

# The Effectiveness of Vocalized Hesitations When Discussing International Travel Experiences



by James Chow

Faculty Mentor: Dr. Xiaoying Xie

## ABSTRACT

---

*This study aims to determine the effectiveness of vocalized hesitations when attempting to persuade people to travel abroad by recounting personal international experiences. Using an experimental design, 171 undergraduate students at California State University, Sacramento were divided into two groups and shown a video of someone attempting to persuade them to travel abroad based on fictional international experiences with or without vocalized hesitations. Participants then completed questionnaires measuring their attitudes about the message. The results suggest that the effectiveness of vocalized hesitations is dependent on the message receiver, the travel experiences, and the type of persuasion.*

According to the 2008 World Tourism Organization, international tourist arrivals (people traveling outside of their home country) reached 922 million people. Additionally, more people are visiting other countries for study abroad programs and for business purposes. As a consequence, people of varying cultures find themselves in situations where they will have to interact with different people, making intercultural communication effectiveness an increasingly valuable characteristic.

To effectively interact with culturally different people, a reduction of ethnocentrism is necessary. A recent study (DeNotaris et al. 2008) reported a strong negative correlation between frequency of travel and a person's ethnocentric predisposition. This correlation suggests that individuals who travel more frequently and experience more cultures are less inclined to judge other cultures in reference to their own as the standard. Thus, traveling abroad contributes to intercultural communication effectiveness. In a qualitative study (Pennington and Wildermuth 2005), students made comments about their short-term travel/study experiences abroad that fit into a model of intercultural competency, suggesting that even short-term experiences in different cultures contribute to intercultural communication effectiveness.

While international travel is becoming more prevalent, it is still important to better understand how decisions are made to travel abroad. Traveling abroad presents the sojourner with the unique experience of interacting with people of differing cultures. Travelers will be faced with different beliefs, values, and norms, particularly in the behaviors of the people of the host culture. People making informed decisions about if and where to travel abroad, will get some of that information from other people vocally narrating their own experiences in other cultures. Thus, what other people say about their intercultural experiences could contribute the deciding factors of whether or not someone will travel abroad. While the content of what is being said about different cultures by the speaker is important, the nonverbal aspects of the message also contribute to the reception of the message. As Butler noted, “Arguments’ and ‘delivery’ are not separate, discreet units, but are instead interdependent components of the process of persuasion” (1984, 1). Thus, when people are potentially being persuaded by other people vocally narrating their own international travel experiences, the delivery of the message is an important factor. However, there seems to be a lack of research supporting the notion that nonverbal aspects specifically related to narratives of personal intercultural experiences influence the reception of the message by the listener.

This study aims to fill that void by investigating the relationship between listener reception of message content and message delivery quality when the message content consists of a personal narration of international experiences. By investigating this relationship, this study will contribute to our understanding of how people decide to travel abroad.

To investigate the relationship between listener reception of message content and message delivery quality, an experimental research strategy will be used. First, participants will be asked to watch a video of a student recounting fictional experiences of culturally different behaviors while traveling abroad, then participants will be asked to complete a survey measuring their attitude toward the behaviors described in the videos they watched.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

---

The literature reveals conceptual understanding for social acceptability and for how to apply concepts for interest and curiosity towards differing cultures, as well as for how vocalized hesitations affect argument quality in the court room. The current study combines these concepts and investigates them in the context of discussing international travel experiences to persuade people to travel abroad.

## **Dependent Variables**

To investigate how messages are received when international travel experiences are being verbally and vocally expressed to someone by describing culturally diverse behaviors, this study measures three aspects. One aspect is how the receiver categorizes the cultural behaviors as acceptable or unacceptable behaviors. The second aspect is how interested in observing or participating in the cultural behavior the receiver is. The third aspect is how curious the receiver is to learn more about the culture to which the behavior belongs.

### **Acceptability**

“Acceptability” may be defined as how someone finds something as socially satisfactory by conforming to social standards. If something is socially acceptable, then it is something that is congruent with a group’s system of values, beliefs, and practices. Judging something as acceptable or not is similar to determining if something is good, bad, right, or wrong. These kinds of value judgments are a result of positive or negative reinforcements in the form of peer approval or disapproval (Skinner 1972). This view on how value judgments are made connects the concept of acceptability with culture, thus validating the legitimacy of researching the relationship between acceptability and differing cultural behaviors. Furthermore, Nishida and Nishida’s (1981) meta-analysis of values in an intercultural context shows that acceptability of social practices is culturally bound.

Previous research seems to be limited to measuring acceptability towards non-culturally specific behaviors. For example, scholars have examined attitudes towards deception by measuring whether certain forms of deception are deemed as acceptable (Seiter et al. 2002). Seiter et al. (2002) measured people’s acceptability based on the content and type of deception, rather than the delivery aspects of the message.

Lefebvre’s (1982) work on moral judgment involved questionnaires being given to Russian and US participants to measure their attitudes towards the same ethical situations to identify differences. Studying Russian citizens’ and United States citizens’ attitudes sheds light on what behaviors are acceptable to differing cultures, but not on how members of one culture judge culturally specific behaviors from other cultures.

### **Interest and Curiosity**

According to Perry (1990, 354), “Favorable attitudes are likely to lead indirectly to enhanced learning about countries,” ultimately suggesting a self-perpetuating cycle where an increase in consumption of knowledge about foreign countries will cause an increase in a favorable attitude toward those

countries, thus causing an increase in desire to learn. Perry (1990) collected data to support a hypothesized model that illustrates this cycle.

The relationship between knowledge consumption, favorable attitude, and desire to learn is congruent with the theory of selective exposure. “Selective exposure” has been defined as “any systematic bias in audience composition” (Sears and Freedman 1967, 195). Thus, messages are more likely to reach an audience that shares the same attitude of the message. For example, stories about a certain country are more likely to be heard by people who share a favorable attitude towards that country. Theoretical research involving selective exposure has involved themes of foreign countries (Best et al. 2005; Perry 1990). However, empirical research about the delivery aspects of the message in relation to the concept of selective exposure to information about foreign countries is lacking.

### **Independent Variable**

Vocalized (uttered with the voice) hesitations, both verbal (pertaining to words) or nonverbal (not pertaining to words), will be the independent variable. Verbal and nonverbal hesitations fall under the category of powerless speech. Bradac, Hemphill, and Tardy (1981) noted that nonverbal hesitation forms (*uh*, *eh*, and *um*), were used more frequently by people of lower power status. O’Barr (1982) later identified “you know” and “I mean” as verbal, rather than nonverbal, hesitations. Another discourse marker that sometimes fits into the category of verbal hesitations is the word “like.” Because “like” is often used to fill pauses, it also fits into the category of vocalized verbal hesitations (Levelt 1983). Bradac et al. were able to show that these forms of vocalized hesitations in speech “produced judgments of low power” (1981, 334), and lower power attributed low competence in the speaker. In other words, people who are perceived as being of lower power status are also perceived as being less competent.

Powerless speech has been shown to serve mostly as a negative distraction for the receiver of the messages (Areni and Sparks 2005). Areni and Sparks also said of powerless speech that its “influence in guiding attention means that it renders otherwise persuasive elements impotent,” suggesting that the content becomes less relevant to the decision-making process when powerless speech is present (2005, 523).

### **Rationale for Research**

Previous studies mostly focus on how cultural differences affect intercultural interaction. In these studies, predispositions are measured and compared to draw implications. For example, Hornikx and Hoeken (2007) conducted research to determine differences in attitudes towards evidence used in arguments between French and Dutch participants. In another study (Viswat

and Kobayashi 2008), the researchers investigated how United States citizens and Japanese citizens approached conversation participation, and discovered differences in frequency of joining conversations and differences in motivation to join conversations. While these types of studies provide valuable information for better understanding how different cultures might interact with each other, they do not point out how cultural differences influence an individual's attitudes towards other cultures. More specifically, research on how cultural differences are presented to listeners and how that presentation might influence an individual's attitudes towards other cultures is absent.

Another key factor in the predominant research involving cultural differences is the nature of the cultural differences. As previously stated, predispositions (such as an individual's tendency to use statistical evidence when arguing) are the common themes of research. The present study offers a different perspective by defining the "cultural differences" as actual cultural practices or events that are not direct factors in human interaction.

By exploring the relationship between how these cultural differences (cultural practices and events) are perceived and how those cultural differences are presented to an audience, this study aims to identify ways to increase people's desire to gain international experience when listening to other people discuss their experiences abroad by determining if it is appropriate to use vocalized hesitations. Experience traveling abroad has been shown to increase global attitude, which, in turn, increases motivation to travel abroad (Arasaratnam 2006).

## HYPOTHESES

This study tests five hypotheses (H) based on Arasaratnam's (2006) model involving experience abroad, global attitude, and motivation to travel abroad; on Perry's (1990) model involving consumption of information about foreign countries; and on the effects of verbal and nonverbal hesitations on persuasive messages.

**H1:** Participants who receive a message without vocalized hesitations will report higher acceptability towards the cultural behaviors being described in the message than participants who receive a message with vocalized hesitations.

**H2:** Participants who receive a message without vocalized hesitations will report higher interest towards participating in or personally observing the cultural behaviors being described in the message than participants who receive a message with vocalized hesitations.

**H3:** Participants who receive a message without vocalized hesitations will report higher curiosity towards learning more about the culture from which

the behaviors being described in the message originate than participants who receive a message with vocalized hesitations.

**H4:** Participants who receive a message without vocalized hesitations will report higher competency of the speaker than participants who receive a message with vocalized hesitations.

**H5:** Participants who receive a message without vocalized hesitations will report higher trustworthiness towards the speaker than participants who receive a message with vocalized hesitations.

## METHODOLOGY

---

Using a quantitative approach, the researcher collected data to discover relationships between the variables. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data.

### **Participants**

The study participants were 171 undergraduate students at California State University, Sacramento. Of these, 91 were male (53.2%), 76 were female (44.4%), and 4 participants who did not report their gender (2.3%). The mean age of participants was 24 (SD = 5.87). There were two sophomores (1.2%), 112 juniors (65.5%), and 52 seniors (30.4%), and 5 additional participants who did not disclose their year in school (2.9%). Regarding ethnic background, 46.8% of the participants reported being Caucasian, 20.5% reported being Asian American, 9.9% reported being Latin American, 5.8% reported being Pacific Islander, 4.7% reported being African American, 1.2% reported being Middle Eastern, and 11.1% claimed Other or Unlisted for ethnicity.

### **Research Strategy**

The researcher used an experimental design for the current study. To achieve an experimental design, the researcher created different levels of the quality of speaking between subject groups. One group received one level of inducement, while the other group received a different level of inducement. After receiving their assigned experimental condition (independent variable), each group completed a questionnaire (see Appendix) to measure various continuous variables (dependent variables) as their reaction to the experimental condition.

### **Independent Variable**

Speaking quality while delivering a fictional account of various world travel experiences is the independent variable for the current study. Speaking quality was determined by the presence or absence of verbal and nonverbal

hesitations (*um*, *uh*, and *like*). The different levels of the independent variable included one video of the speaker recounting fictional world travel experiences with verbal and nonverbal hesitations, and another video of the speaker without verbal and nonverbal hesitations. The manipulation check for the two levels of the independent variable included asking the participants to indicate the degree to which they found the speaker's speech to contain verbal and nonverbal hesitations, and to indicate the degree to which they found the speaker's speech to be fluent or flowing.

The content of the videos consisted of a student describing some recent international travel experiences. The speaker in the video described four specific countries, each with its own cultural practice or behavior. The speaker described people driving on the left side of the road in London, people blowing their nose into their hands and into the street in India, people bathing in the nude in community bathhouses in Japan, and the availability of horse meat for human consumption in Argentina. The videos were produced in the same setting. Each video used or featured of the same speaker sitting in the same room against the same wall during the same time of the day. The presence of the verbal and nonverbal hesitations is the only difference between the two videos.

### **Dependent Variables**

To account for the listeners' reception of the message, the researcher took three measurements for each cultural behavior or practice. Testing was conducted using each individual cultural behavior for each independent variable, and using the overall scores of all four of the cultural behaviors for each independent variable. First, the participant's acceptability towards each cultural behavior was measured by asking her/him to indicate the degree to which she/he found the behavior acceptable on a 7-point Likert-type scale (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for all cultural behaviors = .77). Then, level of interest in participating or personally observing was measured for each cultural behavior on a 7-point Likert-type scale (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for all cultural behaviors = .70). Finally, the participant's level of curiosity was measured by asking her/him to indicate to which degree she/he was curious to learn more about the specified culture for each cultural behavior (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for all cultural behaviors = .75). These three measurements are important to observe because they are abstract ideas that together give an indication as to what extent the participants may or may not be considering traveling abroad.

Additionally, a 15-point semantic differential scale was used to measure participants' attitudes towards the speaker in the video. The scale used for the present study is based on a multidimensional measurement first developed by McCroskey (1966). The scale measures two categories of attitude towards the

speaker: competence (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .79$ ) and trustworthiness (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .79$ ). Participants chose a value on a 7-point scale between dichotomies related to what was being measured.

### **Procedure**

Data collection took place on April 30, 2010 and May 11, 2010. One class for each experimental condition was selected, totaling two classes. The classes consisted of undergraduate courses from the Communication Studies department. Participants in each class received written instructions, were asked to sign an informed consent form, received a four-page questionnaire, and were then asked to watch a 60- to 90-second video prior to filling out their questionnaire. The videos were displayed on the in-class projector connected to a laptop. The classrooms also contained wall-mounted speakers powerful enough to ensure that all participants were able to hear under normal circumstances.

## **RESULTS**

---

Each hypothesis was tested individually by looking at the relationship between the specific variables. Along with testing each hypothesis, the measurements for the manipulation check were tested.

### **Manipulation Check**

First, the researcher conducted an independent-sample *t* test to determine if the manipulation of the independent variable was successful. Because one level of inducement of the independent variable was a message with vocalized hesitations, and the other level was without vocalized hesitations, the participants were asked to indicate to what level they noticed the speaker's speech contained vocalized hesitations, and to what level they thought the speaker was speaking fluently. Both manipulation checks were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale. The results showed that the level to which the participants noticed the speaker's speech contained vocalized hesitations was greater in the group exposed to the "with vocalized hesitations" condition ( $M = 5.56$ ;  $SD = .17$ ) than in the group exposed to the "without vocalized hesitations" condition ( $M = 2.89$ ;  $SD = .15$ ;  $t(169) = 11.73$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The results also showed that the level to which the participants rated the speaker as fluent was greater in the group exposed to the "without vocalized hesitations" condition ( $M = 4.91$ ;  $SD = .15$ ) than in the group exposed to the "with vocalized hesitations" condition ( $M = 3.23$ ;  $SD = .18$ ;  $t(169) = 6.72$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). These two relationships indicate that the manipulation was successfully induced between the two participant groups.



## Hypotheses Testing

The researcher also used an independent-sample *t* test to test each hypothesis (H). First tested was hypothesis H1. The researcher conducted an independent-sample *t* test between the overall scores for acceptability for each sample group. The results showed that the group exposed to the condition without verbal hesitations scored greater on the acceptability scale ( $M = 4.46$ ;  $SD = .16$ ) than the group exposed to the condition with verbal hesitations ( $M = 4.20$ ;  $SD = .16$ ;  $t(174) = 1.23$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The results indicate that the difference is not significant. However, the data revealed significant results while testing the differences between the levels of acceptability towards each individual cultural behavior of the two groups. The results showed that level of acceptability towards driving on the left side of the road in London is greater in the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 5.48$ ;  $SD = 1.92$ ) than in the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 6.08$ ;  $SD = 1.56$ ;  $t(174) = 2.29$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This relationship is significant. The differences between the two groups regarding their acceptability towards someone blowing their nose into the street or their hand in India, communal bathing in Japan, and human consumption of horse meat in Argentina were insignificant ( $p > .05$ ). Thus, the hypothesis is only partially supported.

Next, H2 was tested. The researcher conducted an independent-sample *t* test between the overall scores for interest in participating in or personally observing the cultural behaviors being described for each sample group. The results showed that the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations scored greater on the interest scale ( $M = 3.36$ ;  $SD = 1.35$ ) than the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.24$ ;  $SD = 1.44$ ;  $t(174) = .54$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The relationship is not significant. However, significant results were found again when looking at the difference of each individual cultural behavior between the two sample groups. The results showed that the level of interest in participating in or personally observing driving on the left side of the road in London was greater in the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 5.24$ ;  $SD = 1.83$ ) than in the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 4.33$ ;  $SD = 2.16$ ;  $t(174) = 3.01$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The results also showed that the level of interest in participating in or personally observing communal bathing in Japan was greater in the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.30$ ;  $SD = 2.01$ ) than in the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 2.70$ ;  $SD = 1.81$ ;  $t(174) = 2.09$ ,  $p < .05$ ). These two relationships are significant. The differences between the two groups regarding their interest in participating in or observing someone blowing her/his nose into the street or their hand in India, and human

consumption of horse meat in Argentina were insignificant ( $p > .05$ ). Thus, the hypothesis is not supported.

The third hypothesis (H3) was tested next. The researcher conducted an independent-sample  $t$  test between the overall scores for curiosity to learn more about the cultures for each sample group. The results showed that the level of curiosity to learn more about cultures was greater in the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.63$ ;  $SD = 1.64$ ) than in the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.59$ ;  $SD = 1.58$ ;  $t(174) = .20$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The relationship is not significant. Again, the researcher found significant results by looking at the differences of each individual cultural behavior between the two groups. The results showed that the level of curiosity to learn more about London's culture was greater in the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 4.16$ ;  $SD = 2.13$ ) than in the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.92$ ;  $SD = 2.10$ ;  $t(174) = .75$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The results also showed that the level of curiosity to learn more about Japan was greater in the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.89$ ;  $SD = 2.21$ ) than in the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.42$ ;  $SD = 2.10$ ;  $t(174) = 1.44$ ,  $p < .05$ ). These two relationships are significant. The differences between the two groups regarding their curiosity to learn more about India and Argentina were insignificant ( $p > .05$ ). Thus, the hypothesis is only supported for learning more about London.

The researcher then tested the fourth hypothesis (H4) by conducting an independent-sample  $t$  test to test the relationship between vocalized hesitations and perceived speaker competency. The results showed that the speaker's level of competency was rated higher by the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 4.16$ ;  $SD = .97$ ) than by the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 3.41$ ;  $SD = 1.07$ ;  $t(171) = 4.80$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This relationship is significant. Thus, the hypothesis is supported.

Finally, the researcher tested the fifth hypothesis (H5) by conducting an independent-sample  $t$  test to test the relationship between vocalized hesitations and perceived speaker trustworthiness. The results showed that the speaker's level of trustworthiness was rated higher by the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations ( $M = 4.60$ ;  $SD = .95$ ) than by the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations ( $M = 4.52$ ;  $SD = 1.07$ ;  $t(172) = .53$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The relationship is not significant, thus, the hypothesis is not supported.

## DISCUSSION

---

Some of the tests discussed in the previous section resulted in significant findings, while some showed no relationships. The mixed results supported some of the hypotheses of this study, showed no relationship for others, and uncovered unexpected relationships for some.

The group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations reported higher levels of acceptability towards driving on the left side of the road in London than the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations. This finding indicates that Hypothesis 1 (H1) is supported for that cultural behavior. The relationships between the other cultural behaviors and the manipulation of the independent variable are not significant and, as a result, do not support the hypothesis or provide additional findings.

Similarly, Hypothesis 2 (H2), related to vocalized hesitations and interest in participating in or personally observing cultural behaviors, is only supported for driving on the left side of the road in London. The finding of Hypothesis 3 (H3), related to vocalized hesitations and curiosity about the culture being described, is only supported for driving on the left side of the road in London. Hypothesis 4 (H4), related to vocalized hesitations and perceived competency, is not supported due to an insignificant difference in the results. Hypothesis 5 (H5), related to vocalized hesitation and perceived speaker trustworthiness, is not supported due to insignificant differences in the results.

The data also revealed additional findings. Because the group exposed to the condition with vocalized hesitations reported higher interest in participating in or personally observing communal bathing in Japan than did the group exposed to the condition without vocalized hesitations, the results suggest that, in this case, participants who received the message with vocalized hesitations reported higher interest than participants who received the message without vocalized hesitations. Regarding participants' curiosity to learn more about the culture, the same difference was found. Thus, participants who received a message with vocalized hesitations reported higher levels of curiosity to learn more about the culture being described in the message than participants who received a message without vocalized hesitations.

An explanation for the additional findings can be provided by the identification theory of persuasion (Burke 1969). According to Burke, "you persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his" (55). This idea explains why, in the present study, the speech containing vocalized hesitations was more successful at producing higher levels of curiosity to learn more about the culture and an interest in participating in or personally

observing communal bathing in Japan if the participants themselves regularly use vocalized hesitations in their everyday speech.

### LIMITATIONS

---

The limitations of the study can be seen in the measurement and the sample. For the measurement, a simple single-question design was used, so only one question was asked (e.g., To what level do they find the cultural behavior being described as acceptable?). If more time were allowed, a more thorough measurement involving multiple questions could have been designed and proven reliable by pretesting. While the sample size was adequate, only one class (out of convenience) was selected for each experimental condition. Using only one class per condition makes the differences in time and day that the measurements were taken more distinct. Additionally, minor computer effects resulted in slightly lower quality of video playback for one of the groups than for the other. However, both groups were tested in the same room using the same equipment.

### FUTURE RESEARCH

---

This study suggests the direction for future research should be looking at different contexts for persuading people to travel abroad. For example, a study could use a salesperson for a travel company who is trying to persuade the participants to purchase travel services, instead of a peer student merely suggesting that the participants should travel internationally. Another direction for future research should be looking at the types of cultural behaviors being described by making a clearer distinction between emotionally evoking cultural behaviors and neutral behaviors to produce stronger findings for practical use.

### CONCLUSION

---

The mixed results found in this study suggest that, in some cases, it is more effective to use vocalized hesitations to persuade someone to travel abroad based on your personal experiences, and, in other cases, it is more effective not to use vocalized hesitations. Based on the type of cultural behaviors described, it may be that using vocalized hesitations is more effective when describing cultural behaviors that have a higher chance of producing an emotional response, such as communal bathing, than when describing cultural behaviors that have less of a chance of producing an emotional response, such as driving on the left side of the road in London. Whether you are trying to convince a friend to travel abroad or representing a company that wants to convince potential customers to subscribe to your

travel services, it is important to recognize how you are speaking, who you are speaking to, and what you are speaking about, because your use of vocalized hesitations will make a difference.

APPENDIX

---

Below are items that relate to the behaviors being described by the speaker in the video. Record your first reaction to each item as you remember them being described in the video. There are no right or wrong answers.

**I. Please indicate the degree to which you find the behaviors being described by the speaker in the video as acceptable or unacceptable using the following seven-point scale:**

Completely Unacceptable = 1; Very Unacceptable = 2; Somewhat Unacceptable = 3; Neutral = 4; Somewhat Acceptable = 5; Very Acceptable = 6; Completely Acceptable = 7

1. When the speaker in the video describes driving in London:

Acceptability: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. When the speaker in the video describes someone in India blowing their nose in public:

Acceptability: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. When the speaker in the video describes communal bathing in Japan:

Acceptability: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. When the speaker describes eating horse in Argentina:

Acceptability: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**II. Please indicate the degree to which you find the behaviors as something you would be interested in traveling to the specific country to observe:**

Very Strongly Uninterested = 1; Strongly Uninterested = 2; Somewhat Uninterested = 3; Undecided = 4; Somewhat Interested = 5; Strongly Interested = 6; Very Strongly Interested = 7

1. When the speaker in the video describes driving in London:

Interesting: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. When the speaker in the video describes someone blowing their nose in public:

Interesting: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. When the speaker in the video describes communal bathing in Japan:

Interesting: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. When the speaker describes eating horse in Argentina:

Interesting: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**III. Please indicate the degree to which the description of the cultural behavior in the video makes you curious to learn more about the culture:**

Very Strongly Not Curious = 1; Strongly Not Curious = 2; Somewhat Not Curious = 3; Undecided = 4; Somewhat Curious = 5; Strongly Curious = 6; Very Strongly Curious = 7

1. When the speaker in the video describes driving in London:

Curious:            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. When the speaker in the video describes someone blowing their nose in public:

Curious:            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. When the speaker in the video describes communal bathing in Japan:

Curious:            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. When the speaker describes eating horse in Argentina:

Curious:            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

**IV. Instructions: On the scales below, indicate your feelings about the speaker in the video. Numbers 1 and 7 indicate a very strong feeling. Numbers 2 and 6 indicate a strong feeling. Numbers 3 and 5 indicate a fairly weak feeling. Number 4 indicates you are undecided.**

- 1)            Intelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unintelligent
- 2)            Untrained 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trained
- 3)            Honest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Dishonest
- 4)            Untrustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trustworthy
- 5)            Inexpert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Expert
- 6)            Self-centered 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not self-centered
- 7)            Honorable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Dishonorable
- 8)            Informed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Uninformed
- 9)            Moral 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Immoral
- 10)            Incompetent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Competent
- 11)            Unethical 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Ethical
- 12)            Insensitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sensitive
- 13)            Bright 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Stupid

14) Phony 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Genuine

15) Not understanding 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Understanding

**V. Please indicate the degree to which you find the speaker's speech in the video to contain verbal and nonverbal hesitations (*um, uh, er, like*):**

Very many = 1; Many = 2; Somewhat many = 3; Don't remember = 4; A few = 5; Very little = 6 None = 7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please indicate the degree to which you find the speaker's speech to be fluent (capable of flowing):

Not fluent at all = 1; Not very fluent = 2; Barely fluent = 3; Don't remember = 4; Somewhat fluent = 5; Very fluent = 6; Perfectly fluent = 7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please indicate whether or not you consider the speaker to be a professional or a peer student:

Professional = 1; Don't Remember = 2; Peer Student = 3

1 2 3

Please indicate whether or not you consider the speaker to be an authority on the subject or not an authority:

Very much an authority = 1; An authority = 2; Somewhat an authority = 3; Don't remember = 4; Somewhat not an authority = 5; Not an authority = 6; Very much not an authority = 7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. My age is \_\_\_\_\_ years.

2. I am MALE FEMALE

3. Please indicate your ethnicity (please circle 1 or 2):

CAUCASIAN AFRICAN AMERICAN LATIN AMERICAN  
NATIVE AMERICAN PACIFIC ISLANDER ASIAN  
MIDDLE EASTERN OTHER\_\_\_\_\_

4. Please indicate what year you are in college:

FRESHMAN SOPHOMORE JUNIOR SENIOR  
GRAD STUDENT OTHER\_\_\_\_\_



## REFERENCES

- Arasaratnam, Lilly. 2006. Further testing of a new model of intercultural communication competence. *Communication Research Reports* 23(2): 93-99.
- Areni, Charles, and Johnny Sparks. 2005. Language power and persuasion. *Psychology & Marketing* 22(6): 507-525.
- Best, Samuel, Brian Chmielewski, and Brian Krueger. 2005. Selective exposure to online foreign news during the conflict with Iraq. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 10(4): 52-70.
- Bradac, James, Michael Hemphill, and Charles Tardy. 1981. Language style on trial: Effects of "powerful and "powerless" speech upon judgments of victims and villains. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 45: 327-341.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Butler, John. 1984. The essentials of nonverbal communication: What every good debater should know. *Florida Communication Journal* 12(1): 10-17.
- DeNotaris, Linda, Christopher Mcallister, Robyn Notarstefano, Emily Panasci, and Sarah Shoemaker. 2008. Pack your perceptions, it's time to fly: Changes in cultural superiority based on direct intercultural experiences. *National Communication Association*: 1-35.
- Hornikx, Jos, and Hans Hoeken. 2007. Cultural differences in the persuasiveness of evidence types and evidence quality. *Communication Monographs* 74(4): 443-463.
- Lefebvre, Vladimir. 1982. *Algebra of Conscience*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Levelt, Willem. 1983. Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition* 14: 41-104.
- Levey, Stephen. 2006. The sociolinguistic distribution of discourse marker like in preadolescent speech. *Multilingua* 25: 413-441.
- Nishida, Hiroku, and Tsukasa Nishida. 1981. Values and intercultural communication. *Communication* 10(1): 50-58.
- O'Barr, William. 1982. *Linguistic Evidence: Language, Power, and Strategy in the Courtroom*. New York: Academic Press.
- Pennington, Barbara, and Susan Wildermuth. 2005. Three weeks there and back again: A qualitative investigation of the impact of short-term travel/study on the development of intercultural communication competency. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 34(3): 166-183.

Perry, David. 1990. News reading, knowledge about, and attitudes toward foreign countries. *Journalism Quarterly* 67(2): 353-360.

Sears, David., and Jonathan Freedman. 1967. Selective exposure to information: A critical review. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 31: 194-213.

Seiter, John, Jon Bruschke, and Chunsheng Bai. 2002. The acceptability of deception as a function of perceiver's culture, deceiver's intention, and deceiver-deceived relationships. *Western Journal of Communication* 66(2): 158-180.

Skinner, Burrhus. 1971. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company.

Viswat, Linda, and Junko Kobayashi. 2008. Cultural differences in conversational strategies. *Journal of Intercultural Communication* 18: 7-7.