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1983.

For centuries explorers, missionaries and political envoys have been sending back descriptions of (for them) newly discovered tribes and nations with an eye to preparing their successors for better communication. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, ethnographers began the systematic science of describing different 'ways of life' and created the concept of culture as well as the field of cultural anthropology. Increasingly anthropologists were called upon to apply their knowledge to the training of colonial administrators and missionaries. In the 1950s anthropologists in America such as Edward Hall, Ruth and John Useem and others began to specialise in the training of businessmen and development workers for cross-cultural contacts. Hall appears to be the first to use the term, *intercultural communication*, in his 1959 book, *The Silent Language*¹, and he has continued to introduce many of the seminal ideas of intercultural communication.

Hall writes especially for American, European and Japanese businessmen because innovations in communication often start with the 'merchants'. They have established the initial patterns of intercultural communication as far back as the invention of writing 5,000 years ago to keep records of grain supplies. In this view,

businessmen are often too pragmatic and untrained in the ritual, poetic dimensions of life to notice the less rational, nonverbal aspects of radically different cultures.

Most Intercultural Communication is Nonverbal

Many intercultural researchers would agree with Hall that only about 10% of communication is at the level of conscious, explicit beliefs and formal vocabulary and/or grammar. Far more important are the largely unconscious levels of gesture, facial expression, eye contact, tone of voice, the timing of conversational topics, touch, the degree of emotional expressiveness and the sense of when to be formal or informal. You may know the vocabulary and grammar perfectly, but unless you master the nonverbal levels you may be a miserable communicator.

Hall terms this part of culture which has not been formulated in words the core, *Primary level culture (PLC)*. The PLC defines what is meaningful information for people, and messages which do not fit into the logic of this schema are simply lost on them. It is also the level most resistant to change precisely because it is hidden and implicit. American, European or Japanese cultures may appear

superficially similar at the level of international scientific or business knowledge but differ profoundly at the core, primary level. Hall believes that the PLC is rooted in our nervous system and in the hemispheric functions of the brain through early socialisation so that we can never really transform this level of culture in our personalities.

Degree of Distance in Face-to-Face Interaction

Hall pioneered the study of *proxemics*, the analysis of space as a form of communication. Research on distance in conversation—why, for example, people of Mediterranean or Arab countries prefer much closer face-to-face contact than Anglo-Americans—has become an important focus of intercultural communications because it indicates a range of communication styles. Hall has also studied the space dimension of communication in architecture and in the design or arrangement of furniture. For example, he interprets the German use of inner and outer doors as evidence of a search for greater privacy and interpersonal distance.

How Much Explicit Information?

Another primary-level dimension of importance for intercultural communication is the assumption in cultures such as the Japanese that meaning is conveyed in the general *context* and *feeling* of the conversation (*high context cultures*) and not in explicit, logical or verbal expression (*low context cultures*). Ritual introductions and nonverbal cues, such as a glance of the eyes, which quietly trigger expected reactions, are more important in *high context cultures*.

Hall found that Western Jesuit missionaries in Japan failed to communicate because they insisted on low-context, rationalistic philosophical arguments, while for the Japanese the meaningfulness of a religion lies in the general contextual feeling.

Low context, explicit communication is linked with 'fast messages' like the American TV commercial that gives all the hard, persuasive facts about a very specific item in thirty seconds. High context messages may require a slower unfolding of the full connotative, holistic meaning.

Getting our Time Rhythms Synchronised

The conceptions of time, Hall argues, are a core system of a culture around which beliefs, values and cultural institutions are organised. Some of the most radical barriers to intercultural communication arise from differing senses of time. Hall lists many time dimensions in a culture: *biological time* of growth, reproduction, sleep and forms of hibernation; *personal time*, that is, variations in expressive emotional and psychological states; *physical time* based on seasons; *metaphysical time* such as mystical out-of-the-body experiences that seem to escape time; *sacred time* of myth and ritual that transcend history; *profane, man-made time* of minutes and hours, etc. However, one of the most important cultural definitions of time is *micro-time*, that is, the sense of time which lies at the unconscious, primary level of culture. For Hall there are two major patterns of micro-time in cultures around the world: *monochronic* sense of time—the attention to one thing at a time in linear, stepwise order; and *polychronic*

time—attention to various ongoing activities at one time. Monochronic time is associated by Hall with more industrialised, task-oriented and highly bureaucratized societies where complex tasks require division of labour and concentrated attention to the steps of a production process. Polychronic time is associated with more person-oriented cultures and with cultures which emphasize a holistic expression of the poetic, humanistic aspects of life as well as task orientation. Mediterranean, Middle Eastern and Latin American cultures tend to be more polychronic while North Atlantic cultures are more monochronic. Hall gives examples of how monochronic North Americans are frustrated when polychronic people do not keep to schedules, wasting time and money. But to polychronic people, North Americans appear to be insensitive, narrow personalities.

The Global Ballroom

Hall suggests that successful intercultural communication depends very much on the harmonious synchronisation of rhythms of time, levels of emotional expressiveness and explicitness of meaning. Primary levels of communication such as music, poetry and dance, which are rooted in feelings and imagination, may be the deepest common denominator of culture and the bond which holds together the human species. William Condon has coined the term 'entrainment' to describe the process in which two people such as the new-born baby and the mother become synchronised into each other's rhythms.² Present research suggests that these rhythms are deep in personalities at the level of brain waves and that synchronisation with one's own personal rhythms is an important aspect of personality development necessary for intercultural communication.

Hall, in his practical *Handbook for Proxemic Research*, has developed a system of observations to detect when people of the same or different cultures are out of sync. It includes 1) films of people interacting; 2) a notation system recording gestures, etc; 3) time-motion analyses; and 4) a computer programme to show when people are in sync or out of sync.

For example, a film of children on a school playground examined in slow motion revealed that, as one little girl moved from group to group, the children were in sync not only with each other but with her. Furthermore the rhythm of the girl, who was orchestrating the whole playground, was later found to be that of a currently popular rock music record. Hall concludes that there was an underlying cultural rhythm influencing independently both the music composer and the children.

Some researchers, such as Michael Prosser, consider Hall's generalisations too facile.³ Nevertheless, the research of Hall and others on the nonverbal level of intercultural communication is challenging many commonly held concepts of communication. At this level, there are no defined senders, no receivers and no readily identified messages. Communication at its deeper levels is a continuous process of unspoken synchronisation and shared rhythms that make up group identity.

II: Forming the Basic Concepts

William B. Gudykunst. 'Intercultural Communication: Current Status and Proposed Directions' in Brenda Dervin and Melvin J. Voigt (eds.) *Progress in Communication Sciences*. Vol. VI. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1985.

The Growth of Intercultural Training

The writing of Hall and others stimulated a rapid spread of intercultural workshops for businessmen, overseas students, language teachers and diplomatic corps in the 1960s and early 1970s. David Hoopes and his associates at the Regional Council for International Education and the programme of Richard Brislin at the East-West Centre in Hawaii were instrumental in bringing people from the disciplines of anthropology, psychology, linguistics,

communications and international relations into the more formal study of intercultural communication.⁴ In 1976 these people interested in more practical training formed the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR). SIETAR has its centre at Georgetown University, USA, but with organizational branches and an intensive programme of training in Europe, Japan and other parts of the world.

In the 1960s university-level courses in intercultural communication began to be introduced, often (in the USA) in departments of speech communication with an emphasis on the cultural dimension in interpersonal communication, public speaking and rhetoric, and international diplomatic relations. The widespread promotion of intercultural communication as a recognized degree programme in the USA came after 1970 when the Speech Communication Association created a commission for International and Intercultural Communication and the International Communication Association (ICA) created a Division of Intercultural Communication. By 1977 approximately 200 colleges and universities were offering one or more undergraduate courses in intercultural communication and 60 universities offered a master's or doctoral level specialisation.⁵

With this growth in the 1970s came an outpouring of textbooks which brought together from various disciplines some of the basic concepts of the field.⁶

Strong Links with Cultural Anthropology

The concepts of *culture* and *subculture*, taken from anthropology, are of crucial importance in the field of intercultural communication because this field distinguishes itself from other areas in the larger field of communications precisely by focussing on the *cultural variable* in interpersonal, group, interracial, mass or international communications. Textbooks also took from anthropology a host of cross-cultural comparisons of styles of communication, values and world views influencing communication, as well as nonverbal

behaviours such as those analysed by Hall above.

From psychology, textbooks borrowed concepts such as culturally influenced modes of perception, for example, the fact that world views screen out awareness of some aspects of reality. From social psychology came conceptions of empathy, stereotypes and prejudice—all the ways that group membership influences the way we perceive other groups.

From sociology these textbooks took ideas of interpersonal and intergroup conflict and cooperation, interracial and inter-ethnic relations, and family interaction. From linguistics and semiotics came analysis of codes and signification in verbal, nonverbal, gestural and kinesic (body language) communication. Many adapted the theory of Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Whorf that the language of a people is not just a vehicle for thought but defines the way they think and the values they hold.

The study of rhetoric contributed an analysis of techniques of persuasion, line of argument and styles of public address. The borrowing from the then incipient field of communication depended on whether the context of intercultural communication was interpersonal, small group, mass or international.

Intercultural communication remains today a highly interdisciplinary field, and much research is done from the perspective of anthropology, psychology, linguistics and rhetoric. One of the major efforts has been to develop an agreed-upon body of theory distinct from other fields which explains how the *process* of intercultural communication actually happens.

III: Major Debates in the Field of Intercultural Communication

Molefi Kete Asante, Eileen Newmark and Cecil A. Blake. *Handbook of Intercultural Communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979. *Communication Yearbook of the International Communication Association*, Vols I (1977), II (1978), III (1979) and IV (1980). New Brunswick, NJ, and London: Transaction Books.

Beginning in 1974 the Commission on International and Intercultural Communication of the Speech Communication Association published an annual review of research in this area, and from 1976 the Yearbook of the ICA included a review of research on intercultural communication. In 1977 the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* began publication. These annual reviews and other handbooks provided a forum for defining the focus and boundaries of this new field.

What is Intercultural Communication?

Most would agree that the focus is the study of cultural similarities or dissimilarities that impede or enhance communication across cultures. There is a tendency, however, to distinguish *cross-cultural* research—the study of typical styles of communication in different cultures—from *intercultural* research—the study of people of different cultures interacting and communicating together. Some add that cross-cultural communication tends to be one-way, from one culture to another without much direct feedback from the receiving culture, as for example in the case of mass communications.

Research on intercultural communication deals with many levels, from the interaction of two individuals, to small groups, organizations, relations between nations and even to multinational institutions such as Christian, Muslim or Buddhist traditions spread over the world.⁷ Each major level is tending to form a subdivision within the field with its own theory and methods. At the interpersonal level, researchers are guided by models of research on interpersonal communication; at the organization level, they depend on theories of organizational communication. In each case, they bring in the cultural variables.

Research in the field treats the interaction of ethnic, interracial and even religious subcultures as intercultural. Much of this, however, seems to be *within* major cultural or subcultural divisions and is more *intra-* rather than *inter-cultural*. One solution is to place

intercultural differences on a continuum from situations of contact between subcultures within national cultures to interaction of people from radically different national cultural traditions.

A Euro-American Bias?

In the 1970s the Centro Monachin Fellowship in France called intercultural communication an American undertaking for the benefit of American public and private agencies. In fact, the field is attracting scholars from a variety of cultural and minority backgrounds, especially from Asia, India and the Middle East. These scholars are attempting to detect Euro-American ethnocentrism in the field and open up its theoretical conceptions to non-Western traditions of philosophical and scientific analysis.

Tulsi Saral, for example, points out that the Western obsession for a science which limits truth to what can be objectively observed, categorised and measured must be balanced with an intuitive, subjective, holistic awareness of deep structures of consciousness such as artistic perception, peak experiences or religious insight that are at the heart of intercultural communication. Instead of a sender-message-receiver model, he favours a 'convergence model' in which new information is originating from all parties of a communication process and the process of exchange moves towards mutual understanding.

An 'Inside' (Emic) or 'Outside' (Etic) Analysis?

Ethnographers have traditionally avoided external cultural bias in their observations by adopting an inside, participant-observer, emic stance. But inter-cultural analysis is comparing *two* cultures or observing cultures of equal validity interacting. Which of the two cultures defines the categories of analysis? One solution is to construct an abstract scientific category that is objective, supposedly culture-free and applicable to all cultures. Another is to balance alternating inside (emic) and outside (etic) observations. Still another

solution is to presuppose that in intercultural interaction both parties are constructing a new third culture.⁸ One then gives inside description of the process and result of this new common culture.

Focus on Cultural Conflict or Cultural Harmony?

Molefi Asante notes two divergent emphases in the field: cultural dialogue and cultural criticism. The cultural dialogue school takes the position that human nature is essentially the same throughout the world and that the goal is to enhance the similarities and mutual agreements. This group tends to work through international peace organisations, transnational perception seminars and religious or quasi-religious movements to bring about world understanding. Cultural dialogists tend to come out of the field of rhetoric with its tradition of classical Aristotelian rhetoric and humanistic philosophy.

The cultural criticism school starts with the premise of cultural

conflict in order to clearly detect, define and classify differences, and to focus study on critical points of conflict. There is little sense in seeking similarities and harmony until we can first classify the unique features of every culture and then compare the similarities and differences. This group often works with problems of development communication where there is resistance to innovations or with business and diplomatic missions having an underlying competitive relationship. Their research tends to come out of a tradition of comparative anthropology such as the work of Edward Hall, which primarily analyses the barriers to communication between cultures.

Tulsi Saral, however, questions the value of the continual listing of differences in communication styles, cognition, and values because it does not address the central issue of the field, *the live intercultural interaction process*. Moreover, in Saral's view, this reveals a Western bias in its emphasis on categorisation, classification, logical sequencing and rational relationships.

IV: A New Focus: 'The Live Process'

William B. Gudykunst (ed.) *Intercultural Communication Theory: Current Perspectives*. (International and Intercultural Communication Annual of the Speech Communication Association, Vol VIII). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1983.

In the Action Caucus and Seminar on Theory in Intercultural Communication held at the 1980 convention of the Speech Communication Association, many felt that with so many different disciplinary and contextual approaches the field needed a focus for co-ordinated, cumulative research. Some suggested that the field should move beyond descriptions of how people communicate in different cultures. The distinctive focus should be the analysis of the process of communication that occurs in specific intercultural situations or events. In a meeting between Japanese and American businessmen, for example, what mechanisms of verbal and nonverbal communication are actually used? Although some would argue that at best the parties become aware of their mutual differences, another view proposes that in the process a kind of common third culture emerges that is unique to this communication event. It is difficult to predict how people will communicate in a given intercultural event from the global American or Japanese

culture because these cultures are internally heterogenous and contexts of intercultural contact vary so greatly. Each episode of intercultural communication is essentially a creative synthesis.

Cronen and Shuter, in their chapter of Gudykunst's book, suggest that the task of research is to analyse: 1) how parties negotiate a set of third-culture communicational rules in an intercultural event; 2) how third-culture decisions regarding language and nonverbal behaviour are made; and 3) how intercultural communicators establish a common communicative ground. Cronen and Shuter seek an explanatory theory for the emergence of a third culture largely at an interpersonal level, and they draw on theories of interpersonal communication. Analysis of how an intercultural 'third culture' emerges at the level of organizations or mass and international communication may require quite different models.

Building Understanding at the Interpersonal Level

Vernon E. Cronen and Robert Shuter. 'Forming Intercultural Bonds' in William B. Gudykunst (ed.) *Intercultural Communication Theory: Current Perspectives*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983. pp.89-118.

Cronen and Shuter provide a helpful review of major current theories of how persons establish common communicative grounds, but they argue that the Co-ordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) is the best explanation.⁹

'Maximum Disclosure of Self' Theory

The *co-orientation* explanation proposes that people reach mutual understanding and trust by revealing to each other their self-concepts and positively accepting these self-concepts. Cronen and Shuter note that such deep revelation is difficult in intercultural events and may actually lock the parties into a cycle of conflict. Co-orientation expects too much, and intercultural communication often works precisely because the parties get on with the task with quite different goals, understandings and values.

Difficulties of 'Rules' Theory

Every culture has 'rules' for initiating and developing an interpersonal relation. For example, Anglo-Americans begin by asking questions while Blacks employ leading statements challenging others to represent or define themselves. Ethnographic descriptions of these cultural rules of communication are not always helpful, however, in predicting the unique set of rules that emerge in specific contexts of intercultural exchange.

'Uncertainty Reduction' Theory

This approach suggests that, when strangers meet, they rather systematically gather information which enables both parties to predict how the others will react to their statements. Cronen and Shuter point out that people from different cultures may have very different ways of reducing uncertainty which can lead to misunderstanding if these ways are not adapted. For example, Taiwanese, who come from a relatively high context culture, expect information to emerge from the context and often initiate relationships with set, ritualistic patterns. Americans, from low context cultures, are immediately explicit and expect everything to be freely negotiable from the start. Information gathering must be flexibly adapted to the event itself.

Co-ordinated Management of Meaning (CMM)

The CMM theory assumes that modern complex, heterogenous societies entail frequent contact between cultures and subcultures and a high degree of awareness of the purposive task-orientation of formal organisations. This requires not just ordinary competence for communication that one learns by early socialisation within one's own cultural group, but an ability to detect conflicting communication patterns that can potentially destroy a relationship.

In order to train people to detect this vicious circle of mistaking the meaning of others, with increased defensiveness and conflict, a much more flexible model of communication is needed.

CMM refers to the process by which meanings are assigned to verbal or nonverbal messages in specific episodes of interaction. CMM does not presuppose that the messages mean the *same* to each party, but only that they can co-ordinate toward common goals. Suppose that the episode is the discussion between an Iranian husband and a liberated American wife over respective responsibilities in the household and family tasks. Each party brings a background of interpretations that form a hierarchy of specific reference to this episode: 1) *cultural patterns*—someone must be

dominant in the home; 2) *life-scripting* and *self-concept*—the husband's interpretation that lack of dominance threatens his male identity; 3) the *personal relationship*—continuing tension over respective home responsibilities; 4) the *episode* itself—the wife nagging and the husband resisting, and 5) sequence of *speech acts*—first insults followed by serious conflict...or...the husband apologises.

In this vicious circle of misunderstanding, the ideal would be for the parties to become aware of the destructive meanings they are assigning, re-evaluate their cultural patterns and self-concepts, and negotiate new 'rules' specific to this particular husband-wife relationship based on their common goals.

V: Intercultural Communication at the Organisational Level

William B. Gudykunst, Lea P. Stewart and Stella Ting-Toomey (eds.) *Communication, Culture and Organizational Processes. (International and Intercultural Communication Annual, Vol 9, 1985)*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985.

Most of our intercultural and inter-ethnic contacts occur not at the interpersonal level, but within the structure of organisations such as multinational corporations, hospitals, schools or other forms of organisation that presuppose co-operation towards common goals and collective decision making. Research at this level treats organisations as forms of subculture. Typical questions are conflict management, integrating difficult cultural conceptions about how the organisation should function and creating a common 'third culture' of communication within an organisation.

Cultural Conflict in Organisations

In the view of Stella Ting-Toomey, conflict within organisations can be the source of adaptive regeneration and innovative growth if it is appropriately expressed and handled. A crucial problem is how to manage conflict when different people of different cultural backgrounds have different conceptions of how conflict is to be resolved. For example, low context North Atlantic cultures tolerate a high degree of expressive conflict and do not feel that it disrupts personal relations, while high context Asian cultures fear and try to cover over conflicts. If an office administrator rejects a proposal of an American subordinate, the subordinate is likely to argue publicly and offer 'objective facts' to defend his or her case. A Japanese subordinate, suggests Ting-Toomey, would take the rejection in more subdued fashion, but see it as a sign of deep personal distrust and eventually resign.

Social Identity in Intercultural Communication

Gudykunst proposes that the majority of interactions in modern organisations are more strongly influenced by *group* member-

ships—occupation, gender, class, race, etc.—than by personal dispositions. Conflict resolution is helped by analysis of how the internal host culture perceives the social identity of strangers and vice versa. In the 'Sociology of the Stranger', which Gudykunst borrows from Simmel and others, much depends on how much newcomers desire to be part of the ingroup (join, reside permanently or just visit), but also whether the attitude of the ingroup is positive, ambivalent or negative.

For example, if strangers desire only to visit and the ingroup attitude is positive, they will be typed as 'welcome guests', but if the ingroup perception is negative, they are 'intruders'. If the strangers desire to join and the ingroup perception is positive, they are 'newcomers with talents'. But if the ingroup perception is negative, the newcomers are 'suspicious marginals'.

Gudykunst also develops a typology which proposes that the potential for conflict over newcomers depends on a combination of the degree of desire to join the group, the intensity of worry about the disruptiveness of the newcomer, and the degree of normative consensus about how to treat the outsider. The potential for conflicts is *least* for 'guests' because there is high consensus on how to treat 'guests' and little anxiety that they will stay to disrupt even if they are 'odd'. The potential for conflict is *greatest* for 'marginal people' who are between two cultures; they have not cut ties with their original cultures, but also have not yet been assimilated into the new culture. The host culture is highly concerned about them because they are entering and uncertainty prevails about how to treat them. An example of highly conflictive entry suggested by Gudykunst is the case of women (outsiders) or suspicious minorities who want to move into the managerial level of organisations.

VI: Cultural Imperialism or Cultural Synthesis?

Dwight Conquergood. "Is it Real?" Watching Television with Laotian Refugees.' In *Directions, PCSD*. Northwestern University Programme on Communication and Development Issues, 2:2, 1986, pp.1-5.

Geoffrey Lealand. *American Television Programmes on British Screens*. London: Broadcasting Research Unit Working Paper, 1984.

Michael Anderson. *Madison Avenue in Asia: Politics and Transnational Advertising*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh-Dickinson University Press, 1984.

The study of intercultural communication at the international level deals largely with *global systems* of communication such as multinational corporations and the integrated global market of pop music, films, news and TV programming. In the background of much of this research is the 'cultural imperialism' thesis that there is a one-way flow of cultural products from the North Atlantic nations and that this is having a profound impact on local cultures.

Audiences Make Their Own Interpretations

Early research documented the heavy flow of film and TV programming, but there was relatively little data on how this actually affects local cultures. Current studies indicate that audiences

tend to interpret foreign programming selectively through the lenses of their own cultural world view.

One colourful example is Conquergood's ethnographic research on the TV viewing habits of a group of Laotian refugees in Chicago. He found that one of the early purchases of Laotians was a TV set and that their favourite programmes were 'monster movies' and 'horror shows'. Some also purchased VCRs so that they could rent even more horror movies. Many of the Laotians considered that the programmes represented real events, and most saw them as evidence for activities of real spirits in America. Although Thai monster movies were readily available, they much preferred the American versions. In Laotian folk culture, intensive interaction between

humans and myriad spirits is regarded as quite ordinary. Disasters, disease and war are attributed as a matter of course to the action of spirits in the world. The American portrayal of spirits in the horror movies confirmed for the Laotians that 'there are monsters and spirits in America, too' and helped them interpret their new American environment.

British Viewers of American Programmes

Studies show that many British viewers enjoy seeing the occasional American-produced programme, but that they perceive this as a portrayal of a culture distant and different from theirs. There is little evidence of wholesale identification with American culture. Lealand found that British viewers enjoyed seeing a different life style, the glamour, the fantasy, the fast moving plots, the scenes of American mountains, beaches and plains—but as a kind of continuing travelogue. Again, local world views are the basis of interpretation. Studies of the reaction of British viewers to television violence show that the portrayal of violence in American programmes was less disturbing to audiences than violence in British TV because the American portrayals are seen as distant or peculiar to the American context.

International Pop Music Flows

Rock music, which emerged in the United States during the 1950s, has proved attractive to youth throughout the world.¹⁰ But research shows that American rock music styles have been profoundly adapted to local youth cultures and local music traditions not only in Britain or Germany but also in many non-Western cultural contexts. These local pop music styles such as reggae in Jamaica are circulated around the world and are further adapted as they are introduced into British, American or other cultures. Local adaptations of rock music remain by far the most popular, but there has also emerged a kind of international synthesis, 'Muzak', which blends many different local versions of pop music and becomes the music of discos and the stereo background of public places throughout the world.¹¹

Transnational Advertising Agencies

The transnational advertising agencies (TNAAs) are pertinent cases because they are among the major users of the results of research on intercultural communication. The economies of scale lead the TNAAs to develop a single international campaign based on one ad formula, but carefully adapted to the psychology and cultural motivations in different contexts.¹² This creates an ethical problem for some intercultural researchers who fear that they may be tools for 'cultural imperialism' and the destruction of local cultures.

Anderson's book is significant because it focuses on Asian countries—Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and China—which have cultures more distinct from North Atlantic countries. He does not attempt to study the general cultural effects of advertising, but rather the intercultural interaction within the structure of the TNAAs themselves.

Anderson's general conclusion is that TNAAs have made some strategic concessions to nationalistic tendencies in Far Eastern countries, but that the TNAAs continue to shape the cultural pattern of the entire national advertising industry. The basic cultural influence is the introduction of a largely American model of the advertising institution used by both local branches of TNAAs and the domestic advertising agencies. Although there is increasing employment of locals because of their cheaper wages and skills in the local culture, they undergo a careful socialisation and training programme in the culture and procedures of the international advertising industry. The TNAAs bring in advertising concepts, themes, symbols, and graphics which nationals adapt to local cultural demands.

Anderson notes much stronger nationalism and suspicion of foreign influences in countries such as Indonesia which have a tradition of political and cultural struggle for national independence. But most governments have no clear policy of subordinating TNAAs to goals of national social and economic development. He concludes that the TNAAs are fostering an increasing gap between Western-oriented elites and an indigenous popular culture, a gap which is harmful, in the long run, to national unity and social stability.

William E. Biernatzki, S.J.
Issue Editor

FOOTNOTES

1. William B. Gudykunst. 'Intercultural Communication: Current Status and Proposed Directions' in Brenda Dervin and Melvin J. Voigt (eds.) *Progress in Communication Sciences*, Vol VI. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1985. p.2. Cf Edward T. Hall and William Foot Whyte. 'Intercultural Communication' in C. David Mortenson (ed.) *Basic Readings in Communication Theory*. New York: Harper and Row, 1979. pp.403-419.
2. William S. Condon. 'Neonatal Entrainment and Enculturation'. In M Bullowa, ed., *Before Speech: The Beginning of Interpersonal Communication*. New York Cambridge University Press, 1979.
3. Michael Prosser. Review of *Beyond Culture* in Nemi C. Jain (ed.) *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* Vol IV. 1977. Speech Communication Association, Falls Church, VA. pp.106-107.
4. David S. Hoopes, Paul B. Pederson and George M. Renwick (eds.) *Overview of Intercultural Education, Training and Research* Vol I: Theory (1977); Vol II: Education and Training (1978); Vol III: Special Research Areas (1978). Georgetown University, Washington D.C. SIETAR. David S. Hoopes (ed.) *Readings in Intercultural Communication. Vol II: Teaching Intercultural Communication: Concepts and Courses*. SIETAR, 1977. David Hoopes and Paul Ventura (eds.) *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-Cultural Training Methodologies*. SIETAR, 1979. William G. Davey (ed.) *Intercultural Theory and Practice: Perspectives on Education, Training and Research*. SIETAR, 1979. Edward C. Stewart. *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. La Grange Park, IL: Intercultural Network and SIETAR, 1979. Richard W. Brislin (ed.) *Culture Learning: Concepts, Applications and Research*. Honolulu: Univ Press of Hawaii and The East-West Center, 1977. John E. Walsh. *Humanistic Culture Learning: An Introduction*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii and the East-West Center, 1979. Pierre Casse. *Training for the Cross-Cultural Mind*. SIETAR, 1980.
5. La Ray M. Barna et al. 'Teaching of Intercultural Communication at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels' in *Overview of Intercultural Education, Training and Research*. VOL II. SIETAR, 1978. pp 1-9.
6. Among textbooks that have gone through many printings and editions are: Heinz-Dietrich Fisher and John C. Merrill. *International and Intercultural Communication*. New York: Hastings House, 1970, 2nd ed. 1976; Larry Samovar & Richard E. Porter. *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1972, 1984; John C. Condon and Fathi Yousef. *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1975, 1977; K.S. Sitaram and Roy T. Cogdell. *Foundations of Intercultural Communication*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1976; Fred L. Casmir (ed.) *Intercultural and International Communication*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1978; Michael Prosser. *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978. Larry A. Samovar, Richard E. Porter, Nemi C. Jain. *Understanding Intercultural Communication*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1981.
7. Young Yun Kim. 'Searching for Creative Integration', in *Methods for Intercultural Communication Research. (International and Intercultural Communication Annual, Vol VIII)* William B. Gudykunst & Young Yun Kim (eds.) Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1984. pp.13-30.
8. Stanley E. Jones. 'Integrating Etic and Emic Approaches in the Study of Intercultural Communication' in Molefi Kete Asante, Eileen Newmark and Cecil A. Blake (eds.) *Handbook of Intercultural Communication*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979. pp.57-74.
9. W. Barnett Pearce and Vernon E. Cronen. *Communication, Action and Meaning: The Creation of Social Realities*. New York: Praeger, 1980.
10. Cf. 'Youth and Rock Music'. *Communication Research Trends*, Vol 5 (1984), No 1.
11. Roger Wallis and Krister Malm. *Big Sounds From Small Peoples: The Music Industry in Small Countries*. London: Constable, 1984.
12. Cf. 'Critical Views of Advertising'. *Communication Research Trends*, Vol 3 (1982), No 3.

Current Research on Intercultural Communication

INTERNATIONAL

William B. Gudykunst (Arizona State U., Tempe, AZ 85287 USA), **Syed Arabi Idid** (U. Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia) and **Joseph Forgas** (U. of New South Wales, P.O. Box 1, Kensington, N.S.W. 2033 Australia) are studying effects of intergroup and interpersonal salience of relationships on uncertainty reduction processes in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Gudykunst is also collaborating in a project on uncertainty reduction processes in ingroup and outgroup relationships in individualistic and collectivistic cultures with **Michael Bond** (The Chinese U. of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong), **Tsukasa Nishida** (Nihon U., 6-16 Nishi-Kanda, 2-Chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 101, Japan), **Georgette Wang** (Dept. of Journalism, National Chengchi U., Mucha, Taipei, Taiwan, R.O.C.), **Mary Alexander** (U. of Maryland, Malaysia campus), **Robert Barraclough** (Warrnambool Institute of Advanced Studies, P.O.B. 423, Warrnambool, Vic. 3280 Australia) and **Tae-Seop Lim** (Michigan State U., East Lansing, MI 48824 USA). Additional collaborators are wanted in both projects.

AUSTRALIA

Philip L. Pearce (James Cook U. of North Queensland, Townsville, Qld. 4811) is doing cognitive mapping research and studying attitude changes associated with overseas travel.

CANADA

M. F. Malik (Loyola Campus, Concordia U., 7141 Sherbrooke St., West Montreal, Quebec H4B 1R6) is continuing a study of religious symbols cross-culturally, as well as intraculturally, using biocybernetic methods.

FRANCE

Jean Bianchi (Dept. of Communication, Institut Catholique de Lyon, 10, 12, rue Fochier, 69002 Lyon) is studying foreign TV soap operas' French viewers.

GERMANY (FEDERAL REPUBLIC)

The Intercultural Communication Research Unit SVD (Arnold-Janssen-Str. 24, D-5205 Sankt Augustin 1) deals with interdisciplinary projects involving anthropology, communication and missiology. **Franz-Josef Eilers, SVD**, is developing courses in intercultural communication for non-European Catholic seminaries.

INDIA

At **Indian Institute of Mass Communication** (D-13 Ring Road, S. Extension Part II, New Delhi 110 049) **Uma Narula** is collaborating in a project headed by Prof. **Sut Jhally** (U. of Massachusetts) on cross-cultural analysis of TV advertising.

ISRAEL

At the **Communications Institute of The Hebrew University** (Mt. Scopus, Jerusalem) **Shoshana Blum-Kulke** is investigating inter-lingual and intra-lingual variations in requests and apologies, in collaboration with **Juliane House** (U. of Hamburg), **Gabriele Kasper** (U. of Aarhus), **Elite Olshtain** (U. of Tel-Aviv), **Helmut Vollmer** (U. of Osnabrück), **Elda Weizman** (Hebrew U.) and **Ellen Rintell** (U. of Massachusetts). She also is comparing verbal interactions in Israeli and American families.

Tamar Katriel, (U. of Haifa, Haifa) studies 'directness' and 'indirection' of speech communities in America and Israel; sociolinguistics of Arab-Jewish encounters.

JAPAN

At **International Christian University** (10-2 Osawa 3-chome, Mitaka-shi, Tokyo 181) **Akiro Hoshino** continues to study culture shock, and **Sheila J. Ramsey** is interested in nonverbal aspects of intercultural communication, development of intercultural communicative competence, and cross-cultural communicative styles.

Yasumasa Tanaka (Gakushuin U., 1-5-1 Meiji, Toshimaku, Tokyo 171) is working on the social psychology of international relations and communications.

KOREA (REPUBLIC OF)

At **Sogang University** (CPO Box 1142, Seoul) **Chang-Sup Choi** (Mass Communication) is interested in the impact of communication technology on the individual in Third World cultures, and **William E. Beirnatzki, SJ** (Sociology) currently is completing a book on the intercultural communication of religious meanings.

Hyeon-Dew Kang (Seoul National U., Sinlim-dong, Gwang-gu, Seoul 151) is continuing to study international and domestic news reporting.

NORWAY

Andreas Fuglesang and **Dale Chandler** (Boröya, 4633 Höllen) study interpersonal approaches to participatory processes in development communication.

UNITED KINGDOM

At the **Department of Experimental Psychology, Oxford University** (Oxford OX1 2JD), **Michael Argyle** is doing cross-cultural studies in social skills training and social interaction. **Peter Collett** studies behaviour in natural settings and ritual forms of interaction cross-culturally.

UNITED STATES

Abilene Christian University (Abilene, TX 79699) emphasises intercultural research in communication, psychology, and missions. **Clyde Austin** (Psychology) studies cultural re-entry. **Carley H. Dodd** (Communication) is developing intercultural communication measures.

Brigham Young University's David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies (273 HRCB, Provo, UT 84602) stresses research and training in language and intercultural communication. **V. Lynn Tyler** studies the factors which make intercultural communication possible, stressing practical applications and individual transcultural adjustment.

Fred L. Casmir (Seaver College, Pepperdine U., 24255 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu CA 90265) is conducting projects on intercultural communication in South Africa, organizations as cultures, and communication development.

At the **East-West Center's Institute of Culture and Communication** (1777 East-West Road, Honolulu, HI 96848) **Richard W. Brislin** studies leadership and power in intercultural interactions and organizes workshops to develop intercultural courses (see special box below). **Wimal Dissanayake** is studying ways of developing a science of communication rooted in South Asian culture patterns.

Edmund S. Glenn, (Professor Emeritus of Communication, U. of Delaware, Newark, 19711, USA) is developing a multidisciplinary theory of cognition, relating cognitive development and the structuring of knowledge to cultural diversity.

Cornelius Lee Grove (AFS International, 313 E. 43rd St., New York, NY 10017) is writing books on U.S. host families, on youth exchange orientations, and on Chinese and American cultural differences in the latter in collaboration with **Hu Wenzhong** (Beijing Foreign Studies U., 2 North Xisanhuan Ave. Haidian District, Beijing, China).

Edward T. Hall and Mildred Reed Hall (642 Camino Lejo, Sante Fe, NM 87501) plan another book on communication among Japanese, German, French and American businessmen, and will study cross-cultural differences in the perception and structuring of reality.

The University of Kansas Communication Studies Dept. (Lawrence, KS 66045-2177) offers both MA and PhD specializations in intercultural communication. **Nobleza C. Asuncion-Landé** studies cross-cultural views of conflict, is developing a model of cross-cultural mediation and is studying differences in conceptualization and interpretation of communication that is not culture-bound.

Young Y. Kim (Governors State U., University Park, IL 60466) continues research interests in the adaptation of immigrants, viewed as communication between an immigrant and his or her host environment, comparing case studies of successfully adapted with poorly adapted immigrants.

At the **Marquette University Center for Intercultural Communication** (Milwaukee, WI 53233) **Robert Shuter** is interested in intercultural organizational communication and in cross-cultural relationship and nonverbal patterns.

At **Northwestern University** (1979 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60201) **Dwight Conquergood** (School of Speech) specializes in studies of orality and how cultural performance sustains refugees in crisis situations. He is preparing two works on refugees, and one on performance paradigms and cultural studies. He plans further work on Palestinians in Gaza, and field research with **Manjunath Pendakur** (Dept. of Radio-TV-Film) on the cultural impact of satellite television in India.

K. S. Sitaram (Southern Illinois U. at Carbondale, IL 62901) is developing a programme in intercultural broadcasting, studying the impact of the communication satellite on intercultural communication, and is involved in a NASA experiment on distant teaching by satellite.

Stella Ting-Toomey (Rutgers U., New Brunswick, NJ 08903) is studying intercultural conflict negotiation style and intergroup relationship development.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Books in Print:

- Asuncion-Landé, Nobleza** (ed.) *Ethical Perspectives and Critical Issues in Intercultural Communication*. Falls Church, VA: The Speech Communication Association, 1980.
- Atwood, Rita**. 'Critical perspectives on the state of intercultural communication research' in B. Dervin and M. J. Voigt (eds.) *Progress in Communication Sciences, Vol. IV*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1984, pp.67-90. **Bochner, Stephen** (ed.) *Cultures in Contact: Studies in Cross-Cultural Interaction* (International Series in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 1). Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.
- Brislin, Richard, Kenneth Cushner, Craig Cherie and Mahealani Yong**. *Intercultural Interactions: A Practical Guide* (Cross-cultural research and methodology series, vol. 9). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1986.
- Brislin, Richard, and D. Landis** (eds.) *Handbook of Intercultural Training*. 3 vols. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon, 1983.
- Condon, John**. *With Respect to the Japanese: A Guide for Americans*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1984.
- Fuglesang, Andreas**. *About Understanding: Ideas and Observations on Cross-Cultural Communication*. Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, 1982.
- _____ (ed.) *Search for Process* 3 vols. Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, n.d.
- Glenn, Edmund S., with Christine Glenn**. *Man and Mankind: Conflict and Communication Between Cultures*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1981.
- Grove, Cornelius Lee, and Ingemar Torbiörn**. 'A New Conceptualization of Intercultural Adjustment and the Goals of Training'. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 9 (1985), pp.205-233.
- Gudykunst, William B.** (ed.) *Intergroup Communication*. The Social Psychology of Language Series. Vol. 5. London: Edward Arnold, 1986.
- _____ **52and Young Yun Kim**. *Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication*. New York: Random House, 1984.
- Hall, Edward T., and Mildred Reed Hall**. *Hidden Differences: Studies in International Communication*. Hamburg: Gruner and Jahr, 1983-1985. (also, Tokyo: Bungei Shunju Ltd., 1987, and Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987). Several separate publications, in German, English, French and Japanese.
- Katriel, Tamar**. *Talking Straight: 'Dugri' Speech in Israeli 'Sabra' Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Kim, Young Yun** (ed.) *Interethnic Communication: Current Research*. International and Intercultural Communication Annual. Vol.10. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1986.
- Lonner, Walter J., and John W. Berry** (eds.) *Field Methods in Cross-cultural Research* Cross-cultural research and methodology series. Vol.8. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1986.
- Maletzke, Gerhard, M. Darkow and J. Eckardt**. *Massenmedien und Ausländer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Mass media and foreigners in the German Federal Republic). Frankfurt: Metzner, 1985.
- Messmer, Robert** (ed.) *Vom Umgang mit Fremden: Erfahrungen und Anregungen zur interkulturellen Kommunikation* (On behavior with strangers: experiences and suggestions for intercultural communication). Ludwigshafen: Internationalen Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Kommunikationspädagogik, 1984.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Jan de Waard**. *From One Language to Another*. NY: Thomas Nelson, 1986. Problems of translation in the larger cultural context.
- Shuter, Robert** (ed.) *World Researchers and Research in Intercultural Communication*. Wauwatosa, WI: Culture Publications, 1985. Lists specialists and research.
- Singer, Marshall**. *Intercultural Communication: A Perceptual Approach*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1986.
- Stewart, Lea P. and Stella Ting-Toomey** (eds.) *Communication, Gender, and Sex Roles in Diverse Interaction Contexts*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987.
- Tanaka, Yasumasa** (ed.) *A Study on Attitudes Held by Japanese and Australian National and Local Leaders Toward Development and Cooperation*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Sougou Kenkyuu Kaihatsu Kikou (NIRA), 1986.
- Ting-Toomey, Stella**. 'The "root-metaphor" orientations: Implications for intercultural communication researchers' in S. Thomas (ed.) *Culture and Communication: Methodology, Behavior, Artifacts and Institutions*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1985, pp.27-34.
- UNESCO**. *Directory of Institutions Involved in Intercultural Studies*, 1984.
- _____ *Introduction to Intercultural Studies*. 1983.
- _____ *Getting the Message Across: An inquiry into successes and failures of cross-cultural communication in the contemporary world*. 1975.
- Wang, Georgette, and Wimal Dissanayake** (eds.) *Continuity and Change in Communication Systems: An Asian Perspective*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1984.
- Wu, David Y. H.** (ed.) *Ethnicity and Interpersonal Interaction: A Cross-Cultural Study*. Singapore: Maruzen Asia, 1982.
- Dodd, Carley H.** *Dynamics of Intercultural Communication*. 2nd ed. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- _____ **and Frank Montalvo** (eds.) *Intercultural Skills in Multicultural Societies*. SIETAR International.
- Gudykunst, William B.** *Strangeness and Similarity: A Theory of Interpersonal and Intergroup Communication*. U.K: Multilingual Matters.
- _____ **, Stella Ting-Toomey, Elizabeth Chua, Michuri Tamanai, and Lynda McCroskey**. *Interpersonal Communications Across Cultures*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hall, Edward T., and Mildred Reed Hall**. *Hidden Differences: Doing Business with the Japanese*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday; *Overcoming Friction: Japanese-American Business: Japan for Americans* (in English and Japanese) and *Overcoming Friction: Japanese-American Business: U.S.A. for Japanese* (in Japanese), both: Tokyo: Bungei Shunju Ltd.
- Hesselgrave, David J.** *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally*, revised edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan. (1st ed. 1979).
- Kim, Young Yun**. *Communication and Cross-Cultural Adaptation: An Interdisciplinary Theory* (U.K.: Multilingual Matters), two edited books: *Intercultural Adaptation: Current Theory and Research* and *Theorizing Intercultural Communication*, (both Beverly Hills: Sage), and articles on refugee adjustment and intercultural adaptation.
- Sitaram, K. S.** *Intercultural Communication: A World View and Communicating Across Cultures*. Publisher pending.
- Ting-Toomey, Stella, and Felipe Korzeny** (eds.) *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*. Vols.13-16. Speech Comm. Assoc., Falls Church VA 22041 USA.
- Tyler, V. Lynn**, *Intercultural Interacting*. Provo, UT: David M. Kennedy Center; and *Intercultural Casebook: a people-to-people resources guide*.

Announcements:

Summer Workshop for the Development of Intercultural Coursework at Colleges and Universities: June 23 to July 3, 1987, at the Institute of Culture and Communication, East-West Center, Honolulu, for college and university faculty wishing to develop courses. For more information write: Dr. **Richard Brislin**, 1777 East-West Road, Honolulu, HI 96848, USA; or Tel.: 808-944-7644.

A symposium, 'Culture Indicators: Theory, Methods, Substance': Spring 1988, tentatively at Vanderbilt U. Organizers: **Richard A. Peterson**, Dept. of Sociology, Vanderbilt U., Nashville, TN 37235, USA (Tel. 615-322-7626); **Karl Erik Rosengren**, Dept. of Sociology, U. of Lund, S-221 00 Lund, Sweden (Tel.: (046) 10 88 80); and **Robert Philip Weber**, Office for Information Technology, Harvard Univ., 1730 Cambridge St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA. Content: culture as systems of ideas and 'individual and collective dynamics that result from or cause these ideas.' Deadline for proposals is June 15, 1987, with prior consultation advised.

Stella Ting-Toomey (Dept. of Communication, Rutgers U., New Brunswick, NJ 08903, USA; Tel.: 201-932-7919) is editing Vol. 13 of the *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* on the theme, 'Language and Communication Across Cultures: Theory and Research'. Deadline for mss. is July 1, 1987.

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS — Published four times a year by the Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture ISSN 0144-4646

Editor: Robert A. White

Asst. Editors: James McDonnell, Paul C. Kenney

Subscription:

Individual:	1 year, US\$7.50 (UK£4)	3 years, US\$20 (UK£10)
Institutional:	1 year, US\$12 (UK£7)	3 years, US\$30 (UK£17)
Student:	1 year, US\$6 (UK£3)	3 years, US\$15 (UK£6)

Payment in US\$ or equivalent in UK£, Canadian \$ or W German DM.

Address all correspondence to:

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS

221 Goldhurst Terrace

London NW6 3EP England

Tel: (01) 328-2868

Typesetting and origination by Type Out, London SW16; (01) 677 1788

Printing by Roebuck Press, Mitcham, Surrey; (01) 640-9211

The CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE is an international service for communication research established by the Jesuits in 1977.

Executive Director, Leo A Murray; **Research Director**, Robert A. White; **Director of Documentation**, James McDonnell; **Director of Publications**, Paul C. Kenney.

International Board of Directors: Leeds: James Keegan; London: Joseph Munitiz; Carlos Valle; Madrid: Antonio Blanchi; Manila: Nim Gonzalez; Paris: Michel Dubost; Rome: Peter Henrici, John E O'Brien, John J O'Callaghan.

In Press (January 1987)

- Asuncion-Landé, Nobleza C.** 'Intercultural Communication'. in G. Dahnke and C. F. Collado (eds.) *Communication as Social Science: An Intermediate Survey*. Wardsworth Co. (USA).