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Studies of intercultural communication have gained increasing recognition in the field of communication for their contributions to general theories and their utility in practice. A common view is that intercultural communications are not qualitatively different from intracultural communications (Kim, 1988), but are part of human communication as a whole. Any grand theory of communication must also account for phenomena in intercultural communication to qualify as a general theory.

A major focus in intercultural communication is the process of the intercultural encounter: how communicators with different cultural backgrounds actually experience such encounters, and to what extent they are different from intracultural communication. One way to understand this communicative process is to look at actual conversation in intercultural settings. More specifically, one may examine how communicators contribute to conversation by adapting, at various levels, to each others' message production and interpretation processes.

The current study begins with a review of literature on intercultural communication studies, including cross-cultural studies. Major theories and findings are presented to provide a
adaptation and competence. In particular, with regards to the concern about the communicator's behavioural adjustments, it is argued that the recently renamed Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) (Giles, Mulac, Bradac, & Johnson, 1987) provides a theoretical framework for examination of adaptive and accommodative behaviours in communication. The theory appears to have potential for promising contributions to studies of intercultural communication (Gallois, Franklyn-Stokes, Giles, & Coupland, 1988). However, being evolved from the Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT) that investigated almost exclusively paralinguistic variables in conversational communication (Giles, Taylor, & Bourhis, 1973; Giles et al., 1987; Street & Giles, 1982), a great part of CAT remains as such, a theory. This study is an attempt to explore ways to investigate communication accommodation on other levels than speech style, so as to enrich the theory, as well as enhance our understanding of intercultural communication. More specifically, the focus here is set on discourse as the level investigation, for an comparative study on intercultural vs intracultural communicators.

As a basic component of conversation, topic is presented as the candidate for studying intercultural interaction at the discourse level. It has the advantage of easy identifiability; and, in comparison to speech features, it might relate closer to communicators' (high degree of) consciousness of interaction, which has been identified as a characteristic of intercultural
communication (Gudykunst, 1988), and thus has practical value for intercultural training. The research on conversation topic is also reviewed, conceptualized/defined in this study as the major discourse proposition encapsulating specific referents, presented along with relevant concepts such as common ground.

Literature review is followed by a chapter that outlines the rationale of the study, research questions and hypotheses. Specific variables are introduced as targets for investigation to further our understanding on topic-related accommodation. Intercultural and intracultural interactions are the two conditions of the independent variable, interaction setting, for the investigation on communication accommodation.

Another chapter details the method and analysis of the study. Some dependent variables—topic change (frequency and partner agreement) and topic sharing (representing topic as proposition)—were investigated to obtain a general overview of topic-related accommodation strategies. Some—Brand New, Unused, Textually Evoked, Situationally Evoked, Inferable (representing topic as referents)—were investigated as components of discourse explicitness, to have a better understanding of accommodation strategies in terms of information exchanged. Also examined was Accommodation Rate, to gain insights into participants perception of topic-related accommodation in the conversation. And finally, the role of
interaction involvement was investigate in relation to communication accommodation.

Preceded by a chapter devoted to reporting of results, a final chapter discusses the findings, implications and limitation of the study, as well as future directions for further research.
Chapter II

Literature Review

Cross-cultural Communication Studies

In general, past work has established that cultures differ in a number of aspects, due to historical and environmental reasons, and such cultural variability has an impact on human behaviours including communicative activities.

High-context vs. low-context. A widely accepted cultural distinction relevant to communication is high-context (HC) vs. low-context (LC) cultures. Hall (1977) bases this distinction on the degree of reliance on contextual information in interaction. Hall explains that HC cultures (e.g., many oriental cultures) have most information either embedded in the physical context or internalized as specific social norms, leaving much less in coded, explicitly transmitted messages, while LC cultures (e.g., many western cultures) have the mass of information transferred in explicit codes. Thus, in interpersonal interactions, a member of a HC culture would expect a lot of fellow communicators. In conversation, the listener is expected to figure out the whole story by putting pieces together: what the speaker just said, and whatever the listener has known about the speaker, relevant to
A comparative study by Gudykunst (1983) on how people behave in communicating with strangers (of the same cultural background) has supported the concept of HC and LC cultures with regard to communicative differences. The results indicated that HC culture members were more cautious in initial interactions, had greater tendency to make assumptions about strangers based on the persons' background, and also asked more questions about their backgrounds; while LC culture members engaged in more nonverbal activities as part of explicit expressions, when talking to strangers. Further analyses yielded significant correlations between HC culture members making assumptions about strangers based on their backgrounds and the degree of certainty to predict strangers' sociability and background/personal similarities (with themselves). For LC culture members significant correlations were found between making assumptions about strangers based on their backgrounds and the amount of background interrogation, to check for accuracy of assumptions.

Kang & Pearce (1983) found that Korean (a HC culture) and American (a LC culture) college students differently perceived persons described as having a tendency of reticence, as a characteristic of having high or low level of communication apprehension (HCA and LCA). Americans perceived target-
persons of HCA as less socially attractive, while Koreans had the opposite perception that such persons were more socially attractive. More revealing were comments of Koreans on the HCA targets that they were quietly strong, not easy to get to know but could become a trustworthy friend who was sincere and thoughtful; on targets of LCA that they were progressive (nontraditional) but insincere, might have many acquaintances but no close friends, had poor self-concept and needed group support. This is consistent with earlier findings (Elliot, Scott, Jensen, & McDonough, 1982) that people in Korean culture perceived highly verbal individuals as less attractive to work with, and the amount of verbal behaviours appeared to have little relevance to social interactions; while people in American culture perceived highly verbal individuals more socially attractive than quiet persons, and the amount of verbal behaviour has less relevance in task-related interactions.

In a comparative study, Wolfson & Pearce (1983) asked respondents to role-play as a conversant in response to a partner's high or low self-disclosure (with sensitive or non-sensitive information). In a subsequent questionnaire about the conversation, Chinese (a HC culture) respondents rated both interactions significantly more difficult, uncomfortable, unpleasant, unusual, and less friendly, appropriate, and predictable than Americans (a LC culture).
Gudykunst & Nishida (1986) have investigated attribution processes in different cultures and found HC culture members tend to attribute others' behaviours more to contextual factors, and pay more attention to information leading to more accurate interpretation of indirect/nonverbal message. In contrast, LC culture members tend to attribute others' behaviours more to dispositional factors, e.g., personality traits, and pay more attention to information that facilitates more accurate interpretation of direct/verbal messages. It is also reported that HC culture members make attributions about ingroup fellow communicators with more confidence than LC culture members do. Communication context has therefore been identified as an important aspect of communication across culture.

**Individualism vs. collectivism.** Another commonly used distinguishing dimension is Individualism vs. Collectivism (Hofstede, 1980, 1983; Triandis, 1986). Briefly, individualistic cultures (e.g., western cultures such as German, North American, Scandinavian) are characterized by an emphasis on individual goals, initiatives, efforts and achievements, with a tendency to apply a same value standard to all (universalistic), while collective cultures (e.g., oriental cultures such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese) have more stress or shared responsibility and accountability, taking the group goal and group view as having precedence over that of the individual. There is an emphasis on
cooperation and harmony, with a tendency of using different value standards for members of a different group.

Hui & Villarreal (1989) had Hong Kong Chinese and Americans respond to questionnaires about personal preference in social activities, and found that, for both samples, collectivism is positively related to the needs for affiliation, nurturance, while negatively related to needs of autonomy and deference. A factor called self-reliance vs interdependence, emerged for American respondents, which was significantly correlated with autonomy needs and negatively related to needs for nurturance and affiliation.

Bond (1984) and associates report that Hong Kong Chinese (of a collectivistic culture) specified conscientiousness as an important component of trustworthiness, as opposed to Americans and Australians who identified emotional stability and extroversion as more important for judgment of trustworthiness. Similarly, Alexander, Cronen, Kang, Tsou, & Banks, (1986) report Chinese respondents inferred more background information, than Americans, about others when they were first introduced, but they displaced topics later in time, often until the second or third time they met. This presumably is related to the Chinese conception of the individual as part of a collective, hence the necessary condition of proper background knowledge before meaningful communication can occur.
It is also reported that Japanese, as members of a collectivistic culture, perceived communicators with high self-disclosure as incompetent and less socially attractive, in contrast to the common view of many North Americans (an individualistic culture) that self-disclosure is a sign of openness and intimacy (Nakanishi, 1988). Ting-Toomey (1988) investigated possible differences between cultures in their attitude towards a rhetorically sensitive communication style, which constitutes a desirable communication style that helps communicators to make the best out of their interaction. She found that her French (a mixed individualistic culture) respondents preferred a direct rhetorical style for communication, while Japanese prefer a moderate level of sensitivity in rhetorical style, i.e., less direct and more indirect.

Gudykunst, Yoon & Nishida (1987) report that Japanese and Koreans, compared to Americans, perceived higher personalization (related to intimacy), more synchronization (related to coordination) and less difficulty in ingroup communications, but greater difficulty in communications with outgroups. Matsumoto (1989) reanalyzed data from previous studies of cultural differences (15 nations) in facial expressions. The results showed that individualism is positively correlated with expression of negative emotions (anger, fear and sadness). This confirmed his hypothesis that communication of negative emotions is acceptable in individualistic cultures because it would not be regarded as a
thread to group solidarity. In contrast, group solidarity is much emphasized in collectivistic cultures, which renders expression of negative emotion undesirable in those cultures.

It is noted (Ting-Toomey, 1988; Ting-Toomey, Gao, Yang, Trubisky, Kim, Lin, & Nishida, 1990) that individualistic culture members use more self-face maintenance strategies, while collectivistic culture members use more other-face or mutual-face maintenance strategies in conflict situations. The difference may be attributed to greater concerns of the latter to maintain a sense of group-togetherness and mutual good for all members of a group as a whole, which is not so important for individualistic culture members whose major concerns are individual uniqueness and independence. Leung (1988) found Hong Kong Chinese respondents were less likely to pursue a conflict with an ingroup and more likely to confront an outgroup disputant, than American respondents. Chinese showed more conflict avoidance with friends than with strangers than did Americans, suggesting a heightened distinction of in- vs outgroup for collectivistic cultures. Similarly with regard to uncertainty reduction in initial interactions, Gudykunst et al. (1988) found that there is a difference between ingroup and outgroup uncertainty reduction processes for collectivistic culture members, but not for individualistic culture members. For example, collectivistic culture members expressed higher confidence in making attributions about ingroup interaction partners (stranger), in
comparison to similar outgroup partners. In contrast, individualistic culture members had a similar degree of attributional confidence in both communication situations. This is taken as a reflection, on the one hand, of the dependence of collectivistic culture members on the insider's knowledge for reliable interpretation of the interaction they engage in; one the other hand, of the importance of their interpretation being reliably appropriate for group acceptance. Individualistic culture members are relatively free of such concerns.

Overall, these studies in cross-cultural communication have documented important cultural differences in face-to-face communication. A question naturally follows, i.e., what happens in communication between members of different cultures? A common belief is that there are inevitable difficulties in intercultural communications due to cultural differences. Although there is much less work in intercultural communication than in cross-cultural studies, constant scholarly endeavours to understand and explicate the experience of intercultural encounters has resulted in a moderate literature base. What follows is an overview of major research.

Intercultural Communication Studies

Uncertainty Reduction. One of the most productive research efforts is that by Gudykunst and associates on uncertainty reduction in intercultural interaction. Extended from the
uncertainty reduction theory, research in this area takes as a given that, in their initial interactions with strangers, individuals attempt to reduce uncertainty due to a mutual lack of intersubjective understanding (Gudykunst, 1988; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1989; Gudykunst et al., 1987). It is argued that intergroup communication effectiveness as an outcome of intergroup communication (of which intercultural communication is a particular case), is a function of uncertainty reduction and the reduction of anxiety in intergroup encounters (Gudykunst, 1988).

Group/culture similarity is identified as one mediating variable (among others) to have some effect on uncertainty reduction. Gudykunst (1983a) found that people preferred to do less talking and asked more questions in initial interactions when their partners were culturally dissimilar (from a different culture), due to their desire to know more about the other party. When the other party was culturally similar (from the same culture), they engaged in more talking. It is therefore suggested that difference in degree of cultural similarity can bring about higher levels of uncertainty in intercultural communications with a stranger, which leads to increased need of information seeking. The ignorance about the conversation partner accounts for the fact that people perceived conversation to develop more easily in initial intracultural than in intercultural encounters. His findings supported related research, on interethnic communications among English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians. Simard (1981)
found that people thought it was more difficult to gain the interest of conversational partners of another ethnic group, because they had little idea as to what to discuss, and how to initiate talk.

Interpersonal salience has been found to moderate the influence of cultural dissimilarity, increasing the attributional confidence and reducing the anxiety of communicators in intercultural settings. Gudykunst et al. (1987) present evidence to show that, cultural dissimilarity had relatively little interaction effect on such variables as interrogation and self-disclosure, for people at more developed relationships (e.g., friends) compared to people in a new acquaintance relationships. The data suggested that as relationships develop, the parties get to know one another better. This is when interpersonal salience increases and intergroup salience decreases, which also reduces the effect cultural dissimilarity has on the uncertainty reduction processes.

Such reasoning is consistent with Social Penetration Theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973), and at the same time, partially confirms the common belief is that there are inevitable difficulties in intercultural encounters due to cultural differences of participants. Such difficulties, according to the theory on uncertainty reduction, are much more real to interacting strangers from different cultures, which gradually disappear as interactants get to know each other better.

**Communication Competence.** The assumption of inevitable difficulties in intercultural interactions naturally leads to research
interests in intercultural communication competence, in light of the prevalent view of competence as "the condition for concrete mutual interaction" (Pilotta, 1982, p. 35). Consistent with competence research in general (e.g., McCrosky, 1982; Parks, 1985; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984, Wiemann & Backlund, 1980), major questions asked in this area are concerned with how people communicate with others from different cultures; what behavioural variables indicate/lead to successful communication; and what cognitive and affective dimensions have impact on effective and appropriate behaviours (Ruben, 1977). Whatever dimensions are specified as important to communication competence (in general or in intercultural setting), a focal point always emerges in an overview of the literature: behavioural flexibility or adaptability. For example, Spitzberg & Cupach (1984) note that "adaptability is considered essential for cross-contextual effectiveness" (p. 35) and that "the notion of adaptability is at the core of nearly all competence constructs" (p. 36).

In an earlier effort to build a comprehensive model of communication competence, Wiemann (1977) defines competence as "the ability of an interactant to choose among available communicative behaviours in order that he may successfully accomplish his own interpersonal goals during an encounter while maintaining the face and line of his fellow interactants, within the constraints of the situation" (p. 178). The very act of choosing
presupposes a range of choices, which require flexible decisions and actions in relation to particular goals. Like several other researchers (e.g., Hart & Burk, 1972, 1980; Spitzberg & Hecht, 1984), Wiemann noted this, and explicitly specified behavioral flexibility as one dimension of his model. As the hallmark of competence, this dimension underlies his other dimensions, such as empathy (other orientation), affiliation/support (immediacy), social relaxation, and interaction management. Empathy refers to the ability to take others' perspectives in interaction, thus flexibility in shifting of viewpoints. Similarly for affiliation, a psychological inclination to seek support or to belong to; and social relaxation, the ability to be comfortable interacting with others, flexibility is necessary to tend to one's own as well as others' needs. Finally, interaction management entails numerous behavioural details, which need to be coordinated between the interacting parties, again flexibly.

Dimensions identified for intercultural communication competence have been noted to be very similar to those in the literature on communication competence in general (Hammer, 1989). For example, Ruben (1976) investigated among American personnel in overseas services and identified seven dimensions of intercultural competence: 1) respectfulness; 2) self-orientation; 3) knowledge and perceptions; 4) empathy; 5) interaction management; 6) flexibility; 7) tolerance for ambiguity. He posits that an individual presumably would be successful in
interpersonal interactions in another culture, if this person presents a high display of respect for others, exhibits little self-oriented role behaviours, has a general tendency to base understanding on personalized knowledge (not passing judgments by one's own values); shows good interaction management (receiver-oriented initiation and termination of discussion) and exhibits a high tolerance for ambiguity. Conceivably actualization of these dimensions would vary depending on the persons involved: one culture/person would differ from the next in terms of the manner/style of communication, the importance of respectful attitude, desirability of (degrees of) self-orientation, inclination to discussion of various topics, and so on. Thus, the dimension of flexibility is implicit as essential to performance in all other dimensions, while the difference between communication competence in inter- vs. intracultural interaction is a matter of degree, not a matter of kind.

Of the four major components of communication competence identified by Spitzberg & Cupach (1984), the most discussed in intercultural communication are knowledge and skills, which, as illustrated in the last section, include cognitive capacities for information processing such as perception and attribution, and behavioural performances such as face-management and uncertainty reduction. One way or another, studies make reference to effectiveness and appropriateness as basic criteria for competence.
With regards to effectiveness, earlier empirical studies among sojourners from and in the United States and other countries (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Hammer, 1986, 1987; Hammer, Gudykunst & Wiseman, 1978; Hammer & Nishida, 1985) isolated several behavioural dimensions of intra- and intercultural effectiveness, one of which, relevant to communication, is ability to deal with psychological stress related to uncertainty and anxiety. It was demonstrated that effective intercultural communication requires that an individual makes attributions matching those by the interaction partner, to understand the latter's behaviours. Based on this work, Gudykunst (1988) proffers that uncertainty reduction (attributional confidence) will produce an increase in communicators' intergroup effectiveness.

The work on face-management across cultures (Ting-Toomey, 1988; Ting-Toomey et al., 1990), comes to bear on intercultural communication competence with regards to appropriateness. The contention is that concerns of various degrees of the two dimensions of face-management, self- vs. other-face and positive vs. negative face, are culturally grounded. Variation in face need is often associated with variation in mode of conflict, and presumably, also communication style, e.g., members of cultures with high self-face concern and negative need (dissociation) tend to express a greater degree of self-face and a lesser degree of other-face maintenance in interaction, and use more autonomy-preserving and direct face-negotiation strategies; while members
of cultures with high other-face concern and positive need (association) tend to do just the opposite. Since intercultural communicators constantly encounter need for face-work management, it follows that a competent individual is one who is able to tend to not only aspects of face needs of self, but also of the other partner from a different culture.

Other variables important to effective intercultural communication include open-mindedness (Dodd, 1987; Grove & Torbiorn, 1985; Gudykunst, Wiseman & Hammer, 1977), cognitive complexity and categorization scheme (Detweiler, 1980; Norton, 1984), and interpersonal comfort (Dodd, 1987). On a closer look, all this, like the research discussed above, strongly suggests the centrality of flexibility/adaptability to the concept of communication competence in general, and to intercultural communication competence in particular. Open-mindedness is to have a flexible mind-set, not being rigid but being tolerant in perception and evaluation of the unfamiliar (e.g., people from a different culture), thus conductive to smooth interaction. Being high in cognitive complexity and/or having a broad categorization scheme means to have adaptable cognitive capacities, to see the familiar in the unfamiliar, and to build on it for successful communication.

To recapitulate, flexibility/adaptability is an element essential to communication competence. In general, it refers to the ability, in interaction, to focus/shift attention; to choose among
available interpretative schemes and specific role(s); to make/suspend judgments and inferences; and to adjust plans and manners for specific behaviours. Phenomenologically, it is part of how people experience interactions, as juxtaposition of "so-as-to" and "because-of" motives based on intersubjective understanding (Schutz, 1967). The point is that people constantly adapt themselves in interaction. For competence in intercultural interaction, flexibility/adaptability is even more important, given that greater variability is involved, hence the greater demand for adaptation.

Communication Accommodation Theory

Directly relevant to adaptability in communication behaviours is Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT). Fundamentally, CAT attempts to account for the ways in which communicators adjust their acoustic, nonverbal, sociolinguistic and discourse features during interaction. CAT represents the latest development in a research tradition known as Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT). Both SAT and its more recent formulation, CAT, are especially relevant to concerns about intercultural communication. Intercultural interaction provides a situation where people especially need to adjust their behaviours at all levels for communication to proceed successfully. Research on SAT has a history of association with intercultural communication, using it as a testing ground for theoretical
soundness. Following this tradition, CAT has also been extended to the study of intercultural communication (Gallois et al., 1988).

**Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT).** As a theory of adaptive speech behaviour developed by Giles and colleagues (Giles, 1973, 1984; Giles, Mulac, Bradac & Johnson, 1987; Giles & Powesland, 1984; Giles, Taylor & Bourhis, 1973; Street & Giles, 1982; Thakerar, Giles & Cheshire, 1982), SAT has focused on speech variations in interaction. According to SAT, there are three major strategies of speech accommodations: (1) style shifts to increase perceived behavioural similarity (convergence) between communicators (e.g., when persons involved seek some kind of approval, or better comprehension); (2) style shifts to distinguish (divergence) perceived behaviours from interaction partners (e.g., when persons involved want to dissociate from the other for some reason); and (3) style be continued (maintenance) as it is (e.g., either as a deliberate reaction to the partner's behaviour or simply not heeding it). Specific behaviours involved in such accommodation include both verbal and nonverbal variables. Depending on the particular motivation, the speaker will converge or diverge, by using the same language/dialect as the other interlocutor or using a different one. Similarly, the speaker will choose among types of sentence, vocabulary, speech variants, and/or adjust the speech rate, tone, pitch, volume, etc., so as to sound more like/unlike the other person. These accommodation strategies are goal-directed: to help speakers enhance
communication efficiency, evoke listeners' social approval, and maintain social identities of those involved.

SAT has been widely tested and received ample empirical support from studies on a variety of contexts and relationships, including the intercultural encounter. For example, in a study on bilingualism among Welsh people, Jones (1984) notes that some proficient bilingual speakers regularly converge toward their conversation partners who are non-fluent, second-language learners. In their interactions, they, nonconsciously, even used grammatical errors, similar to ones made by their partners, to converge to the latter's improficiency, so as to portrait themselves in a positive light. Another study (Platt & Weber, 1984) reports that, in attempts to appear agreeable and good-willed, some Singaporeans and Australian immigrants try to match the speech of their native English interlocutors lexically, grammatically and prosodically. In reverse situations, some native English speakers attempt to talk in ways similar to Singaporeans and Aborigines. Similar behaviours are also observed in children (Beebe, 1981), such that Chinese Thai bilingual children used a great deal more Chinese phonological variants when being interviewed in Thai by a person who spoke genuine fluent Thai, but looked ethnically Chinese, while no such change in style was observed when talking to another interviewer who looked like a native Thai.

With regards to code-switching (using alternately different languages) in speech accommodation, Bourhis (1984) conducted a
set of field studies in Quebec among French Canadians (FC's) and English Canadians (EC's), and found that FC's tended to reciprocate convergence in intergroup encounters and switch to English; while EC's were more likely to maintain their own ingroup language in the same situation. This difference is presumably due to the dominance of English in the Canadian society, which is nevertheless evident of accommodation behaviours in intercultural interactions. These results are consistent with earlier findings of Aboud (1976), where Chicano and Anglo-American six-year-old's were asked to teach on request another two children, separately, how to play a game they themselves had just learned. It was shown that when the request was made in Spanish, 17% of the English-dominant Anglo children accommodated by using Spanish, although there were 50% in a bilingual program. In contrast, when the request was made in English, 71% of the Spanish-dominant Chicanos converged by adopting the English language for explanation. All this suggests that power and status difference in language usage associated with social approval indeed influence accommodation behaviours.

Bourhis, Giles, Leyens, & Tajfel (1979) investigated language divergence among trilingual Flemish students (Flemish-English-French). They note that many Flemish and Francophone students spoke English when together as a way of compromising between asserting linguistic distinctiveness and conforming to pressures to use the other's language. In a similar vein, Escure (1982)
examined interaction patterns of Belize Creole, and found that in interaction with Caribs (an ethnic outgroup), Creoles selectively used mesolect depending on their linguistic insecurity and social dominance relative to the neighbouring Carib group. Caribs, in turn, often responded with sneers and asides delivered in neutral tones in their own language, incomprehensible to the Creoles. Bourhis & Giles (1977) examined speech behaviours in an interethnic context, where a group of Welsh people individually engaged in a oral question-answer language session in a lab, with a Standard English speaker asking questions. When the English person displayed a negative attitude toward the Welsh language, the Welsh participants, in answering his questions, would diverge by broadening their Welsh accents, some also using Welsh words or phrases. Such a divergence in speech style was not present before the English question-giver displayed the negative attitude.

These and many other similar studies have attempted to investigate and explain the ways interactants in conversation adjust or attune their behaviours to each other in the framework of SAT. The main concern has been the effect of social cognition on speech behaviours, with less attention to speech behaviours as communicative acts. For SAT to account for and predict adaptive behaviours at various levels of interpersonal communication, Giles et al. (1987) suggested renaming SAT Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT), so as to take into consideration sociolinguistic features of conversational behaviours.
Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT). Shortly after Giles et al. (1987) renamed SAT, a notable study by Coupland, Coupland, Giles & Henwood (1988) marked a real turning point of theoretical development. In applying SAT to an analysis of two samples of communications of the elderly, they noted that for basically the same goals of social approval, communication efficiency and social identities, a broad range of communicators' behaviours were found to exhibit variations as a result of accommodation. The target communicator, a care-giver, in their data was found to differentially use "phatic communion" and topic selection to accommodate to two elderly persons of different age groups. When talking with the junior of the two, the care-giver was found to engage in phatic talk more or less in an usual manner; but she appeared to be especially attentive to responses of the senior person when having a similar talk. The talk with the junior person was less structured with no clear patterns of turn-taking; had more natural, long pausing intervals, and covered a greater variety of topics. In contrast, the talk with the senior person was regularly patterned, with less long pauses, and was more restricted in topics, clearly indicating her leading role in the conversation. It was as if the care-giver felt lesser need to accommodate the first interlocutor so comprehensively and so meticulously, as she did with the latter.

In summary, Coupland et al. (1988) note the potential of SAT, as well as its limitation. They point out that while SAT has taken
an addressee-focus, it only attends to the (language/message) production process of the addressee, and thus identifies only strategies reflecting efforts to match speech features. In other words, those strategies only reflect speaker's reactions to the addressee's speech productive performance (accents, speech rate, etc.) that has nothing to do with the content, and only partly represents the manner, of the conversation. To reconcile the substance of the theory to its new label, CAT, attention to more pragmatic aspects of speech is necessary to explain the overall speaker's effort to adjust and attune to the other. Informed by recent research in the field of communication as well as their own observation, they proposed three additional factors to address concerns over the addressee's state of affairs in interaction: 1) interpretation competence; 2) conversational needs; and 3) interactants' role-relations (Figure 1). Complementary to message production in the process of communication, interpretation competence refers to the ability for proper comprehension in message receiving. Pertaining to the context-dependent variation of communication both in form and content, conversational needs include the need for ideational content construction, for manners appropriate to roles, positions, faces, and for identifiable procedural structures. Behaviours relating to these needs are elements of discourse management at various levels. Finally, interactants' role-relations cover the relational level of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRÉSEE FOCUS</th>
<th>SOCIOLOGUISTIC ENCODING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other's productive</td>
<td>(Approximation strategies) --convergence --divergence --maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other's interpretative</td>
<td>(Interpretability strategies) --complexity --explicitness --clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other's conversational</td>
<td>(Discourse management strategies) --content --manner --style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutual role-relations</td>
<td>(Interpersonal control strategies) --role-discretion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from Coupland et al. (1988)

**Figure 1**

A Model of Accommodation Processes in CAT
interaction involving interpersonal control and relationship, as reflected in conversational behaviours.

Three categories of strategies correspond to the above three aspects. 1) interpretability, including modification of complexity, explicitness and clarity of messages; 2) discourse management, tending to matters such as topic selection, back channeling and turning taking; and 3) interpersonal control, that deals with other's role discretion such as interruption, and forms of address. In CAT, the three strategies from SAT (convergence, divergence and maintenance) are put under a single category called "approximation". Having completed the evolution, the new CAT now offers four strategy categories that can be used to examine relations between changes in communicative style at various levels of analysis (verbal and nonverbal) and motivational/affective dimensions (e.g., communication effectiveness, social norms, social approval, attraction, personal liking) on the one hand; between such behavioural variations and outcome on the other, mediated by the cognitive factors (e.g., evaluations, identity, attributions, perceptions).

While very little empirical work has been done on other aspects (e.g., discoursal, relational) than speech variations, evidence from related areas has endorsed CAT's logical soundness. For example, the notion of communication accommodation incorporates the essence of "person-centered messages", speakers' adaptation to listeners, into a much broader theory that accounts
for various forms of communicators' accommodation under various circumstances. A brief review of that literature in light of aspects specified in CAT will highlight its empirical grounding.

Adaptation to addressee. Bernstein's (1966, 1971, 1981) conception of restricted code and elaborate code as two sociolinguistic variations, represents earlier observations of differentiation of social contexts in language styles. A restricted code is used when "the form of the social relation is based upon closely shared identifications, upon an extensive range of shared expectations, upon a range of common assumptions", where "a backcloth of closely shared identifications and affective empathy [removes] the need to elaborate verbal meanings and logical continuity in the organization of the speech" (Bernstein, 1971/1974, p.146). An elaborate code is used "wherever the intent of the other person cannot be taken for granted. Inasmuch as the intent of the other person cannot be taken for granted, the speakers are forced to elaborate their meanings and make them both explicit and specific. ... ... In terms of what is transmitted verbally, an elaborate code encourages the speaker to focus upon the experiences of others, as different from his own". (ibid., p.147). The basic concerns here are over the listener's experience and the related ability to understand/interpret information they receive.

Research with the constructivist approach (Delia et al., 1982; O'Keefe & Delia, 1985), with a main focus on the relationship
between information processing capabilities and communicative goal achievement, is interested in adaptation to addressee's interpretability and has provided data to support the notion. It has been demonstrated (Applegate & Delia, 1980; Burleson, 1987; Clark & Delia, 1976, 1977) that as children grow older, their listener adaptability improves, and they are able to construct more complex persuasive strategies used for more complex situations. For example, they found that younger children could only make simple requests of listeners, regardless of the degree of reluctance on part of the latter. In contrast, older children showed increasing, age-related, ability to produce elaborate requests, counter-arguments and other-advantage stressing persuasion to ensure the granting of a request. The request type was selected depending on how willing the other person appeared to grant the request. Their main concern was over the connection between cognitive development and communication skill, nevertheless, the findings are indicative of children's, thus people's, adaptation in different communication situations. A similar line of investigation, reviewed in O'Keefe and Delia (1982), has yielded findings that adults (parents, college students, managers, etc.) adjust their messages to various situations and task goals (involving different feelings, obligation, conflicts, etc.) for successful communication.

In a study about goal-directed encoding and cognition, Higgins et al (1982) found that speakers were more likely to "stick
to facts" (use straight descriptions rather than interpretations) relating something about a target person, when they believed the listener did not have the same information about this person. This also appears to apply to inferred information, for people have been found not only capable of recalling conversational implicatures as well as the conversation, but they also had difficulties separating implicatures from the original assertions (Harris & Monaco, 1978; Stafford, Waldron & Infield, 1989). Conversational implicatures were not differentiated in cognition from the original assertions, but treated as part of the conversation. Thus in normal circumstances, speakers will rely on listeners' common sense for additional information inferences, and do not feel the need to state what listeners can figure out from something they actually hear. This is how people use, for example, indirect speech acts, conversational implicatures involving matters of the taken-for-granted in communications (Hopper, 1981). The point is well established that interaction participants indeed accommodate by adjusting their message production. Accommodation corresponds to the partners' needs for communicative effectiveness, and takes consideration of the partners' interpretability related to the stock of knowledge. More explicit messages would be produced to make up for a perceived lacking in some aspects of knowledge relevant to the communicative task at hand.
With regard to accommodation for conversational needs and the interpersonal control needs at discourse level, the bulk of literature is on rules of language use and conversation management (Clark, 1984, McLaughlin, 1984). For example, rules reflecting the way people initiate or terminate conversations, take turns to be the speaker, introduce or change topics, and maintain each other's face/politeness. There is ample indirect evidence suggesting a strong possibility for accommodative behaviours. For example, Beattie and Barnard (1979) present data to show that 34 percent of speaker role-switches in conversation occur swiftly, fast to make known the intention to be the next speaker. It is logical to think that once the turn is taken over, the current speaker normally will not be interrupted, i.e., their desire to speak will be accommodated. Maynard (1980) notes that a conversation tends to switch to a different topic, when the speaker is unable to engage the other partner in discussion of a selected topic. The speaker can be taken as trying to accommodate the other's lack of interest by dropping the previous topic.

Brown & Levinson (1983) suggest a range of politeness strategies, from negative to positive, which people use in a variety of situations for a variety of goals relating to interpersonal relations and control. Clark & Schunk (1980) provide evidence to show that people indeed perceive similar requests for information to be different in degree of politeness: such that "Could you tell me ...?" is more polite than "Do you know ...?" which in turn is
more polite than "Can't you tell me ... ?" Responses to the request are also reported to vary in degree of politeness: so that to a request such as "Do you have the time?" a simple "Ten past six" is less polite than "Yes, it's ten past six", which in turn is less polite than "Yes, I do. It's ten past six". It is suggested that a more polite request will be used to ask for greater favours that supposedly pose greater threat to the face of the person being asked, while a more polite response to the request is used to indicate the speaker is more attentive to the requester's face needs. Their study did not set out to investigate accommodative behaviours, however, it is logical to conclude that people use different strategies to accommodate for different needs.

**Common Ground**

It has become clear now that accommodation in communication may occur, with an orientation to communicators productive performance, or interpretive ability, or conversational needs, or role-relation needs, or a combination of any number of these, as specified in CAT. What is not specified but taken as given is an assumption fundamental to the very concept of communication, and accommodation for that matter, that communication is carried out on the basis of some kind of common ground. Put in another way, whatever aspects of communication accommodative behaviours are oriented to, one basic condition is mandatory, that the communicating parties have something in
common. A brief review of literature on this topic is warranted for further discussion of the objective of this dissertation on communication accommodation and how it may help enrich the theory.

First of all, the idea of common ground has been conceptualized in theories on cultural studies, at a macro level, which also bears on the major objective here to investigate intercultural encounters. To establish the centrality of consciousness in all human activities, Gebser (1981) posits that all human cultures share a common origin of consciousness that has a (limited) variety of mutable manifestation modes or structures to be realized in all aspects of human life. Thus, cultural differences, as is commonly understood, is due to the fact that a different consciousness structure is dominant in particular cultures. From a different standpoint, Bidney (1953) points out that "cultural variation depends in large measure upon the rational, normative selection of man" (p.143) and that "cultural selection ... ... ultimately involves the active choice of the human agents of a given culture system" (p.334). The emphasis on the freedom of choice underscores the rationality and normative nature of cultural differences. The presupposition here is a common core, cultural variations potentially available to all. In other words, cultures differ from one another only to the extent that each has selected a different subset of the common core, while each has knowledge of other possibilities. A logical conclusion is
unequivocal that cultures have capability of being able to learn from and/or adapt to one another, which boils down to realization of their potential.

On a more micro level, the common ground, or mutual/shared knowledge, between the communicators (Clark, 1985; Gumperz, 1982; Sanders, 1988) is identified as the kind of knowledge including mutual beliefs and mutual propositions, which is shared between the communicators and known as such by the involving parties. The usefulness of this concept in theory, and the certainty of its existence in practice, is a moot point. However, there is reason to believe that communications do proceed with a presumption on the part of participants of a possible common ground between them, elusive as it might be (Smith, 1982). Theoretical arguments and empirical evidence have been provided from various areas to bring home the importance of common ground for communications to occur, involving message interpretation as well as production.

On face-work as a condition for social interactions, Goffman (1967) defines face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes ---albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself" (p.5---my emphasis). Clearly, for face to be
established, it is necessary for the potential image to be known to all involved, before it can be approved or disapproved. The shared image is an implicit common ground for social judgment.

Grice (1957, 1968) first put forward the idea that nonnatural meaning is conveyed by the sender intending to get the receiver to do something and also to get the latter to recognize that intention. Levinson (1983) further points out that such meaning conveyance constitutes communication, which "is a complex kind of intention that is achieved or satisfied just by being recognized" and becomes mutual knowledge to the participants, thus "Attaining this state of mutual knowledge of a communicative intention is to have successfully communicated" (p.16). The notion of common ground is here taken as the base of communication directly relating to the intention of the message sender to communicate. For communication to occur, one condition is the parties involved have to both know about this communicative intention.

Taking another approach, Clark and colleagues (Clark, 1985; Clark & Carlson, 1982; Clark & Marshall, 1981) argue that just as common ground is essential to coordination of any action, so it is essential to language use for communication as coordinated efforts. More importantly, they point out that mutual knowledge is not a constant, but varies in scope or strength. They further argue that nothing more than some evidence, along with basic assumptions about each other's rationality, will suffice to allow
communicators to infer inductively their common ground. To
demonstrate the ready availability of common ground, Clark and
Marshall (1981) identify three sources whence people infer their
common ground: linguistic evidence, perceptual evidence and
community evidence. Pertaining to textual cohesion, linguistic
evidence is presented by the part of communication discourse
previously established, hence the probability of information it
contains being shared by the participants. Perceptual evidence is
obtained by the participants from the physical environment in
which they co-present: everything perceptible there is
presumably common knowledge. Community evidence is given
by the shared cultural membership of participants, as they are
expected to know the rules and conventions of their culture. Clark
(1985) contends that the use of language for effective
communication depends very much on communicators relying on
available evidence to build up common ground over the process of
conversation, and each being aware of that common ground.

As is noted in Hewes and Planalp (1987), a certain degree of
intersubjectivity is necessary for communication. When
knowledge is shared, listeners' comprehension is more likely
guided by the same knowledge that guides the speakers'
production so their conception of what is said is similar. They
further point out that if communicators have either substantially
different knowledge or access to different knowledge, the two
conceptions may differ dramatically and misunderstanding may
result, unless messages can be designed to compensate for the differences. Communication then not only is built on, but also helps to locate and expand, common ground, with speakers adapting themselves to listeners' perspectives, aiming at better understanding.

**Topic and Topic Management**

To date, few empirical studies have been done on accommodative behaviours in interactions other than the productive aspects of speech. A good candidate for investigation on other aspects is conversation topic. Intuitively, what a "topic" is is a matter of common sense. Everyone knows that a conversation is "about something", and that this something is "topic". Such is the pervasiveness of topic that a topic emerges as soon as a conversation starts (c.f., Sigman, 1983). Unsurprisingly, this aspect of the conversation has been examined from a variety of angles and has duly contributed to our understanding of the mechanics of conversation qua communication (Nofsinger, 1990).

**Topics in conversation.** In general, topic is often identified as the proposition around which information is exchanged (solicited or offered) in a somewhat organized manner (Keenen & Schieffelin, 1976). This proposition summarizes a set of utterances in the discourse into a thematic statement, or a topic. In relation, topic is regarded as an essential part of participants' role enactment in conversation. Reichman (1978) notes that the
speaker "is expected and entitled to bring up a topic for
discussion, ...(the listener) is expected and obliged to adhere to the
topic brought up by the speaker..." (p. 289). Thus topic is seen as
associating mainly with the participant who, at the moment, is in
control of the conversation, or "owns" the topic under discussion.

In connection, it has been observed (Edelsky, 1981; Yngve,
1970) that participants exchange roles when they take turns
contributing to the conversation as the speaker, but the speaker
does not necessarily have the "floor" (a term borrowed from
Goffman, 1967) when s/he has the turn. This is best illustrated in
the case of a participant, A, assuming the role of the speaker to
ask a question of the other participant, B, the current listener, in
order to obtain a clarification/explanation of what B just said. The
turn alternates with the role, while B is the one who holds the
floor in the process: the current topic is "his/hers". Vance (1974)
provides evidence partially to support this notion of floor, or topic
ownership. He suggests that a topic may be owned by one or the
other participant alone, or it may be jointly owned by both
parties. In other words, the two participants may share the floor.
This latter case occurs when a topic appears to associate to not
only one but to both participants, i.e., it is of some
importance/interest to both of them, and they both contribute
substantially to the development of the topic. Although the notion
of topic ownership has not been explicitly defined, it clearly is
relevant to the line of research on topic management. In terms of
interaction, a smooth and satisfactory conversation can occur with or without a great deal of topic sharing, depending on the communicative goals of participants, whether it is information exchange or information seeking/providing. In contrast, a difficult and awkward conversation, regardless of participants' goals in interaction, is very unlikely to have extended moments when participants engage in topic-sharing.

Related is the organization of information under a topic and the organization of topics into a coherent piece of discourse. Discourse coherence is derived out of the Gricean Maxim of Relevance as a conversational rule from the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975), and directly pertains to interpretability of discourse (McLaughlin, 1984). Management of topic, i.e., the underlying theme of a set of utterances, is a major device to maintain coherence in conversation, including topic shift and topic continuation. The assumption is that the notion of topic is part of the intuitive repertoire of a competent language user. Empirical work has provided supporting evidence that native English speakers are generally sensitive to topic and topic boundaries and are able to identify them fairly consistently (Cegala, Dewhurst, Galanes, Burggraf, Thorpe, Keyton, & Makay, 1989; Planalp & Tracy, 1980). Participants' disagreements over a topic can be taken as a sign of a lack of intersubjectivity, while that segment of the conversation is constructed with a higher degree of
communicator self-orientation, rather than orientation to each other (Cegala, Bayer, Teboul, Dewhurst, & Sears, 1991b).

Another related notion are the distinctions between the given and the new information as topics (Clark & Haviland, 1977; Schank, 1977). The basic information unit is a so-called discourse referent (topic), representing by a noun phrase (NP) and referring to an entity, i.e., an object, an event, a person, a state, and so on. The basis for the given-new distinction is whether the information/referent is known to one or all participants, such that new information/topic is usually introduced in association to given information or topic in previous utterances for a conversation to develop and expand.

Pragmatically, Prince (1981) develops a six-category taxonomy of assumed familiarity (a term she prefers over shared knowledge). Each category varies in degree of information explicitness, which can be assigned to NP's (information units) in a conversation, indicating the degree to which the speaker made assumptions about the listener's knowledge base, i.e., the body of knowledge they may have shared. According to Prince, if the entity represented by a NP is treated by the speaker as not known to the listener, it belongs to the category of New information; it is explicit. An entity is a piece of Evoked information, if it is treated as old, within the range of the listener's knowledge, which is less explicit. If the knowledge of an entity can be expected from a previously mentioned entity, it is of
the category of **Inferable** information, the least explicit of all. The idea is that the more a receiver is assumed to be familiar with a particular piece of information, the less need there is to convey the information to him/her explicitly.

Mazzie (1987) adapted Prince's system and found differences in discourse explicitness between discourses on concrete narrative topics (story-telling) and those on abstract explanatory topics (explaining a numerical system), presumably due to expected discrepancies of different audience in assumed familiarity with the information and topic. When the audience was perceived to be familiar with the information/topic as that in an explanation of relationships of parts of a system, information was conveyed by a high proportion of units in the less explicit/more implicit categories, as the speaker expected the listener to fall back on the stock of knowledge to make the connection. When the audience was perceived to be unfamiliar with the information/topic, as that in a story, information was conveyed by a high proportion of units in the more explicit/less implicit categories. The finding is consistent with the notion that the new topic is introduced in relation to the old topic, with which participants have certain familiarity and can be expected to expand in some ways (Clark & Haviland, 1977; Reinhart, 1981; Schank, 1977). It will be reasonable to suppose that, in cases of little common ground between the participants (e.g., in intercultural interactions), there
would be a higher level of explicitness, as there is relatively little that each party can assume of the other.

**Topic Management.** Previous studies have generalized some rules of competent management of topic, taking into account cognitive as well as relational dimensions (effectiveness and appropriateness). The expectation in accordance with the social mandate of "face" maintenance (Goffman, 1967) is that discourse should be structured basically to enhance comprehension (Clark & Carlson, 1982; Kintsch &. van Dijk, 1978). Topic shift has been found (Planalp & Tracy, 1980) relating to information processing in such a way that the context for a topic change should be accessible to the listener for proper interpretation. In general, a textually derived new topic, therefore, is preferred over one derived externally; a topic related to immediate past remarks is preferred over one related to talk much earlier on; while marking (verbal or nonverbal) is required to signal a topic shift.

In conversations between native and nonnative English speakers, it is noted (Long, 1981a, 1981b, 1982) that conversation topics were dealt with in a simple and brief way in comparison to interactions between native speakers. Also noted is that when a communication breakdowns occurred, a topic was often dropped altogether, and never picked up again. When the non-native speaker appeared unintentionally to mention another topic, the native-speaker often repaired by treating the inappropriate
response as a topic initiation. This finding is similar to the ones to be discussed next in relation to topic or conversation continuation.

With regards to topic continuation, Tracy (1982, 1983, 1984b) found that people generally think it more appropriate to respond to an Issue (Reichman, 1978), a general statement or proposition of principle, belief or feeling of the conversation which is similar to a global topic, than to an Event (Reichman, 1978), reference to a particular past instance or episode, similar to a local topic. However, when the issue is low in comprehensibility, i.e., when it is hard to grasp, due to subject difficulty or lack of contextual information, or when it is simply not clear for some reason; it then becomes more appropriate for conversationalists to follow up with the event at hand. Thus the relational dimension accounts for cases not explained by the cognitive dimension: the conversation is carried on as a social commitment in spite of temporary comprehension difficulties. When a topic is too hard to follow, it is bypassed by a topic shift. Although to a lesser degree, such topic shift is still within the bounds of the relevance rule. There is a different but common type of topic shift, which is also accounted for by the relational dimension for its occurrence, independent of the rule of discourse coherence. Such topic change often occurs when a participant somehow fails to take over the speaking turn to follow up on a topic brought up by the speaker (Maynard, 1980). In such cases, the conversation often takes a sharp turn to discussion of something totally unconnected. One might suggest a
lack of interest/involvement in the previous topic as explanation, but the point is that coherence is out of question here, but face concerns remain regardless of the reason of topic shift. The conversation is carried on one way or another, indicating a commitment to continuous cooperation solely for relational reasons.
Chapter III
Rationale and Hypotheses

Intercultural and Intracultural Interactions

It is established that communication competence necessarily presupposes adaptability, i.e., the ability to adjust plans and manners for effective and appropriated behaviours in interaction, and that adaptability is fundamental to human communication (Spitzberg, 1987). Empirically, adults and children have been observed to adapt themselves constantly in interaction.

On the other hand, studies in cross-cultural communication have documented important cultural differences in face-to-face communication. Difficulties in intercultural communications are common, due to cultural differences. One obvious difficulty stems from another fundamental condition for human communication, i.e., common ground between communicators. The extent to which common ground exists influences the way people communicate. In an intercultural setting, although such a common ground is not totally missing, it is relatively lacking. The absence of the community evidence of common ground (Clark & Marshall, 1981), given by the shared cultural membership of participants to expect mutual compliance to rules and conventions of their culture, is likely to create problems for intercultural communicators. This is
a problem every intercultural communicator must face, hence the greater demand for adaptation, and greater adaptation may be expected. For this reason, intercultural interaction is decided as the situation for the current study to investigate adaptive communication behaviours, which is highlighted by a comparison between intercultural and intracultural interactions.

Moreover, cultural differences, to put in a simplistic term, are in sharpest contrast, when comparisons are made between Western and Eastern cultures (Hall, 1977; Hofstede, 1980, 1983). Thus, American-American dyads and American-East Asian dyads are employed in this study as intracultural interaction and intercultural interaction comparison groups.

**Topic and Communication Accommodation**

The major focus of this study is adaptive communication behaviours. Accommodation, in my opinion, is a specific type of adaptation, with particular attention to the communication partner as a person and adjustments made accordingly (Coupland et al., 1988; Giles et al., 1987). Four aspects of the addressee's characteristics have been specified that may be attended to in communication: 1) (message) interpretation competence; 2) conversational needs; 3) interactants' role-relations; and 4) (message) productive performance.

Corresponding categories of strategies to accommodate the four aspects are: 1) interpretability---strategies to modify
complexity, clarity and explicitness of messages; 2) discourse management—tending to matters such as topic selection, back channeling and turning taking; 3) interpersonal control—dealing with other's role discretion such as interruption, forms of address, and 4) approximation—convergence, divergence and maintenance of speech features. (Coupland et al., 1988)

As noted earlier, past attention of accommodation research was almost exclusively on the paralinguistic or "noncontent" aspects of speech rhythms and patterns (Street & Giles, 1982). Very little empirical work has been done on other aspects (e.g., discoursal, relational), leaving important questions unanswered. For example, How do people accommodate by selecting conversation topics, by role-taking, by doing face-work? How does accommodation occur in terms of interaction management? While CAT has indeed included specifications pertaining to these questions, the theory has yet to be tested in that respect. This study is set out to be among the first to investigate accommodation at the level of discourse.

Among other relevant factors, topic management has been shown to be related to: communication competence (Tracy, 1982, 1983), to information processing such as message interpretation and comprehension (Planalp & Tracy, 1980), to interaction regulation (Goffman, 1967; Maynard, 1980; Maynard, & Zimmerman, 1984), and to interpersonal control in interaction (Palmer, 1989; Reichman, 1978; Yngve, 1970). Several of these
are aspects of communication accommodation specified in CAT. Given that, topic provides a good entry point to tap into those unexplored aspects. For the purpose of the current study, two aspects are selected for investigation about accommodation strategies relating to topics in conversation: interpretability strategies to deal with interpretation competence; and discourse management strategies to meet conversational need for content construction/contribution.

**Topic Change and Topic Sharing**

The way people manage topics is considered here in light of communication accommodation as part of discourse management to meet the conversational needs. Topic is expected to reflect communicators awareness of their situation, with respect to their common ground and their needs in conversation for proper contribution. In this study, discourse management is operationalized as topic management strategies, including topic change and topic sharing.

Gallois et al. (1988) posit that, to take account of variability in group membership and related factors, speakers in an intercultural encounter would differentially attune to the communicative characteristics they believe to belong to their message recipients, depending on their motives. Positive attuning occurs when they desire recipients's social approval, high communication clarity and efficiency, a self-image shared by both
parties, an equal role relations, and to meet the perceived communication needs of recipients as individuals. With opposite motivations, there would be no attuning or negative attuning.

Tracy (1984) expresses a similar, though more general view that communication involves multiple goals (instrumental and relational) for effectiveness and appropriateness. Based on this review, it is assumed that in an ordinary informal situation, with no apparent instrumental goals or identity threads, the cooperation principle and the politeness requirement would dictate that people interact with one another in an appropriate manner. Participants thus would accommodate to each other in conversation just to ensure a relatively smooth interaction. They are expected to be sensitive to each other’s conversational need for content contribution, and would try to find appropriate topics for both parties to get involved.

In the case of intercultural interaction, the relative lacking in common ground would make it harder to hit a proper topic, as can be inferred from the observations that participants found it easier to develop conversation in initial intracultural interactions than in similar intercultural interactions (Gudykunst, 1983a); but more difficult to gain the interest of the conversational partner of another ethnic group (Simard, 1981). Accordingly, intercultural communicators may need to shift topics more frequently, hence the following hypothesis.
H1. In search of common ground, intercultural dyads will accommodate by make more topic shifts in conversation than intracultural dyads.

However, considering the novelty of intercultural encounters, where there is not only a high level of interpersonal salience (communicators are strangers to each other), but also a high level of intergroup salience (communicators are also strangers to each other's culture), one would expect differences to exist in accommodative actions between intracultural and intercultural settings. Considering the fact that intercultural communicators must at once deal with uncertainties at two levels: uncertainty about one's partner as an individual, and uncertainty about a different cultural group of which one's partner is a member. It is not only more difficult for intercultural dyads to share topics, but it is also more appropriate for them to share less. Extensive topic sharing involves extensive information input from both parties, therefore it is more demanding psychologically, and even more so when communicators have a high level of uncertainty about each other. A certain amount of topic sharing helps to establish an appropriate conversation partnership, without the embarrassment of one party, or maybe both, being overwhelmed by unfamiliar information. Based on the above rationale, a hypothesis is offered.

H2. Intercultural dyads will engage in less topic sharing in conversation than intracultural dyads.
As is noted in Hewes and Planalp (1987), a certain degree of intersubjectivity is necessary for communication. When knowledge is shared, listeners' comprehension is more likely guided by the same knowledge that guides the speakers' production so their conception of what is said is similar. They further point out that if communicators have either substantially different knowledge or access to different knowledge, the two conceptions may differ dramatically and misunderstanding may result, unless messages can be designed to compensate for the differences. Communication then not only is built on, but also helps to locate and expand, common ground, with speakers adapting themselves to listeners' perspectives, aiming at better understanding.

Another line of research by Cegala and associates (Cegala et al., 1989; Cegala, Galanes, Burggraf, Thorpe, Keyton, & Makay, 1986; Cegala, Teboul, & Dewhurst, 1991a; Cegala et al., 1991b) examines participants' agreements over topic change points as a concrete manifestation of communicator intersubjectivity, and proposes that a relatively high degree of intersubjectivity is achieved when the conversation partners follow each other closely and understand each other well. In other words, if a conversation proceeds smoothly with little difficulty, participants are likely to enjoy considerable degree of intersubjectivity. This is less likely to be case in intercultural interaction. Thus as a reflection of
discrepancy in common ground and insufficient inter-subjectivity of intercultural communicators, it is hypothesized that

**H3.** Intercultural dyads will have less agreement on points of topic change than intracultural dyads.

**Discourse Explicitness**

Communicators are also sensitive to the possible discrepancy in common ground on the level of referents involved in the conversation: what is specified in CAT as the interpretation competence of the interaction partners. It is just part of the adaptation, or accommodation process for communicators to cater their information input to what they assume the partner knows and does not know. For efficiency in message interpretation, communicators may accommodate by adjusting the explicitness of their own message (Higgins et al., 1982; Mazzie, 1987). The discrepancies between the knowledge base of the intercultural dyad leads us to hypothesize a difference between intercultural and intracultural dyads, in the combination of information in their conversation that contribute to discourse explicitness.

**H4a.** Combination of information types in discourse explicitness of the conversation will be different for intercultural and intracultural dyads.

More specifically, it is expected that, in comparison with intracultural dyads, intercultural dyads will have a greater demand for message interpretation, and therefore will be more
explicit in their conversation and communicate, using higher proportion of explicit type of information. Intracultural dyads have less such needs, thus will have a lower proportion of explicit information.

H4b. Intercultural dyads will attend to each other's conversation needs for content comprehension and accommodate by using more explicit information for topic development than intracultural dyads.

Since communication accommodation can be an individual effort, it is hypothesized that

H5. Americans in intercultural dyads will attend to the partner's interpretation competence and accommodate by using overall more explicit information to develop

Participants' Perception

In addition to the usual practice of conducting a study exclusively from a researcher's perspective, this study also includes participants' own account of their perception of interactions, using a method recently developed by Cegala et al., (1989), so that participants report their perception of topic in conversation, when it changes and who changes it. This allows an assessment of accommodation as it is experienced by the participants. It is of methodological, as well as theoretical, significance to take into consideration participants' own perception. After all, communications are possible because of
communicators, who are the first to affect and be affected by whatever outcome the occasion might produce. Both dyadic and individual measurements will be used. However, individual measurement will be taken of only American participants to ensure the relative homogeneity of individual analyses, as international participants will involve people of different nationals with expected more subtle differences in cultural influence on their behaviours. The decision is further justified by the fact that the English language is used as the medium for discussion, thus it makes most sense to focus on how Americans accommodate to their partners.

Besides, a direct assessment of participants' perception of topic change by way of accommodation is also of interest. How the participants feel about topic changes, and what do they think about these changes would provide further evidence to confirm the hypothesized relationship between topic change and communication accommodation, that it occurs to accommodate, to facilitate communication in some way. Particularly, since topic change is investigated here as accommodation strategies, participants response to it might shed new lights on its utility. Thus a question is posed

RQ1. Will individuals in different dyad types have different perceptions about communication accommodation by way of topic change?
Topic and Interaction Involvement

It is commonly believed that topic is associated with communicators' interaction involvement in a way that active pursuit of a topic is taken as an indication of interest, while change/abandonment of a topic implies a lack of interest (Goffman, 1967; Tracy, 1982). Research has shown that when people are minimally involved in interaction, they are less certain about the flow of the conversation, more likely to lose a grip of the topic at hand and change abruptly to another one (Kellerman & Roloff, 1983; Villaume & Cegala, 1988).

Defined as the extent to which an individual partakes in an immediate social environment, interaction involvement constitutes a necessary condition of competent interpersonal interaction (Cegala, 1982). A highly involved participant in interaction is said to be attentive and perceptive to his/her partner as well as to the latter's acts and talk, sensitive to the flow of the conversation so as to respond accordingly with his/her own input, contributing to the process of conversation by integrating her/his thoughts, feeling and behaviors with the on-going interaction.

Cegala (1981) found that the degree of involvement is positively related to an individual's effective performance in interaction. It is suggested to also affect the adaptivity to situational demands in various circumstances, e.g., goal directed talk, conversation with strangers (Cegala, 1984; Cegala et al,
1982). With a low level of involvement, participants are often psychologically removed from an interaction, inattentive and unresponsive in their conversation. As a consequence, they are less certain about the flow of the conversation, more likely to lose a grip of the topic at hand, and change abruptly to another one (Villaume & Cegala, 1988; Kellerman & Roloff, 1983). Moreover, higher involvement is found to associate with lower level of uncertainty, as well as more active information-processing (Cegala & Villaume, 1988; Villaume & Cegala, 1988; Kellerman & Roloff, 1983).

Since interaction involvement is such an important cognitive factor in communication, it might also play a role in accommodation. What is interested in here is the possible interference of interaction involvement in accommodative behaviours. To explore the possibility, two questions are posed:

RQ2a Does dyad type have any effect on participants' state of interaction involvement?

RQ2b To what extend does interaction involvement effect conversation performance, in terms of topic sharing and discourse explicitness?
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Method

Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of 132 (77 female and 55 male) student volunteers from a large Midwest university. Ninety-eight of the participants, average age 21, were undergraduates enrolled in an introductory communication class who received extra credit for their participation in the study. The remaining 34 participants were volunteer international students (both undergraduate and graduate), with an average age of 23, from a variety of fields and programs in the university. International students were selected according to their ethnicity and nationality (i.e., non-native English speakers from East-Asian countries).

Independent Variable

Of the 132 participants, 98 were Americans, and 34 were international students. Thirty-two American-American (A-A) dyads and 34 American-International (A-I) dyads formed two comparison groups for the respective condition of intracultural vs intercultural communication setting.
In the final analysis, data for 3 A-A dyads were discarded, as it turned out that individuals of these dyads were not really total strangers. Five A-I dyads were also excluded from the data analysis, because the international individual in the dyad did not meet the above criteria (e.g., not from Asian countries, or raised in U.S. and thus used English almost as a first language). Thus only 29 A-A dyads and 29 A-I dyads provided data for analysis.

**Interaction Involvement Measure**

The state version of Cegala's (1981) Interaction Involvement Scale (IIS)(see appendix A), was used to measure the participant's personality type in terms of interpersonal interaction, as well as their actual self-perceived involvement in the conversation. A seven-point Likert scale was used with each item, ranging from "not at all like me" (1) to "very much like me" (7). Thirteen of the items had reversing scale values before they were added. The internal reliability for the scale is reported to be .88, while temporal reliability has once been assessed to have a correlation of .81 (Cegala, 1984; Cegala et al., 1982). The internal reliability obtained for this study was .83. Considerable validity data for the scale are reported by Cegala and associates (e.g., Cegala, 1981; Cegala et al., 1982; Cegala, 1984; Villaume & Cegala, 1988; ).

**Exit Questionnaire**

An exit questionnaire was designed to provide information about participants' perception about the laboratory setting (e.g.,
its artificiality) and the procedures used in the study (e.g., its being too long). Also, it provides relevant background information about the subjects (e.g., their previous experience in intercultural interaction, international students' length of stay in the states, their personal experience with the Americans, etc.). Eleven of the items were answered by all participants, nine of which used a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5). (See Appendix B).

Procedure

Dyads were formed semi-randomly, depending on the times of individual's availability and the time they were contacted. Each dyad was scheduled to come to the department at a prearranged time. They were first instructed to engage in a 10-minute, get-to-know-each-other conversation in a laboratory. The lab was furnished to resemble a waiting room, with armchairs, coffee table and a few magazines. The conversation partners were seated on two chairs facing each other across a coffee table where two microphones were placed. The experimenter left the room after initial instructions were given, so the dyad could talk more freely. They were encouraged to discuss anything they chose. The conversation was video-taped through a one-way mirror. Subjects were informed of the video taping prior to the start of the conversation, and were told that they would have opportunity to watch the tape later. They were also asked to sign a release
form giving their consent to have the video tapes analyzed for purposes of this study.

At the end of ten minutes, the experimenter terminated the conversation. Subjects were then asked to complete the state version of the interaction involvement scale (IIS). They were then informed that the study was to examine informal conversations in relation to topic management. After that, participants were taken to separate rooms to view the video tape of their own conversation. They were instructed to stop the tape each time they noticed a topic change, record the time of change from a digital o'clock on the screen, identify who initiated the topic change, whether that change was accommodating or not, and describe the ways in which the change was or was not accommodating. After completing this task, participants were again given the opportunity to withdraw consent to release the video tape. Before they were finally dismissed, each completed the exit questionnaire.

Dependent Variables and Data Coding

All of the conversations were transcribed. Transcriptions were coded for topic sharing and information explicitness. Participants' responses in viewing were examined for the agreement of each dyad on points of topic change.

**Topic sharing.** Transcripts were examined to determine the extend to which conversation partners shared a topic (topic sharing rate). The topic sharing rate (TPSHR) was defined in this
study as a function of the number of shared topics (TPSH) and the total number of topics a piece of conversation contains, where, technically, the total number of topics is the number of topic changes which participants have agreed on. Thus, TPSHR is based on the topics on which there was agreement. A topic sharing was judged to have occurred if, for a given topic, both partners had contributed substantial information input to that topic, excluding contributions such as side comments, requests for clarification or explanation, request for further information, completions by the listener of the speaker's sentences, and back channeling utterances (see Figure 2 for examples). As the task was rather straightforward, the coding was done by the author alone.

**Coding of agreement on topic change.** Participants' agreement on topic changes were coded following procedures described in Cegala et al., (1991b) and Cegala, et al. (1986). In brief, a difference of eight seconds between participants's tape stops was used as the upper limit on defining agreements. In other words, participants's tape stops that occurred within eight seconds of one another were defined as an agreement on the point of a topic change, when they also agreed on who initiated the change. In this study, the actual average time difference between tape stops counted as agreement was 2.3 seconds. Agreements on topic change were calculated using a modified version of the kappa statistic (Cegala, 1991), which takes into accounts of the variation in participants' tape stops (to identify topic changes) and
I. A Topic That was Shared.

1 A: How many people are in your group?
2 B: We've got five.
3 A: Oh, we have six. I don't know if we are allowed to have that many.
4 B: Oh, I went up and asked her the second day of the class like how many she thinks, or how little should be, in a group. She says from two to seven. But I thought seven probably would be too much.
5 A: Oh, that's good. I didn't think she would allow us to have six, but, (B: Umum.) she does.
6 B: Yeah that goes past five. So. I told, I said to the other guy, maybe she'll let you joint our group. B'cause you know we already did the proposal. That's is funny. [Both laughed]

II. A Topic That was NOT Shared.

1 A: Yeah. No, I didn't go to any (class) today. [Both laughed]
   Well, I have two on Friday. The one that is canceled in the morning, then I slept through my communication class.
2 B: Yeah? That's kind of easy to do.
3 A: I have that class every day of the week. But she canceled it today, so I went out last night. I didn't feel like getting up this morning.
4 B: Yeah. It can happen.

Figure 2
Examples of Topic Sharing
removes chance agreement due to the number of stops made by each individual.

Coding of discourse explicitness. All referential noun/pronoun phrases (NP), not including the ones functioning as modification of other words, were identified and coded as one of the five information categories based on Prince's (1981) taxonomy of a given-new information, subsets of New, Evoked and Inferable. NP's that function as adverbial, expletives, dummies and idiom-pieces, repetitions were also omitted.

New information includes Brand New (BN) and Unused (UU). BN NP's represent entities that are not only first introduced into the conversation, but also taken as previously unknown to the listener. UU NP's represent entities that are first introduced into the conversation, but are taken as not unknown to the listener, i.e., it is part of the listener's stock of knowledge. For example in an opening utterance, "My girlfriend told me yesterday that she knew your mother and her company, and that the CEO there is an African-American". "My girlfriend" is a piece of New information (in the case that the listener did not know of this girlfriend); "your mother" and "her company" is Unused information.

Evoked information is further classified into Textually Evoked (TE), which were NP's referring to entities previously mentioned in the discourse (text), orSituationally Evoked (SE), NP's referring to entities, including participants and other salient features, in the nontextual, external situation. Thus, "she" and
"there" in the above example are Textually Evoked information, and "me" Situationally Evoked.

**Inferable** (PI) information is conveyed by NP's representing entities that can be inferred via logical or plausible reasoning from other entities already introduced or evoked or inferred earlier in the discourse. From the above again, "the CEO" belongs to Inferable information.

The categories SE, TE, BN represent more explicit information, while the categories of UU and PI represent more implicit information, as they both rely on the listener's stock of knowledge for complete understanding. To adjust for the relative length of each participant's contribution in conversation, either due to variation in speed of speaking or relative ease of the interaction, the textual explicitness for each participant is indicated by the proportion of each NP categories in the total number of words spoken (WCNT) by that person.

The author independently coded all the data, while another graduate student not familiar with the study, after being trained in the used of the coding system, independently coded about 16 percent of the data (9 of 58 conversations). The intercoder reliability using Pearson correlation, run on the total count of each of all six categories obtained by the two coders, resulted in coefficients for individual categories respectively as follows: BN (.302, \(P = .05\)); UU (.656, \(P = .01\)); SE (.843, \(P = .01\)); TE (.812, \(P = .01\)); PI (.296, \(P = .05\)).
Participants' perception of accommodation. Topic changes that were identified (in their responses during the play-back---Appendix C) as "accommodation change" (ACC), and those as "non-accommodation change" (NACC) were totaled for each participant. Participants' perception of accommodation was operationalized as ACCR (rate of accommodation topic change) and NACCR (rate of non-accommodation topic change), to adjust for variation in total topic change each individual identified.

Data Analysis

Statistical treatment of the data included $t$ test, MANOVA and discriminant analysis with dyad as the unit of analysis for H1 through H4. For H5, the unit of analysis is individual speaker.

To test H1, the topic change frequency for each dyad was calculated combining the reports of both participants, and a comparison was made between dyad types, using a $t$ test.

Rate of topic-sharing in all topics was calculated for each dyad. A comparison was made between two dyad types, using a $t$ test to assess H2.

Additionally, a MANOVA was run for dependent variables in H1 (CHG) and H2 (TPSHR) to assess their interdependency and the effect of dyad type on their joint distribution.

Agreements about topic change were averaged for both dyad types, and a $t$ test was used on kappa for H3.

H4 and H5 each involved 5 dependent variables. NP category proportions were calculated for each American participant, as well
as for each dyad, of both groups. A comparison of NP usage were made between the dyad types, at both individual and dyad levels, and a MANOVA was conducted respectively for their assessment. An additional dependent variable WCNT (word count) was also included in the analyses to examine the discourse length, as it is conceptually related to other variables.

A follow-up discriminant analysis was run on the major variables to identify variables that contribute most to the classification of a case into either one of the dyad types.

*t* tests were used for the comparison of individual perceptions about topic change in relation to communication accommodation. The perception was based on participants' total specifications of topic change as accommodation change (ACC) and non-accommodation change (NACC), and the rate of two categories (ACCR and NACCR) to adjust for total number of change identified.

An ANOVA analysis was use to investigate whether dyad type had any effects on the participant's state of interaction involvement, as indicated by their IIS scores.

To explore to what extend, if any, the personality state of interaction involvement had effect on the conversation performance, in terms of topic sharing and discourse explicitness, MANOVA were used on discourse variables and TPSHR between the two dyad types using IIS scores as covariate, with both dyad and individual as the unit of analysis. Correlations were also run for IIS score and discourse variables plus TPSHR.
Finally, a frequency analysis was conducted on nine of items on the Exit Questionnaire, to assess the participants' general evaluation of the study.
Results for research questions and hypotheses testing are presented in this section, following a brief report of the preliminary analysis of the Exit Questionnaire. One question often raised with regard to experimental study is the possible effect of laboratory setting on the subjects' behaviour, leading to the important issue of validity. An examination of participants' reports on how they felt about the procedures can provide some assistance in overall evaluation of the study.

Preliminary Analysis of Exit Questionnaire

The questionnaire provided useful background information about the participants. The majority of Americans assigned to the intercultural dyad condition had limited experience in interacting with East-Asians: on average each had personally known one or two persons from the East Asian countries, including one East-Asian friend on average. For international participants, the average length of their stay in the U.S was 16 months, most had never known an American before they came. None were native English speakers and the majority never spoke before they came to the U.S.
The frequency analysis of the exit questionnaire turned out results fairly favorable with the study (see Table 1 at the end). Over half (58%) of the participants disagreed/strongly disagreed that "the lab setting was artificial". About three quarters (73%) disagreed/strongly disagreed that "I was distracted by the setting". About thirds (68%) agreed/strongly agreed that "I felt comfortable during the conversation". Three quarters (76%) agreed/strongly agreed that "the conversation was typical of self behaviour in a similar interaction". About 87% felt the play-back procedure was "interesting", while 66% felt the play-back procedure "not too long". Overall, 82% percent "enjoyed the conversation". For items pertinent to the main objective of the study, 50% felt they were able to identify accurately the point of topic change, about 11% disagreed and 37% were not sure either way. About 69% felt they constantly changed topic to keep the conversation going and about 21% disagreed.

Main Analyses

**Topic-related variables.** H1 predicted that A-I dyad partners will try to accommodate each other by way of topic change in search of common ground. Thus they will have more topic shifts in conversation than A-A dyads. The test results showed a difference in the mean of topic change between A-I dyads \( (M = 14.6) \) and the A-A dyads \( (M = 15.9) \). The difference however is not significant to reject the null hypothesis \( (t = -1.08; p = .14; df = 114) \). Thus H1 is not supported.
H2 predicted that A-I dyads will exhibit less topic sharing in conversation than A-A dyads. The $t$ test results for the comparison of TPSHR were significant ($t = 2.01; p = .025; df = 56$). The mean of A-I dyads was .49, while the mean of A-A dyads was .59. H2 was thus supported.

As for the MANOVA on dependent variables in H1 (CHG) and H2 (TPSHR), there is a significant multivariate result for the main effect of dyad type (Wilks' lambda = .841, $F (4,111) = 5.26, p = .001$). Univariate tests showed a significant effect of dyad type on TPSHR ($F (1,114) = 8.20; p = .005$), but not on CHG ($F (1,114) = 1.16; p = .283$) (see Table 3 at the end). Thus, the difference in TPSHR alone contribute to the significant difference in the main effect of the dyad type. H2 was further confirmed.

H3 predicted that Intercultural dyads will have less agreement on points of topic termination than A-A dyads. The mean kappa for the A-A dyads was .441 and The mean kappa for the A-I dyads was .428, both of which is rather low and comparable to similar findings in previous studies on topic change agreements (e.g. Cegala et al., 1989; Cegala, Teboul, & Dewhurst, 1991; Cegala et al., 1991b). The $t$ test results was not significant ($t = .31; p = .38; df = 56$). H3 is not supported.

**Discourse explicitness.** H4a predicted that there would be a difference in the discourse quality of the conversation between intercultural and A-A dyad types. The result of a multivariate test (Table 2 at the end) of the five information types was highly significant main effect for dyad type (Wilks' lambda = .748, $F$
(6,109) = 6.13, \( p = .000 \). H4a is supported. This was all the more significant, as no dyad type effect was found on WCNT (\( F(1,114) = .52; p = .47 \)), i.e., two dyad types did not differ in the length of conversation, although the average words per conversation for A-I \((M = 797)\) is somewhat lower than that of A-A dyads \((M = 881)\) (Table 3).

H4b predicted that A-I dyads would attend to each other's conversation needs for content comprehension to accommodate by using more explicit information (more BN, SE and TE and less UU, PI, in proportion to the total word count) to develop topics than A-A dyads. Univariate tests showed a significant effect of dyad type on three of the five information categories (Table 2 at the end): UU \((F(1,114) = 10.86; p = .001)\), SE \((F(1,114) = 11.90; p = .001)\) and PI \((F(1,114) = 4.48; p = .036)\). No significant effects were found on BN \((F(1,114) = 2.88; p = .09)\) and TE \((F(1,114) = .04; p = .84)\). An examination of the means of the significant categories showed that, as predicted, A-I dyads used more SE \((M = .101\) compared to \(M = .078\) for A-A dyads) and less UU \((M = .022,\) compared to \(M = .028\)). Unexpectedly, A-I dyads also used more PI \((M = .030,\) compared to \(M = .025)\) Thus, H4b was only partially confirmed.

A discrimination analysis was conducted on the three discourse explicitness variables plus topic share rate, all of which reached the significant level in previous analyses. A step-wise analysis resulted in a discrimination function, including all four variables. Table 4 presents the summery statistics of the analysis.
It shows that altogether the four variables accounts for 36% of the variance among the dyad types.

The centroids for intracultural and intercultural dyad groups on the discrimination function were .738 and -.738 respectively. These, considered in conjunction with the structure matrix for the discrimination function and the four variables (see Table 5 at the end), showed that UU and SE contributed most significantly to the discriminant function, followed by TPSHR and PI. A classification analysis indicated that, based on their discrimination scores, 75% of the conversations were accurately classified.

Discourse explicitness with individual as unit of analysis. H5 predicted that American communicators in A-I dyads will attend to their international partner's interpretation competence and accommodate by using overall more explicit information than communicators in A-A dyads. With the individual as the unit of analysis, the result of multivariate test of the five information types showed a significant main effect of the dyad type on the conversational discourse (Wilks' lambda = .662, $F(4,82) = 3.32, p = .01$). As with the case of dyadic analysis, no dyad type effect was found on WCNT ($F(1,85) = 2.88; p = .09$) (Table 3), while the average word number per conversation for A-I ($M = 770$) is slightly lower than that of A-A dyads ($M = 881$). In other words, Americans in two dyad types did not perform differently in terms of the length of their share of the talk. Univeriate tests identified significant effects of dyad type on three of the five information categories (Table 2): UU ($F(1,85) = 11.20; p = .001$), SE ($F(1,85) =$
15.56; \( p = .000 \) and PI (\( F (1,85) = 4.47; p = .037 \)). No significant effects were found on BN (\( F (1,85) = 2.96; p = .089 \)) and TE (\( F (1,85) = 1.28; p = .26 \)). An examination of the means of significant categories showed that, as predicted, A-I dyads used more SE (\( M = .112 \) compared to \( M = .078 \) for A-A dyads), and less UU (\( M = .020 \), compared to \( M = .028 \)). Unexpectedly, they also used more PI (\( M = .031 \), compared to \( M = .025 \)). H5 was partially confirmed.

**Participants' perception of accommodation.** RQ1 asked that whether individuals in different dyad types would have different perceptions about communication accommodation by way of topic change. The \( t \) test results (see Table 6 at the end) for the comparison of ACC and NACC resulted in no significant difference, at either the dyad level or the individual level (ACC for dyad: \( t = -1.61; p = .055; df = 114 \); NACC for dyad: \( t = .65; p = .25; df = 114 \); ACC for individual: \( t = -.63; p = .25; df = 85 \); NACC for individual \( t = -.29; p = .38; df = 85 \)) between the A-I dyads (ACC \( M = 11 \); NACC \( M = 3.2 \) for dyads; ACC \( M = 12 \); NACC \( M = 2.6 \) for individuals) and A-A dyads (ACC \( M = 13 \); NACC \( M = 2.8 \) for dyads; ACC \( M = 13 \); NACC \( M = 2.8 \) for individuals). Even after adjustments were made for the relative frequency of topic change for each person, the \( t \) test on rate of non-accommodation (NACCR) and rate of accommodation (ACCR) still turned out insignificant (\( p = .22 \) for both variables at the dyad level and \( p = .33 \) for both at the individual level). Thus, there appears to be no general difference
between dyad types in terms of their perception of topic-related accommodation occurring in the conversations.

**Interaction involvement in conversation.** RQ2a asked whether dyad type had any effects on the participant's state of interaction involvement, which was relevant to the conversation performance. The ANOVA analysis results showed significant differences for intercultural dyads and intracultural dyads \( (F(1,114) = 6.14; p = .015) \). On average, intercultural dyads scored lower on IIS, with a mean of 85, than intracultural dyads, which had a mean of 91. The results for analysis on the individual level, however, presented no statistically significant differences for intercultural dyads and intracultural dyads \( (F(1,85) = 1.35; p = .25) \), although the numeric value showed a similar tendency with intercultural communicators scored lower \( (M = 88, \) in comparison to intracultural communicators' \( M = 91) \).

RQ2b asked to what extend, if any, the personality state of interaction involvement, at the time of interaction, had effect on the conversation performance, in terms of topic sharing and discourse explicitness. The multivariate analysis of covariance yielded significant main effects for discourse variables, including topic share rate, between the two dyad types (Wilks' lambda = .659, \( F(6,108) = 9.33, p = .000 \)). The effect of IIS on these dependent variables (multivariate within cells regression) did not reach significance level for differentiation of the two dyad types (Wilks' lambda = .943, \( F(6,108) = 1.08, p = .38 \)). On the other
hand, correlations between IIS scores and discourse variables plus TPSHR did not yield significant results for any of the variables.
Chapter VI
Discussion

The current study set out to investigate the way dyadic conversation partners accommodate to each other in an intercultural communication setting, in contrast to those in an intracultural setting. The focus was on topic management including topic change, topic sharing, topic agreement, discourse explicitness and participants' perception of such accommodation in conversation.

Although the hypotheses examined received mixed support, the main contention that intercultural and intracultural dyads accommodated differently in conversation was confirmed. Significant differences were found between the dyads types in the combination of information exchanged in the conversation, contributed by three (SE, UU, PI) of the five categories of discourse explicitness. Overall, intercultural dyads accommodated with less topic sharing and relatively more explicit information input than the intracultural dyads. They used significantly more SE and less UU. Similarly, Americans in A-I dyads also showed significant differences from those in A-A dyads in the combination of information exchanged in the conversation, as well as topic sharing and discourse explicitness. All these differences stood out in contrast to the finding that no dyad type effect was
present on the length of conversation. In addition, the dyad type effect on interaction involvement in this study was significant as it is. However, it was not enough to override the differences between dyads in discourse variables (explicitness and topic share rate).

Where there were no significant dyad type effects, there were unexpected findings: differences in topic changes were not significant between the dyad types; nor were differences in agreements on topic change points, which were low for both groups at about 40%. The two groups were not significantly different in their use of BN and TE categories of information in the conversation, while, contrary to the prediction, A-I used significantly more PI in their conversation. Besides, no significant differences were found between dyad types in participants' perception of accommodation in relation to topic change.

**Interpretation and Implications**

**Topic-related variables.** Intercultural dyads in the study did not make more topic changes, nor did they arrive at less agreements on topic change points as had been expected. While the mean values of the two variables presented differences in the predicted direction---A-I had higher mean for topic change and lower mean for topic agreement---such differences might be attributed to chance alone.

Given the present findings about topic change, it seems that A-I dyads covered roughly the same number of topics as did A-A
dyads. They did not appear to have much difficulties in finding something both parties could talk about. There are two competing explanations: the novelty of the situation and the commonality between the parties. The first points to the possibility that being strangers in two senses, A-I dyad participants had more to find out about each other culturally and personally, and thus had no lack of conversation topics, even for simple curiosity. The second possibility arises from the fact that both parties were students of a same university, which they didn't know but were quick to find out, and which provided them with common ground and thus topics of broad common interests. The first challenges the grounding of the hypothesis, while the second brings to attention an important methodological observation. The dispute may be settled by an examination of the information categories in the conversation, to be discussed in a later section. In passing, conceptually, a great increase in sample size might bring out the potentially significant differences in topic change frequency between the dyad types, which also remains to be seen.

The same cannot be said of the variable of topic change agreements, as the findings here are consistent with that of other studies in two ways. Cegala et al., (1991b) observe that low overall agreement rate for various dyad types, as well as no significant differences among dyad types, is characteristic of the conversations in their studies (Cegala et al., 1989; Cegala, Teboul, & Dewhurst, 1991). It appears to be true for this study as well, although the dyad types were based on dyads' relational history
in their research, and on interaction settings in this one. The agreement rate was low for both groups: 44% for A-A and 43% for A-I, which was not significantly different. The repeating results have added to our knowledge of intersubjectivity: conversation participants jointly cohere their utterances, at the same time individually perceive a different structure of topics in the conversation (Cegala et al., 1991b, p. 26). In other words, at the level of conversation topics, participants have discrepant mapping or structuring of the information in their conversation into topics. This holds regardless of the dyad type: the partner's cultural similarity is not a factor, just as interaction history is not, in the way people perceive their conversation structure.

With regards to topic sharing, significant differences of two dyad types have not only supported the research hypothesis, but also proved to be an important indicator. Topic share rate stood out to distinguish the two dyad types in all the multivariate analyses it was entered. It is a component variable of the discrimination function that separated the two dyad types. The analysis of covariance further showed that the significant differences between the dyad types in interaction involvement did not reduce the effect of dyad types on the topic sharing rate: A-I dyads still shared highly significantly less topics than A-A dyads. This indicated that communicators were able to handle the delicate balance between the conversational need for content contribution/development, and the need for message interpretation/comprehension, by differentiating the extent they
shared topics in conversation to accommodate each other. Participants in two groups employed different tactics for their topic development. Individuals in A-I dyads tended to somehow "monopoly" the topic more often, when the partner would be at the receiving end of information flow for a topic. In contrast, individuals in A-A dyads were more "liberal" with the topic, and both parties had relatively equal give-and-take in contributions to a topic. Thus, for a particular topic, an A-I dyad is more likely to develop it in an information inquiry/supply fashion, with one party doing most of the talking about something the other person is less knowledgeable; whereas an A-A dyad is more likely to develop it in an information exchange fashion, with parties alternating the talking role in a discussion about something both parties have some knowledge about.

An additional value of the result pertains to the concept of topic share, which is not new, but has never been clearly defined. The approach here suggests a new possibility to explore this phenomenon, and through it to better understand the phenomenon of conversation. One thing it has already helped in this study is to provide statistical evidence to the validity of the concept of common ground in study the process of communication qua conversation (c.f., Smith, 1981). Mutual contribution to a topic, which is seen as associated to someone (Vance, 1974; Yngve, 1970), is, in ordinary conversation, a way interaction partners associate with each other. With regards to communication accommodation at the level of conversation topics, to
accommodate in a positive way would amount to making efforts to share topics, which would not be the case when involving parties wish otherwise. A positive way here refers to a synchronizing interaction relationship. The finding about topic sharing points to a direction for future studies on intercultural communication in particular and communication accommodation in general.

**Discourse explicitness variables.** Some interesting findings were obtained in this study about the discourse explicitness in terms of information combination. As expected, the two dyad types showed marked differences in the combination of information they exchanged, as a whole, in conversation: communicators did accommodate in different ways in the intercultural vs intracultural settings, by using different combinations. A-I dyads covered higher rate of SE, TE and PI categories of information than A-A dyads did, while A-A dyads communicated more of UU and BN categories than A-I dyads. The differences stand out in contrast to the finding that no dyad type effect was found for the length of conversation: information combination has nothing to do with the length of the discourse that carries the information. A-A dyads and A-I dyads in the study spent exact amount of time (ten minutes) and covered about equal amount of information (around 900 words in average), yet the conversations they produced differed qualitatively content-wise. The exact nature of such differences is explicated in the following paragraphs.
Besides the information combination, the two dyad types further differ significantly in use of three of the five categories that contribute to the extent of information being presented with adequate explicitness. It had been hypothesized that intercultural dyads would use more explicit information, expressed by NP's of BN, SE and TE categories; while intracultural dyads would use NP's of UU and PI categories that assumed a certain degree of familiarity on part of the listener and thus less explicit. An examination of the means of all categories showed that, as predicted, A-I dyads used more SE (situationally evoked information), TE (textually evoked information), and less UU (Unused, presumably known information); yet unexpectedly, they also used more PI (Inferable information) and less BN (Brand new information).

To interpret, the study has shown that the conversation of the A-I dyad covered more about referents (SE) that were in the immediate situation, i.e., conversation partners, location of the event and things in the immediate environment; partners stuck relatively more to referents (TE) already brought up in the conversation; and they did not assume much of the other party, thus less information was treated as something familiar (UU). A-A dyads on the other hand covered less about referents (SE) in the conversation situation, relatively less about things brought up earlier (TE), and more was assumed of the other party, so that things/referents (UU) were brought up without explicit qualification or explanation. All this was expected of both dyad
types, in light of the different relationships between dyadic members. Parties in A-I dyads were strangers at the interpersonal level as well as at the (cultural) group level (Gudykunst, 1981). Thus, their mutual presence at that particular location becomes not only easy topics, but probably the only common ground they could both step on to start building a relationship of interaction partners, one that is both interpersonal and intergroup. To accommodate each other, A-I communicators made good use of this information source, of which they could count on the other's knowledge, to avoid misunderstanding or confusion. Entities already introduced into the conversation is a second information source that A-I communicators relied on in mutual accommodation to further develop their conversation in a smooth way. The parties being strangers at two levels left them little room to reasonably assume much of each other. To accommodate, few references to new information were made in such a manner, as if the listener was able to locate the actual referents. All this was not necessary for A-A dyads, accordingly, they accommodated by a reversed usage: they covered less about each other, less about things brought up earlier, and more frequently, presumably familiar topics were introduced.

On the other hand, instead of covering more as hypothesized, A-I dyads touched less of Brand New referents that were introduced into conversation for the first time, while A-A dyads introduced more frequently such referents. When this unexpected, seemingly contradicting finding about use of Brand
New is laid out in light of the two relationship levels, it becomes clear that the result was not so surprising after all. In contrast to A-I members, A-A members were strangers at the interpersonal level but not at the (cultural) group level. Having a common cultural background to fall back on, A-A dyads were able to build a relationship of interaction partners, solely of an interpersonal type. To accommodate, they need to exchange information that was new to the other to establish the interpersonal common ground. A similar practice would be more difficult for A-I dyads, as interpersonally new information may very well be "culture-sensitive" and thus not as explicit as it sounds. For example, "an Alpha Psi" in "She is dating an Alpha Psi" may be a piece of Brand New information to an American, but it would sound more like a piece of Unused information to a person of another culture, and belong to the category not explicit to be used often in A-I dyads. Thus, the finding about BN information also provides support for the assumption that dyads being studied would tend to accommodate for successful communication, and that dyad types would affect the ways communicators accommodate.

In my view, the hypothesis (H4) A-I dyads' conversation would exhibit higher degree of discourse explicitness, is supported, but the measurement of explicitness has to be somehow adjusted. This will be discussed later.

With regards to Inferable information, the finding is more puzzling. One plausible explanation may be from the content type, which is either concrete or abstract. It has been suggested
that a discourse of abstract content is often more implicit than one of concrete content. This is only natural as abstract discourse usually deals with relationships among elements of various natures, while the knowledge of elements involved is presupposed. On the other hand, the higher level of abstraction offers a better chance to find common ground, as it is more inclusive. It might be the case that A-I dyads, in search of common ground, are likely, more than A-A dyads, to bring in abstract topics. Put it another way, A-A dyads might tend to talk about particular instances (e.g., I have a friend who...), which involves a lot of details and particular references. A-I dyads, on the other hand, might tend to talk about general circumstances of some kind (e.g., Taiwan education system), which involves a whole set of logically related general concepts. Thus, A-I dyads were able, at least in part, to get around the problem of lacking common ground, and conversed with relative mutual familiarity on more general topics, comfortably bring in logically inferable information. This is only speculation based on general subjective impression of the data, and has to be verified with a qualitative examination of the actual conversation content. As a hindsight, it is consistent with the principle of the Social Penetration Theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973).

In any event, the study shows that these communicators did systematically accommodate in different ways with regard to the things they chose to talk about. In the follow-up discrimination analyses, the three discourse explicitness categories (SE, UU, PI)
plus topic sharing rate were shown to have accounted for 36% of the variance between the dyad types, while 75% of the dyads were correctly reclassified into two dyad types based on their discriminant scores. The multivariate analysis of covariance provide further support to show that the significant differences between the dyad types in interaction involvement did not reduce the effect of dyad types on the discourse explicitness: within cells regression with IIS scores and discourse variables (explicitness and topic share rate) failed to present significant difference between the dyad types; the two dyad types were still highly significantly different.

The minor importance of the effect of interaction involvement on participants' performance in this study, is also seen in the findings that the coefficients of correlations between IIS scores and discourse variables plus topic share rate did not reach significance. Thus, independently, IIS scores did not correlate with discourse variables in a meaningful way, and was not a good predictor for variations of these variables. On the other hand, dyad type effects on Interaction Involvement scores turned out less significant than they first appeared, as the low scores for intercultural dyads were contributed mainly by the international partner of the dyad. Once they were removed, the mean IIS scores of individuals in A-I dyads increased from 85 to 88, while the differences between Americans in the two dyad types did not reach significance. Considering the fact that the Asian participants were conversing in a non-native language, and
to partners of other than their own culture, it is hard to expect them to be able to be highly involved, even if they intended to do so.

One objective of this study is to confirm different accommodation efforts between dyad types at the level of individual performance. As predicted, in the discourse explicitness of their share of the conversation, American communicators in A-I dyads did show significant differences from individuals in A-A dyads. While the results were very similar to those in the dyadic analysis, the theory of communication accommodation is once again verified, that communicators behave differently to accommodate different partners. Americans in this study were shown to have attended to their international partners' unique characteristics, and accommodated with a different combination of information from that of their counterparts in A-A dyads. Overall, they were more explicit when talking as a party in an A-I dyad, using more SE, TE and less UU, than when they were part of an A-A dyad. The ability of individuals to accommodate and to adapt in different communication settings also received empirical supports from this study.

Participants' perception of the conversation. Another objective of the study is to investigate to what extend, if any, participants of two dyad type may differ in their perceptions about the conversation in terms of topic-related communication accommodation. In that regard, there appears to have no general
difference between dyad types. Although the numeric value showed a tendency of A-I dyads to have a higher rate of non-accommodation perception and a lower rate of accommodation perception than the A-A dyads, both groups had much higher accommodation perception than non-accommodation perception, roughly in a six to one ratio. Both A-I dyads and A-A dyads felt the majority of topic changes in their conversation were accommodation topic shifts. Put it another way, participants of both dyad types perceived their conversation as outcome of accommodation in so far as topic change was concerned.

One is tempted to interpret this lack of difference as evidence of the successful communication accommodation: because of the accommodative efforts and performance, communicators in two dyad types feel equally about the conversation they each engaged in; no real differences exist between their subjective experiences about accommodative topic change. However, caution is highly recommended here, as it is a very complicated issue. The findings here offered only a preliminary, general rough picture with regards to the participants' perception. Rather than jumping to premature conclusions, future work are greatly needed to investigate the difference between participants evaluation of accommodation efforts in different dyad types, another part of accommodation theory not under discussion here.

More importantly, this finding about the participants' topic-related perception about the conversation endorsed the utility of
looking at topic change as means of communication accommodation. The relationship of topic change to communication accommodation is firmly established, as there would have had a overwhelming negative perception about topic change and accommodation, should participants have felt it was irrelevant.

Implications for Communication Accommodation Theory. In general, the major contention of the CAT was supported in part, that communicators will attend to communication partners' interaction-related characteristics—productive performance, interpretation competence, conversational needs of content, manner and style, and mutual role relations—and select from a range of accommodation strategies—approximation, interpretability, discourse management, interpersonal control—in line with the orientation they adopt towards the partner, so as to accomplish particular interactional goal(s) (Coupland et al., 1988; Giles et al., 1987). More specifically, the study has shown that, in a situation where communicators were motivated to gain social approval and desired clarity in communication, they were sensitive to the partner's conversational needs for content, as well as their needs for message interpretation and comprehension, and accommodated accordingly and respectively.

Another implication of this study for the CAT is that the results provided first direct empirical supports to its founding assumption that accommodation in interaction is not limited to speech variations, but occurs in all aspects of communication.
Some of those aspects specified in CAT were tested in the study through specific feature (e.g., information explicitness, topic change and topic sharing) at the discourse level, and proved to be viable. Similarly, other investigations can be carried out on the remaining untested aspects, so as to provide a relative complete picture of communication accommodation. Moreover, the operationalization employed in the study of the communication accommodation strategies into particular discourse features has profound methodological implications. Although still at the infant stage in need of further development, the approach here has unmistakably suggested some practical solutions to bridge the gap between theory and theory verification for CAT. This can be considered as a breakthrough in the development of the theory, as it has admittedly been a very difficult undertaking (Gallois and Giles, 1991)3.

Lastly, participants' perceptions of topic related variables (topic change, topic sharing) to account for accommodative behaviours in communication in this study, continued to testify to the possibility of incorporating an alternative to the researcher's perspective in general scientific inquiries, following Cegala and associates (Cegala et al., 1989; Cegala, Teboul, & Dewhurst, 1991; Cegala et al., 1991b). Communication processes as experienced by participants would certainly enrich CAT as a theory that takes into serious account internal processes such as motivations and interactional goals.
Implications for intercultural communication studies.

Implications of this study for intercultural communication research are manifold. An overwhelming majority of work on intercultural communication are done on data collected in survey questionnaire or some simulated methods, which rely heavily on respondents subjective perception and their memory. While survey and simulated studies have undeniable values, the dominance of a single method or two leaves something to be desired in the scientific inquiry of intercultural communication. Being one of the very few existing studies on intercultural communications that involved "real" interactions between persons of different cultural upbringing, the findings here provided strong evidence with relatively high validity. The findings reflected what intercultural communicators actually did, and not what they said they did and/or what they thought they would do in that kind of setting.

Findings in this study about communicator accommodation in various aspects first empirically confirmed the idiosyncrasy of intercultural communication, as was shown in the discourse quality of A-I dyads' conversation with a different information combination than A-A dyads' conversations. The idiosyncrasy, however, does not categorically differentiate intercultural communication from intracultural communication; instances of both were subject to identical analyses, and yielded meaningful results. Cultural differences were shown to indeed bring along
unique difficulties to interpersonal interaction, such as the lacking common ground and the impaired comprehension.

Also shown were the fact that such difficulties were not insurmountable: communicators were able to make good use of the relatively little commonality they shared and accommodated for a smooth and successful interaction, although it was far from effortless. Followed from the above, the role of adaptability in intercultural communication was highlighted. It is not too far a fetch to relate adaptability to competence in intercultural communication, although communicators' judgment about such adaptation remain to be evaluated. Communicators were able and did adapt themselves in conversation performance, when they encountered a partner from another culture. What's more, their adaptation were partly captured by a set of suggested concrete ways to study it.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

One obvious limitation of this study is that the data are from a laboratory setting with students as sample. This restricted the generalizability of findings here. For instance, being strangers to each other, the dyad type effect on participants might be different than if participants had been friends or even acquaintances, where cultural differences had been specified as less salient the better interaction partners know each other (Gudykunst, 1981; Gudykunst et al., 1987). However, as a first attempt to investigate an unvisited area, a lab experiment has its values. It helps us to
select and to aim at potentially important targets, and it is pertinent to a particular type of social interaction: initial interaction of a solely social relational type. In passing, this type of interaction is not unusual, or rare, in reality. There is no lack of common examples like tourists, international trade business personnel, exchanged students/scholars, short-term international volunteers of various types, international observers. The list goes on. Notwithstanding, further efforts are definitely needed to extend research, whenever possible, to real world occurrences, or at least to a larger and more representative population. More specifically, a related limitation is that this study is rather restricted in scope, involving only a simple scenario. A lot of important variables were not looked into, such as power relationships, status differences, personal identity and motivations. While the approach is justifiable as a first attempt, it is important to recognize the limitation, and systematically include different aspects in future studies.

One thing worth mentioning is the possible effect of lab setting on participants that might subtract the validity of the results. This is a legitimate concern that had been attended to. The exit questionnaire was designed to address this potential problem. First of all, background information about the participants with regards to their intercultural interaction experience gives one reason to be confident of the conversations in study as typical of ordinary intercultural interactions. Secondly, participants responses to the setting and procedure of
the study indicated that the majority of them did not feel bothered, but perceived their interaction as close enough to their natural behaviours.

A third point is participants' report about topic change. One third of them felt the need to change the topic in order to keep the conversation going. This is a point that unmistakably reflects the artificial nature of the study. In natural social encounters people usually have little obligation to keep on talking if they don't want to; they can always opt to take off. This, however, is an difficult option for a study participant: they have the unwritten obligation to talk in usual circumstances. On the other hand, there is no lack of instances in real life, where people have to maintain a conversation for one reason or another, whether they like to do it or not. Some such instances are work-related situations where the job/professional obligations have priority over personal liking, e.g., nurse, salesman, educator and diplomat. With this in mind, future research of this kind would best serve our purpose, if done to investigate interactions, where participants are obligated to keep the conversation alive.

Another relevant point is that, being students of the same school somehow "contaminated" the condition of intercultural setting, as participants shared the membership of a subgroup: the university community, which to some extent disqualified the interaction from a "truly" intercultural one. Here again, we have a real problem that cannot be solved so far. However, the same argument in the last paragraph applies here too. In real life, there
are many instances where people of different cultural groups interacting, who also share, to various extent, a variety of other cultural subgroup memberships. In fact, the ubiquity of social group is such that social psychologist Tajfel (1978) once observed that the concept of purely interpersonal communication is "absurd", as no instances of it can be found (quoted in Gudykunst, 1981, p.4). By the same token, it is actually difficult to find instances of communicators not sharing any group-membership. The important thing then is to have an adequate knowledge as to what the shared membership is, and to what extent it is shared.

One also should be aware of the fact that study here on intercultural communication is from an American perspective, with Americans as the major target of investigation and English as the medium used. It will be illuminating to duplicate the study in an reversed manner, from a perspective of non-American communicators, and using a language other than English. Also relevant is that the investigation could have included another control group of intracultural communication setting, with I-I dyads consisting of two non-Americans. These are issues worth pursing further in future studies.

A reexamination of the relationships between interaction involvement and topic share rate reveals the mistake of putting the variable of topic share rate into a correlational analysis with interaction involvement. Past research indicates that minimally involved people are less certain about the flow of the conversation, more likely to loose a grip of the topic at hand and
change abruptly to another one (Kellerman & Roloff, 1983; Villaume & Cegala, 1988). This association provides an alternative point of vantage to look at the phenomenon of topic-sharing. From the above, it is reasonable to infer the presence of a high level of mutual involvement, when both parties in interaction show considerable interest in a topic. In other words, if, in a conversation, the participants engaged in topic-sharing most of the time, it is an indication that they have accommodated to each other well and had relatively high involvement. However, this is not a symmetric relationship: when people engage in relatively less topic sharing, as the case with intercultural interaction, the opposite does not necessarily hold. One cannot logically conclude that the parties are less involved. Thus, this is one area that needs reconsideration.

Finally, two points about the concept of discourse explicitness and its measurement. First, as discussed earlier, the concept appears only partly reflecting the picture of people's accommodation in terms of types of information exchange. The two categories, Brand New and Inferable, also need to be reconsidered taking into account the two dimensional nature of intercultural interaction: interpersonal and intercultural. The new conceptualization should be capable of capturing the difference at both levels. The other point is relevant to the issue of generalizability: always be cautious in utilization of the categories. One should be aware of the type of conversations to be analyzed
with these categories; what the similarities and differences are to the ones studied here.
Notes

1. It should be noted that cultural differences in various dimensions (e.g., high vs low context; individualism vs collectivism) are overall comparative generalizations. They indicate general cultural tendencies and do not preclude variabilities within a culture. Thus, for example, members of a high context culture are more likely to exhibit high context behaviours than members of a low context culture, but not absolutely so. Each and every individual member at all times may not all behave that way.

2. The term "Dyad type" is used in this study to refer to dyads in either of the communication settings: intra- vs. inter-cultural interaction. Strictly, it is not quite an accurate term for the reference it represents, yet, as it would not cause confusion here, it is adopted for the sake of convenience. After all, it is dyads that is being studied.

3. Personal communications with Cynthia Gallois and Howard Giles.

4. This is a fundamental issue involving the very concept of culture or social group, its definition and utility, which is far beyond the scope and purpose of this study (for references, see e.g., Bidney, 1962; Geertz, 1973 and many others).
Appendix A

Interaction Involvement Scale
**Interaction Involvement Scale**

Respond to each statement below by indicating the extent to which it describes you during the conversation you just had.

1. I was keenly aware of how my conversation partner perceived me.
   - Not at all
   - Not Like
   - Somewhat Not sure
   - Somewhat Like
   - Very much like me
   - me unlike me
   - like me
   - me like me

2. My mind wanders during the conversation and I missed parts of what was said.
   - Not at all
   - Not Like
   - Somewhat Not sure
   - Somewhat Like
   - Very much like me
   - me unlike me
   - like me
   - me like me

3. Sometimes during the conversation I wasn't sure what to say, I couldn't find the appropriate lines.
   - Not at all
   - Not Like
   - Somewhat Not sure
   - Somewhat Like
   - Very much like me
   - me unlike me
   - like me
   - me like me

4. I carefully observed how my partners responded to me when I talked.
   - Not at all
   - Not Like
   - Somewhat Not sure
   - Somewhat Like
   - Very much like me
   - me unlike me
   - like me
   - me like me

5. I listened carefully to what my partner said.
   - Not at all
   - Not Like
   - Somewhat Not sure
   - Somewhat Like
   - Very much like me
   - me unlike me
   - like me
   - me like me

6. Sometimes during the conversation I wasn't sure what I was expected to say.
   - Not at all
   - Not Like
   - Somewhat Not sure
   - Somewhat Like
   - Very much like me
   - me unlike me
   - like me
   - me like me

7. Sometimes I pretended to be listening, when in fact I was thinking of something else.
   - Not at all
   - Not Like
   - Somewhat Not sure
   - Somewhat Like
   - Very much like me
   - me unlike me
   - like me
   - me like me
8. Sometimes during the conversation, I felt like I knew what to say, but I just didn't respond.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me

9. I was very responsive to my partner's conversational goals.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me

10. During the conversation, I carefully observed how my partner responded to me.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me

11. I felt withdrawn and distant during the conversation.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me

12. Sometimes in the conversation, I wasn't sure what others' needs were (e.g., a compliment, reassurance, etc.) until it was too late to respond appropriately.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me

13. During the conversation I really knew what was going on, I was sure of what to say and do.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me

14. I was preoccupied during the conversation and did not pay complete attention to my partner.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me

15. I felt sort of "unplugged" during the conversation, I was uncertain of my role, others' motives, and what was happening.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much
like me me unlike me like me me like me
16. Sometimes I did not accurately perceive my partner's intentions or motivations.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much like me me unlike me like me me like me

17. I was very perceptive to the meaning of my partner's behavior in relation to myself and the situation.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much like me me unlike me like me me like me

18. Sometimes during the conversation I was not sure how I was expected to respond.

Not at all Not Like Somewhat Not sure Somewhat Like Very much like me me unlike me like me me like me
Appendix B

Exit Questionnaire
Exit Questionnaire*

Please answer the following questions.

1. How long have you been in the U.S. altogether? ___________ years ______ months.

2. How old were you when you first came to the U.S.? I was ______ year-old.

3. What is the language you speak at home? I speak _____________ at home.

4. If English is not your first language, when did you start learning English? It was 19______.

5. Did you often speak English before you came to the U.S.? __Yes, or ___No. If "Yes", how often? (check one) _____Once every week, or ___ once every other week, or _____once every month, or ___once every other month.

6. How long have you been speaking English? ___years ___months

7. Did you personally know any Americans before you came to the U.S.? __Yes, or ___No. If "yes", how many? There were (about) ___.

8. How many American/East-Asians do you know whom you have seen and talked to fairly often (at least once a month)? There are ______ (roughly, include both friends and nonfriends, both the past and present)

9. How many American/East-Asian friends do you have whom you know fairly well? There are _____________.

10. In general, the conversation you just had, is it similar to "real" informal conversations you have had with Americans/East-Asians? ___Yes, or ___No

11. The conversation was artificial due to the laboratory setting.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Not Sure  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

* Americans in A-A dyads responded to items 10-20; Americans in A-I dyads responded to items 8-20; international participants responded to all items.
12. I found myself changing topics just to keep the conversation going.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

13. I was distracted by the setting of the conversation.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

14. I felt comfortable (as opposed to nervous) during the conversation.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

15. Given the type of conversation (i.e., with a stranger), this was typical of the way I interact.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

16. I found the playback procedure to be interesting.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

17. I thought the playback procedure took too long.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

18. I was able to identify points of topic change accurately during the playback procedure.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

19. Overall, I enjoyed the conversation and felt that it went rather smoothly.

Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly

20. Please feel free to comment about anything regarding the procedures used in this study or any other aspect of it.
Appendix C

Response Sheet for the Play-back
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Who Changed?</th>
<th>Accommodation Change?</th>
<th>In what way(s) was the topic change ACCOMMODATING?</th>
<th>In what way(s) was the topic change NOT ACCOMMODATING?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Please be specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The topic was accommodating because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The topic was accommodating because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The topic was accommodating because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The topic was accommodating because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The topic was accommodating because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The topic was accommodating because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The topic was accommodating because</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Tables
Table 1.

Frequency analysis of Exit Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(N=132)</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SDA</th>
<th>MISS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/%</td>
<td>N/%</td>
<td>N/%</td>
<td>N/%</td>
<td>N/%</td>
<td>N/%</td>
<td>N/%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conversation was artificial due to the laboratory setting.</td>
<td>5/3.8</td>
<td>30/22.7</td>
<td>21/25.9</td>
<td>58/43.9</td>
<td>18/13.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found myself changing topics to keep the conversation going.</td>
<td>16/12.5</td>
<td>75/56.8</td>
<td>14/10.6</td>
<td>21/15.9</td>
<td>6/4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was distracted by the setting of the conversation.</td>
<td>1/1.8</td>
<td>16/12.1</td>
<td>17/12.9</td>
<td>82/62.1</td>
<td>14/10.6</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt comfortable during conversation.</td>
<td>20/15.7</td>
<td>70/53</td>
<td>10/7.6</td>
<td>27/20.8</td>
<td>3/2.3</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the type of conversation, this was typical of the way I interact.</td>
<td>7/5.3</td>
<td>93/70.5</td>
<td>11/8.3</td>
<td>15/11.4</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found the playback procedure interesting.</td>
<td>22/25</td>
<td>82/62.1</td>
<td>8/6.1</td>
<td>6/4.5</td>
<td>1/0.8</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought the playback procedure too long.</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td>18/13.6</td>
<td>23/17.4</td>
<td>79/59.8</td>
<td>6.1/6.2</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to identify topic change accurately for the playback.</td>
<td>9/6.8</td>
<td>57/43.2</td>
<td>49/37.1</td>
<td>13/9.8</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I enjoyed the conversation and felt that it went smoothly.</td>
<td>27/20.5</td>
<td>82/62.1</td>
<td>13/9.8</td>
<td>7/5.3</td>
<td>1/0.8</td>
<td>2/1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA=strongly agree  A=agree  NS=not sure  DA=strongly disagree  SDA=strongly agree  MISS=missing
## Table 2.
Means of Information Categories for Text Explicitness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad Types</th>
<th>Infor. Categ.</th>
<th>A-I</th>
<th>A-A</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.47***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < .001$

*** $P < .05$
### Table 3.
**Means of Variables Related to Conversation Topic Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dyad Types</th>
<th>A-I</th>
<th>A-A</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>797.3</td>
<td>881.3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Share Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>8.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>770.4</td>
<td>881.3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Share Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>5.40**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P < .005**
Table 4.
Summary of the Discriminant Analysis for Topic Sharing Rate and Three Information Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.
Structure Coefficients Between Discriminant Function and Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>0.59822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>-0.54495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPSHR</td>
<td>0.36046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-0.17210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.  
$t$-Tests on Means of Accommodation and Non-Accommodation Topic Changes between Dayd Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dyad Types</th>
<th>A-I</th>
<th>A-A</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAOC</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCR</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACCR</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAOC</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCR</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACCR</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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