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ENHANCING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION:
A LANGUETIC MODEL

V. Lynn Tyler

While visiting in the Middle East, an American was invited to dinner at the home of an Arabic friend. As he was leaving, he made a special effort to thank the host and hostess for their hospitality and generosity. But as he talked with them, he realized that his sincere compliments had been misunderstood.

* * * * *

An American supervising a project in the Orient was partially responsible for some real errors made. He called a meeting to discuss the problems and to justify his actions. He wanted to explain how anyone in a similar type situation could have made such a mistake, and hoped to imply that he should not be blamed and asked for suggestions as a follow up. But, during the presentation, he sensed that something he was trying to communicate was unacceptable.

* * * * *

It was an international "let your hair down" type of social -- relaxed. As three or four Americans loaded up on cream and sugar, words were said by the hosts that seemed to offend almost everyone present.

* * * * *

What happened in each of these situations? Ineffectual information? Erroneous motivation?

Many people anticipating an experience, interacting with someone of another culture, expect some challenges in communicating, especially when languages and cultures are very distinct. Unfortunately, many mistakenly assume that problems stem from language differences alone, and that usually they can be resolved by appropriate language training or some type of language-based explanation.

Actually, verbal communication comprises only a portion of the total message that is conveyed, fed back, and reacted to. In the cases reviewed above, the English language might have been used, but without misunderstanding. The situations described all involve a broad spectrum of "communicative indicators." Nonverbal signals (gestures, assumptions, and actual situations, for example) often surround and greatly influence normal language expressions.
To communicate effectively in or with varied cultural constraints, one must take into consideration many factors which often have been overlooked by people whose life experiences differ widely in time, space, and medium of communication.

The intercultural communicator should try to discover pertinent differences and similarities regarding expectations, assumptions, values, and behavior unique to different peoples and should become familiar with factors and conditions which may either inhibit or enhance culturally loaded messages. Such a communicator is most effective when using specific cues to communication which are affected by contextual and environmental factors influencing its participants.

In every intercultural communication context, certain information and motivation 'gaps' must be bridged if communication is to reach its highest potential. These gaps may inhibit messages if they are in the form of "MIS-CUES" (which may be defined as communicative elements that are in some real way—even if assumed to be—offensive, provocative or intolerable), or "MISSED-CUES" (which are unclear, have varied meanings, are meaningless in certain contexts, or are simply "too different"). Mis-cues lead to miscommunication, while missed-cues result in non-communication.

The term "LANGUETICS," has been coined recently to mark the comprehensive study of essential verbal, nonverbal, para-verbal, and other indicators of language-based communication. "Languetics," as a holistic term, comprehends more than linguistics (the scientific study of verbal language: written or spoken), or communication (studies of audiences, modes, and media—for focused purposes), or ethno-behavioral sciences (which study mental, emotional, and physical behavior based on cultural or other influences), as these deal with communication systems and their results. "Languetics" encompasses all essential LANGUAGE MARKERS (or their notable absence) and their CULTURAL INDICATORS, or other elements and influences on or from language—as these are significant in an intercultural setting.

Culture Grammars for specific cultures and Intercultural Grammars are currently being developed to identify "cultural variants," and to help bridge the barriers to intercultural communication that are created by these variants. These Culture and Intercultural Grammars are more than just explanations of syntactic rules of a given language or syntactic differences among the languages of different cultures. They include the essential "languemes" of the culture involved. In other words, they include information about denotative, connotative, referential, idiomatic meanings of important lexical terms, as well as information about nonverbal cues that are essential to communication.
To increase communication efficiency, they are being compiled in thesaurus fashion and will include guidelines for most effective use. The guidelines will include an explanation of how the languetic model introduced in this paper can be used to facilitate the development of actual message components and how it can be used in locating relevant concerns found in Intercultural Grammars.

In order to develop useful Intercultural Grammars, a readily retrievable and practical system of data availability is essential for detecting and then effectively utilizing the pertinent required information. This must include:

1. Data required for the receptor (receiver) of the message, but which is not present in the situation or in the message per se. (That is, it is "between the lines.""
2. Data that is ambiguous for either the originator or receptor of the message.
3. Data that is implied but which must be made explicit in a new cultural context.
4. Data which is already explicit but which may need distinct treatment, because it may be offensive or otherwise potentially not acceptable within a new cultural perspective.

The languetic model of intercultural communication now to be considered is aimed at identifying and defining the basic and essential components and factors involved in intercultural communicative encounters. From numerous attempts of the Brigham Young University Language and Intercultural Research Center to identify systems useful in bridging gaps in intercultural communications, the following six factors have emerged as paramount aspects where communication either succeeds best or consistently breaks down: (1) culture, (2) language, (3) interaction, (4) communication, (5) context, (6) environment. Each of these factors has been divided into several interrelated categories and components to represent the conceivably infinite number of divisions that could be made. These categories are the horizontal headings in Figure 1. An extension of these categories and a partial listing of possible components under each of these categories is provided in Appendix A at the end of this paper. An extensive familiarity with relevant components is necessary before this model can be used consistently by different translators--otherwise potential mis-cues would be analyzed in different boxes by different users. See Figure 1.
In "languetics" analysis each significant factor and component can be demonstrated as influencing or being influenced by messages as these confront cultural barriers. Intercultural communication involves much more than explicit definitions from 'culture,' which may have already been delineated acceptably for many anthropologists, sociologists, linguists, and others. The explicit (surface of 'plain') meaning of a message may be translated acceptably in many cases, but the cultural communicative mode and/or context of the message situation may affect the implicit (deeper, usually hidden--except to culture-participants) meaning(s) of that message.
The Languetics Model of Intercultural Communication serves as a framework into which relevant data can be organized and analyzed. In such a seemingly complex system, data can often be considered interrelated in several of the model categories. It is intended that the model account for such interrelationships and make them manageable. It would be unrealistic to isolate all the details of the factors, components, and their configurations and permutations—as these would constitute the "whole" of any given set of intercultural communications. Only the details that really make a significant difference to a successful intercultural interaction need to be isolated and dealt with. The categories included in Figure 1 may be critical areas where model is used more extensively, new communicative indicators may emerge and some of the present categories may be combined or redefined.

How can the model be used? A somewhat exaggerated example will be examined that is described in Andreas Fuglesang's text, Applied Communication in Developing Countries. (Sweden: Dan Hammarskjold Foundation, 1973). The example was chosen because it has elements from more categories than are usually encountered in a single message and can illustrate the use of all six factors of the model.

Some sanitation experts went to a Zambian village to lecture on the harmful effects of the tsetse fly. The lecturers, from an English-speaking country, could not speak the native language of the villagers. Interpreters were used. Intending to make the presentation more visual and impressive, the lecturers brought a large model of a tsetse fly. They were using an instructional technique which their own culture considered to be perfectly appropriate. For the Zambian villagers, however, the use of a large-scale model was completely foreign to their culture, and the meaning of the message was unacceptable, or lost. The villagers' reaction was, "It may be true what you say about this... but it cannot concern us, because the flies are not so big in our place."

Interpretation of the message from English into Zambian may also have caused some real problems, since many scientific or technical terms used by the sanitation experts do not exist in the Zambian language. The interpreters themselves may have been unfamiliar with the terms and approach used by the specialists, with the result that much of the message was either misinterpreted to their audience, or not interpreted at all.

From the brief summary of Fuglesang's account presented above and from further information that was included in his text, the message intended to be expressed by the English-speaking sanitation experts can be reconstructed under each
of the six main factors of our model, as can the message perceived by the Zambian villagers. These messages have been included in the appropriate boxes of the message column in Figure 2.

**Figure 2**

**INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE INDICATORS MODEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE EXPRESSED:</th>
<th>(FEEDBACK)</th>
<th>ONGOING...</th>
<th>MESSAGE PERCEIVED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease is spread by germs carried by insects and other animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are here to teach you the harmful effects of the tsetse fly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are helpers (guiding lights) to this primitive group of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to make the presentation more impressive to this primitive people by using a large and impressive model of the tsetse fly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTEXT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are helping many primitive peoples all over the world to improve their standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The specialists insisted that the lecture be held in a village but to avoid exposure to the tsetse fly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparing the messages expressed with the messages perceived, a fairly good idea of the categories under each factor that contributed to the miscommunication can be diagnosed. Each factor will now be considered one by one to explain the reasoning one might use to diagnose the problem areas.
In looking at the two messages for the culture factor, the main problem seems to be a disparity in the knowledge structure of the two cultures involved. The concept of disease being spread by germ-carrying insects and animals is present in the sanitation experts' knowledge store, but is not present in the knowledge store of the Zambian villagers. Auspiciously, this is the reason why the sanitation experts came to Zambia in the first place: to teach the Zambian villagers the concept of disease-causing germs and how the dangers produced by them can be eliminated or reduced. An X has been placed in the culture box under the category of education and knowledge simply to show that there was a problem in the communication related to this category. (How extensive the problem was and for whom is another consideration to be made, of course).

The message under the language factor is simply the verbal message that the sanitation experts attempted to convey. The message is straightforward enough, yet it was still misperceived by the Zambian villagers. There could well have been a strong nonverbal component to the communication which prevented the verbal message from getting through, therefore an X has been placed in the box under this category. Once we get to the communication factor, it will be found that the biggest problem was likely due to the art form used. There may have also been a problem with jargon the experts used which was not understood by the interpreters—the message in a sense was coded, and this code needed to be broken before the message could be accurately represented by the interpreters. Therefore, an X has also been placed in the box under the category coded.

Considering the interaction factor, it is obvious that the sanitation experts perceive themselves as being more educated (status) than the villagers and see themselves in the role of teachers to "villagers." They may even perceive themselves as being saviors to a primitive and backward people. They have come because of a strong sense of obligation to these "backward villagers." They are possibly there because of an empathy they feel for less privileged peoples, but there is likely a condescending attitude as well. On the other hand, the villagers perceive the visitors in the role of intruders with no real tribal status, but out of a sense of obligation to visitors, they are listening good humoredly, trying not to show their frustration at a condescending attitude from their strange visitors. X's have been placed in the status, role, obligation, and attitude boxes because of the respective differences apparent in the two messages under each of these categories. (Recall that depth and scope of each difference still is to be weighed as to relevance and effect.)
Turning to the communication factor, what is apparently one very crucial cause of the miscommunication is found: the art form. The large and impressive model of the tsetse fly, which was intended as a visual aid to clarify the meaning of the message, has been perceived by the villagers as a full scale model of supposed American (or British) tsetse flies. An X has been placed in the interpersonal box, as well as the art form box, to indicate that the reason for creating such a large model may have been because the communication was intended to be for a group of people. A life size tsetse fly could not effectively be seen by all.

The past memories category under the context factor undoubtedly reinforced the empathetic attitude and savior role of the sanitation experts in their own minds while at the same time reinforcing the condescending attitude and intruder role possibly perceived by the villagers.

Looking at the environment factor, the hotness of the weather and the stuffiness and smallness of the village hut (the locale for the meeting) undoubtedly added to the frustration felt by all present at the meeting, but probably wasn't enough, taken alone, to produce the miscommunication.

The number at the top of some of the boxes indicates a relative priority of attention that could be given to correcting the problem in each of the categories to achieve the elimination of the miscommunication: the lower the number the higher the priority for correction. In other words, the plan of attacking the problems would proceed from 1 to 2 to 3, and so forth.

Although there was likely a problem element present in all of the categories marked with an X, the element from some of the categories may not have been disruptive enough taken alone to cause the miscommunication or may have been related to an element from another category in such a way that elimination of the one problem could eliminate the other as well.

For example, using a more appropriate locally acceptable art form, or making it clear—in cultural terms—that the model was much larger than real life, might allow the verbal message to make it through the "nonverbal noise" created by the incorrectly perceived visual aid. This in turn might allow the concept to take hold among the Zambian villagers that there is a danger present in tsetse flies from their disease-carrying germs. Therefore, the villagers would be more likely to perceive the sanitation experts in the role of teachers, having some status, unlike earlier visitors to their country. Correspondingly, their attitudes toward the visitors might change for the better and their sense of obligation to accept and use new knowledge might be enhanced.
The above problem appears on the surface to have been primarily the result of an ambiguous or unclear message. However, it might just as well have been the result of an offensive message: the villagers might have been insulted by the use of a "childish" visual aid. Then the solution would have been quite different: an appropriate culturally rendered apology might have been in order, as well as an explanation—in local terms—that such visual aids are not demeaning in the culture of the sanitation experts. Whether the problem element was Ambiguous or Offensive or both is indicated in the figure by placing an A or an O at the bottom of each relevant category box. (A = Missed-Cues while O = Mis-Cue. See p. ** preceding).

The example of the miscommunication in Zambia has attempted to illustrate how the model can be used to pinpoint the areas of variation between an expressed message and the message as it is perceived and/or fed back by a target audience. However, pinpointing the components of the message where the communication problem may lie is only a beginning step toward the goal of successful communication.

Though the model may be able to indicate where the problem lies, it has not indicated how to solve the problem. Much study and research needs to be done concerning the problem categories laid down in the languetic model. It is this research and study that will generate the information and motivation that are needed to solve intercultural communication problems. It is too time consuming and costly—and possibly otherwise infeasible—to study and research a problem area each time a specific problem is encountered. Therefore, all such information that is gathered must be brought together in a form that will be readily available to anyone else who encounters a very similar problem.

Likely the most useful way to store such information would be in a bicultural communication diagnostic lexicon of potential problem/solution categories for use when translating in either direction from one language/culture to any number of other language/cultures. Such lexicons could be incorporated into Multicultural Grammars and could conceivably be stored in a computer system which would make possible ready access to an appropriate solution of a potential problem.

The model we have been considering has two main uses with regard to such Intercultural Grammars and their related communication diagnostic lexicons: (1) as a tool in generating the lexicons, and (2) as a retrieval mechanism for locating—as in a thesaurus—the pertinent information in an Intercultural Grammar needed to produce a culturally appropriate message.
As a generating tool, the model can be used as illustrated in the example above to locate the categories responsible for ineffective communication by analyzing the disparities between expressed and perceived messages that are already available or that require analysis as ineffective cross-cultural encounters take place. The model can point out the areas where cultural differences in manners of expression are most likely to occur and can direct descriptive researchers to study in depth those areas that are most likely to produce profitable entries for specific Intercultural Grammars. The usefulness of the model in this respect may be analogous to the usefulness of sonar by the geologist to detect the areas beneath the earth's surface where it is most profitable to drill for oil. The ophthalmoscope of the oculist and the medical chart of a doctor also illustrate practical use of "people maps." By using the model, practitioners can save hours of time by directing their most concentrated efforts to those aspects of the target cultures that are most sensitive to the cultural habits of people in the message-producing culture and to intercultural relations, which can bring about the most successful communication.

Research into the sensitive areas of the above illustrated interaction between English-speaking sanitation experts and Zambian villagers might produce the following generalized entry for the English version of an English-Zambian Cultural Grammar:

The Zambian mode of instruction and learning focuses on the perception of the physical world. The Zambians do not respond readily to abstract conceptualizations of the world suggested by large models, charts and symbolization. One might say that they do not subscribe to the convention of pictorial representations found among Westerners. (Adapted from Edward C. Stewart--personal correspondence.)

This generalization could be elaborated further by including two or three specific examples of inappropriate symbolizations. Suffice it to say that one such example might very well be the one already elaborated: the giant model of a tsetse fly.

To make the model useful as a retrieval mechanism, Intercultural Grammars would be organized according to the factors and categories of the model. The sub-entries under each category could be listed alphabetically under each category as is generally done in Appendix A or they could be listed in the order of importance as are the major subcategories under NONVERBAL in Appendix A. This later listing has the advantage that it could be essentially in the same order for all languages and/or cultures.
The generalized entry example mentioned above probably could be included, or at least referenced, in an English-Zambian Intercultural Grammar three times in thesaurus fashion, so that it might be located under each of the three most likely category headings. These three headings would be those that received the three top priority ratings, namely: art form, nonverbal, and education and knowledge. (See Figure 2).

Once an Intercultural Grammar has been prepared, the model can be used to adapt an intended message from one language and culture so that it will be perceived in the target language and culture as it was intended.

Another example will now be considered to see exactly how the model can be used to diagnose a communication problem using an Intercultural Grammar. For the message in this example, a statement that actually occurs in a leadership training manual will be used—a statement that produced a very distressing situation when it was translated literally into the Japanese version of the same manual. The statement that created the difficulty reads as follows in the English version of the manual:

As an administrator of your home and as a good husband to your wife, it is very important to say, "I love you" to your wife once a day or more, and to give her a tender kiss when you leave home for your job in the morning and upon your return at night. (Quoted in Palmer, Spencer J., Every Nation, Kindred, Tongue and People, 1977, in press.)

Without mentioning what the distressing situation was, an examination of how it might have been avoided by using the languetic model and an English-Japanese Cultural Grammar will be made.

First, a representation of the model at the beginning of the Grammar would be consulted to see where the sensitive areas of English-to-Japanese are most likely to occur. A hypothetical diagnostic map of most of the categories have potential sensitive areas.
An examination of the message is now made to see what categories its important elements are likely to fall under. The message is about the husband being an administrator of the home, so family organization may be an important category. It involves the relationship of husband and wife to each other, so human relations and communication and the roles of husband and wife are likely to be important categories. It involves being a good husband and something "very important," so values might be an important category to consider. It involves expressing the emotion love, so attitudes and emotions might be important. Finally, it involves kissing, which is primarily a culture-specific nonverbal form of communication.

Rank order can be made for these categories, as indicated in Figure 4, by the numbers in the tops of the above mentioned category squares.
To save time, a detailed explanation will be given here to demonstrate how to look further in only two of these categories: the human relations and communications and the nonverbal categories. In consulting the subcategory listing in Appendix A under the category human relations and communications, the subcategory marriage constraints appears to be the best component topic to consider. In an actual Intercultural Grammar, a diagnostic model of each of the categories would also be found and could be used exactly like the model of the factors already illustrated. In a Grammar-Thesaurus, a page reference for each of the subcategory components would be listed so that one could easily use a thesaurus to find the diagnostic lexicon that would be most useful. The following might very well be part of an entry under the subcategory marriage constraints in a Japanese-English Intercultural Grammar:

In Japan, tradition makes a man hesitant to use verbal language to communicate the most important feelings of his heart. The Japanese believe that the most effective and impressive communication is not by words, but by heart-to-heart, nonverbal communication, and they are masters in these forms of communication.
Note that a similar comment could be included under the appropriate componential entries for the roles, values, and nonverbal categories.

Turning to the pertinent listing under the category nonverbal, the subcategory kissing looks like a profitable subcategory to consult. Under this category the following entry might well be found:

In Japan, it is generally considered to be immoral to kiss your wife in front of any other person, including your own children.

From the two comments quoted, the statement in the Japanese version of the manual could possibly be changed to read something like the following:

As an administrator in your home and as a good husband to your wife, it is very important to express your love to your wife once a day or more, and to express your affection when you are alone at night or in the morning before you leave for your job.

If the translator of the manual had had such an English-Japanese communication aid, he might have been able to avert the distressing situation encountered in the above example. The message as perceived by the Japanese husbands reading the literal translation of the English manual is expressed very well by the following quote from Seiji Katanuma, from Hokkaido:

We Japanese husbands have never had such a custom of kissing our wives openly, since it seems to us that kissing before our children's eyes or in public is shameful conduct, whether it is heavy or a light kiss. It is even more strange to us to say spontaneously, "I Love You" to our mates. If I suddenly said this at a certain time of day to my wife, she would suspect that I had become insane at last. If we say, "I Love You" in such situations, we feel it is rather an artificial fake expression. Is not the most important word in Christianity, "love?" It is at times distressing that there is so great a difference between us and you regarding the cultural implication of the word "love." (Reported by Professor Katanuma at The Symposium of Mormon Language at Brigham Young University, May 31, 1973.)

The languetic model has been oversimplified to facilitate an explanation of its use and utility, but the explanation should nonetheless communicate to a translator or other intercultural communicator the potential worth of such a model and system of Intercultural Grammars.
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I. CULTURE (Some Examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. MAIN RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AFFECTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BURIAL RITES/CONSTRAINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BURIAL RITES/CONSTRAINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ETIQUETTE, NONVERBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ETIQUETTE, VERBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FRIENDLINESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. GIFT EXCHANGE, SHARING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. GREETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. FAMILY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MARRIAGE RITES/CONSTRAINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. POLITICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SOCIAL GATHERINGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. ORGANIZATIONS                      |
| 1. COMMUNITY SERVICE                 |
| 2. EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS               |
| 3. FAMILY                              |
| 4. GOVERNMENT, POLITICAL             |
| 5. RELIGIOUS DENIZATIONS              |
| 6. SOCIAL CLASSES/INSTITUTIONS       |

| C. LIVELIHOOD                        |
| 1. MEALS AND DIET                    |
| 2. WORKING CONDITIONS/CONSTRAINTS   |

| D. VALUES                            |
| 1. COSMIC ORDER                      |
| 2. ECONOMIC CONSTRAINTS              |
| 3. HUMAN NATURE (GOOD/EVIL)          |
| 4. RELATIONSHIPS (SELF/OFFERS/AUTHORITY/NATURE) |
| 5. RELIGION                          |
| 6. STATE OF HAPPINESS/DISTRESS       |
| 7. STATUS/SUCCESS                    |
| 8. VALUES AND IDEALS                 |

| E. EDUCATION/KNOWLEDGE               |
| 1. CHANGE/GROWTH                     |
| 2. CHILD-REARING                     |
| 3. GROUP VS. INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY     |
| 4. SCHOOLING                         |

| F. CUSTOMS AND RITUALS (Acceptable/Unacceptable) |
| 1. UNWRITTEN CODES                   |
| 2. WRITTEN CODES                     |

| G. TIME                              |
| 1. CALENDAR, CLOCKS                  |
| 2. HABITS                            |
| 3. PUNCTUALLY                        |
| 4. SENSE                             |

| H. SPACE AND MOVEMENT               |
| 1. IMMIGRANT DIMENSIONS              |
| 2. INTRUSION FACTORS                |
| 3. MOBILITY                          |
| 4. SOCIAL DISTANCE                   |
| 5. TERRITORIAL MARKERS               |

| I. LEISURE/RECREATION               |
| 1. GAMES, SPORTS                    |
| 2. HOLIDAYS AND CELEBRATIONS        |
| 3. RELAXATION                       |
| 4. VALUES OF TIMES AND SPACE        |

| J. MATERIALITY                      |
| 1. COMMUNITY LIVING                 |
| 2. FASHION                           |
| 3. HOMES                             |
| 4. MOBILITY                          |
| 5. PROPERTY/COMMUNITY               |
| 6. PROPERTY/PRIVATE                 |
| 7. PROPERTY/UTILITARIAN             |

| K. SYMBOLS                          |
| 1. MOURNING                          |
| 2. RESPECT                           |
| 3. WEALTH                            |

| L. HUMOR                             |
| 1. NEGATIVE                          |
| 2. NEUTRAL                           |
| 3. POSITIVE                          |

| M. TONES (High vs. Low Contexts)     |
| 1. TONES                             |
| 2. TONES                             |
| 3. TONES                             |
| 4. TONES                             |

II. LANGUAGE (Representative)

| A. VERBAL                            |
| 1. PHONETICS (DENOTATION, CONNOTATION) |
| 2. SOUNDS (PHONETICAL)               |
| a. CHANGE                            |
| b. Contraction                       |
| c. Exchange of Meaning--Puns        |
| d. Repetition                        |

| B. PARAVERAL                         |
| 1. ALLOPHONIC VARIATIONS             |
| 2. ARTICULATION                     |
| 3. EXALTATION PATTERNS               |
| 4. JUNCTURE                          |
| 5. INFLENCES/GRANTS                 |
| 6. MITCH                            |
| 7. RHYME OF SPEECH                   |
| 8. SILENCE                          |

| C. NONVERBAL                         |
| 1. VISUAL                            |
| 2. HAND(S)                          |
| 3. FEET. LEGS. TOES.                 |
| 4. Arm(s)                           |
| 5. Joints                            |
| 6. TOOLS                             |
| 7. OBJECTS                           |
| 8. SIGNS                             |
| 9. PHRASES                           |
| 10. STYLE MARKERS                    |
| 11. VOLUME                           |

APPENDIX A:
Languages and Linguistics Symposium 1978
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2. AUDITORY
   a. BELCHING
   b. BLOWING THROUGH FLAPPING LIPS
   c. CLEARING ONE'S THROAT
   d. CLICKING
   e. COUGHING
   f. DRUMS
   g. DUCK CALL
   h. HONKING
   i. GRUNTS
   j. KISSING
   k. MUSICAL
   l. MUSIC
   m. NOISES
   n. OTHER

1. INTONATION PATTERNS NOT ACCOMPANIED WITH VERBAL
   a. AGREEABLE
   b. BLAND
   c. DISAGREEABLE
   d. TACTILE
   e. VISIONS
   f. FUTURE
   g. PAST
   h. SAME
   i. CLOTHES
   j. CLOTHES
   k. CLOTHES
   l. CLOTHES
   m. CLOTHES
   n. CLOTHES
   o. CLOTHES
   p. CLOTHES
   q. CLOTHES
   r. CLOTHES
   s. CLOTHES
   t. CLOTHES
   u. CLOTHES
   v. CLOTHES
   w. CLOTHES
   x. CLOTHES
   y. CLOTHES
   z. CLOTHES

2. INTERPERSONAL
   a. FEELINGS
   b. FEELINGS
   c. FEELINGS
   d. FEELINGS
   e. FEELINGS
   f. FEELINGS
   g. FEELINGS
   h. FEELINGS
   i. FEELINGS
   j. FEELINGS
   k. FEELINGS
   l. FEELINGS
   m. FEELINGS
   n. FEELINGS
   o. FEELINGS
   p. FEELINGS
   q. FEELINGS
   r. FEELINGS
   s. FEELINGS
   t. FEELINGS
   u. FEELINGS
   v. FEELINGS
   w. FEELINGS
   x. FEELINGS
   y. FEELINGS
   z. FEELINGS

3. VOCATIONAL
   a. AGREEABLE
   b. BLAND
   c. DISAGREEABLE
   d. TACTILE
   e. VISIONS
   f. FUTURE
   g. PAST
   h. SAME
   i. CLOTHES
   j. CLOTHES
   k. CLOTHES
   l. CLOTHES
   m. CLOTHES
   n. CLOTHES
   o. CLOTHES
   p. CLOTHES
   q. CLOTHES
   r. CLOTHES
   s. CLOTHES
   t. CLOTHES
   u. CLOTHES
   v. CLOTHES
   w. CLOTHES
   x. CLOTHES
   y. CLOTHES
   z. CLOTHES

IV. COMMUNICATION
A. INTRAPERSONAL
   1. DREAMS
   2. FEELINGS
   3. PRAYER
   4. VISIONS
B. INTERPERSONAL
   1. INTIMATE
   2. CONSULTATIVE
   3. SMALL GROUP
C. MASS
   1. CEREMONY--RITUAL
   2. CONCERT
   3. CRUSADE
   4. DEMONSTRATION
   5. RALLY
   6. REVIVAL MEETING
   7. SPEECH

D. MODE OF DELIVERY
   1. COMPUTER
   2. CORRESPONDENCE
   3. DISCUSSION GROUP
   4. DRUMS
   5. FILM, STILLS
   6. FLAGS
   7. LECTURE
   8. LIGHTS
   9. MOTIONS• PICTURES
   10. PRINT
   11. RADIO
   12. RECORD
   13. SATELLITE
   14. SMOKE SIGNALS
   15. TAPE
   16. TELEGRAPH
   17. TELEPHONE
   18. TELETYPE
   19. TELEVISION
   20. VIDEO TAPE

E. ART FORMS (AND COMBINATIONS)
   1. ARCHITECTURE
   2. DANCE
   3. DRAMA
   4. INTERIOR DESIGN
   5. LANDSCAPE
   6. LITERATURE
   7. MUSIC--INSTRUMENTAL
   8. MUSIC--VOCAL
   9. PAINTING
   10. PHOTOGRAPHS
   11. PICTURES
   12. SCULPTURE

F. PARANORMAL ELEMENTS
   1. EXTRA-SENSORY PERCEPTION
      a. Clairvoyance
      b. Precognition
      c. Postcognition
      d. Telepathy
   2. ILLUSION
   3. INSPIRATION
   4. INTUITION
   5. MEDITATION
   6. PSI-KAPPA (MIND OVER MATTER)
   7. REVELATION

V. CONTEXT "SETTING" (REAL OR ASSUMED)
A. PAST
   1. BACKGROUND
   2. EDUCATION
   3. EXPERIENCE
   4. MEMORIES
   5. TRAINING
B. CURRENT SITUATION
   1. FEELINGS
   2. INSIGHT
   3. INTUITION
   4. PREDISPOSITIONS
   5. TALENTS
C. FUTURE
   1. ANTICIPATIONS
   2. ANXIETIES
   3. ASSUMPTIONS
   4. EXPECTATIONS
   5. INTENTIONS

D. EVENT CHAINS: (Composite of behavioral units of communicative situations.)
E. LINGUISTIC CHAINS: (All verbal/non-verbal composites of meaningful interrelated expressions/perceptions essential to a message being understood.)
F. SITUATIONAL DIALECTS: (Manner of speech used for specific circumstances.)
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Tyler: Enhancing Intercultural Communication

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE INDICATORS MODEL of "LANGUETICS"

MESSAGE EXPRESSED:

CULTURE:

LANGUAGE:

INTERACTION:

COMMUNICATION:

CONTEXT:

ENVIRONMENT:

KEY:

ACCEPTABLE
AMBIGUOUS/UNCLEAR
OFFENSIVE/UNACCEPTABLE

1 - N PRIORITY OF CONCERN
Also to Consider:
DEPTH (Amount)
SCOPE (Extent)

NOT AN INFLUENCE IN THIS COMMUNICATION

For further information, contact BYU Language & Intercultural Research Center,
240 B-34, Provo, Utah 84602

Languages and Linguistics Symposium 1978
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE INDICATORS: LANGUETIC MODEL

CHALLENGES AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

I. Intercultural Communicative Indicators. Devise and use intercultural grammars to:
A. Consider pertinent differences/similarities (such as expectations, assumptions, values, behavior).
B. Note both inhibitors (-) and enhancers (+) of culturally-loaded messages.
C. Mark and take advantage of contexts, environments, participants, to provide communicative results.

II. Intercultural Grammars. Identify cultural communicative "Traps" ("Gaps"): Culturally Hidden Units of Meaning (CHUMS)
A. Inhibitors
   1. Mis-cues
      a. offensive, provocative, intolerable
      b. result in miscommunication
   2. Missed cues
      a. unclear, meaning varied, meaningless, "different"
      b. result in noncommunication
B. Enhancers
   1. Cues
      a. perceivable CHUMS
      b. explicit
   2. Clues
      a. lead to understanding
      b. implicit

III. Language Indicators. Identify denotative and culturally connotative meaning.
A. Verbal (spoken, written/printed, implied)
   1. Morphological (arrangement in meaningful word forms)
   2. Syntactic (word arrangement in relations/functions)
   3. Lexical (development and definition of meanings and changes)
   4. Phonological (speech and sound systems)
B. Para-verbal
   1. punctuation, spacing, rate, pitch, tone, stress, silence, non-fluencies, etc.
   2. logic and stylistic patterns, rhetoric
C. Non-verbal
D. Para-normal (illusions, ESP-expressed, PSI-kappa, etc.)

IV. Communication Modes (Indicators)
A. Direct (interpersonal, group, mass)
B. Mediated--print, broadcast, art, etc.--(interpersonal, group, mass)

V. Interactions and Constraints (Message Modifiers)
A. Social, political, and other cultural variance
B. Perspectives and conditions
C. Experience
D. Abilities
E. Outlook and purpose (intention) including assumptions, biases, etc.

VI. Contexts and Environment
A. Action chains
B. Scope-status
C. Languetic links

VII. Unique Encounters (separate instances of cultural communication)
A. Greetings
B. Visiting
C. Talks
D. Gestures
E. Personal appearance
F. Attitude
G. Language
H. House
I. Work
J. Social
K. Political
L. Education
M. Health
N. Mass media

Intercultural Grammars
Bridges of
Communicative modes
Environments
Ongoing contexts

PEOPLE
CULTURAL GRAMMAR
Understanding
Communicative modes
Environments
Ongoing contexts

MISCOMMUNICATION+
NONCOMMUNICATION=
MISUNDERSTANDING

PEOPLE
CULTURAL GRAMMAR
Understanding
Communicative modes
Environments
Ongoing contexts

I. Required: A readily retrievable system for detecting and efficiently utilizing required data.
A. Data required for the receptor but not present in a source situation or message.
B. Data that is absent or ambiguous for either the originator or receptor.
C. Data that is implied which must be made explicit.
D. Data which is explicit but which may need distinct treatment.

II. Solutions
A. PASTEL (Patterns and Styles of Thought, Expressions and Living)
B. Interculturegrams with summaries and references
C. Experiential Learning Aids (Communication Learning Aids)
D. Intercultural grammar (guidelines, how-to's)
E. Thesaurus of culture specifics (check BYU/LIRC media study for examples)
F. Individual connotative lexicons
G. Remkard (Microfiche Retrieval System)
H. Computer read-outs, expanded texts