CSCanada
Cross-Cultural Communication
Vol. 7, No. 3, 2011, pp. 10-18
DOI:10.3968/j.ccc.1923670020110703.175

ISSN 1712-8358[Print]
ISSN 1923-6700[Online]
www.cscanada.net
www.cscanada.org

The Communication of Respect as a Significant Dimension of Cross-Cultural Communication Competence

LA COMMUNICATION DU RESPECT EST UNE DIMENSION IMPORTANTE DE LA COMPETENCE DE LA COMMUNICATION INTERCULTURELLE

Lauren Mackenzie[1,*]; Megan Wallace[2]

[1]U.S. Air Force Culture & Language Center, USA
Lauren Mackenzie is an assistant professor of cross-cultural communication at the Air Force Culture and Language Center. She holds a Ph.D. in Communication from the University of Massachusetts and has taught communication courses at the University of Massachusetts, the State University of New York, American International College, Columbus State University, as well as throughout the Army and Air Force. Dr. Mackenzie's research centers around the verbal, paralinguistic and nonverbal components that comprise the communication of respect.
[2]U.S. Air Force Culture & Language Center, USA
Megan Wallace received her M.A. in Communication at the University of South Alabama in 2011. Her research interests are intercultural communication and communication in the military. She has recently examined how equal opportunities and diversity is perceived by African American military members.
Email: Meganryanwallace@gmail.com
*Corresponding author.
Address: 130 W. Maxwell Blvd., Maxwell AFB, AL 36112.USA.
Email: Lauren.Mackenzie@maxwell.af.mil

Received 20 July 2011; accepted 27 August 2011

Abstract
The communication of respect has been established as a significant dimension of cross-cultural communication competence. Although there have been several noteworthy studies devoted to the differences in respectful communication across cultures, more research is needed to define and fully understand respect in cross-cultural interaction. The purpose of this article is to provide a strong rationale for the importance of continued study devoted to the communication of respect and to suggest a framework for categorizing the culture-general dimensions of the communication of respect. As such, the article includes a comprehensive literature review synthesizing scholarship devoted to the communication of respect from both academic and professional disciplines. Building on the basis of this literature, a categorization of the various dimensions of the communication of respect is provided in order to inform future research into the interpersonal expression of respect.

Key words: Communication; Respect; Cross-cultural competence

Résumé
La communication de respect a été établi comme une dimension importante de la compétence de la communication interculturelle. Même s'il y a eu plusieurs études remarquables consacrées à des différences dans la communication respectueuse entre les cultures, d'autres recherches sont nécessaires pour définir et comprendre pleinement le respect dans l'interaction interculturelle. Le but de cet article est de fournir une justification solide pour l'importance de la poursuite des études consacrées à la communication de respect et de proposer un cadre pour la catégorisation des dimensions de la culture générale de la communication de respect. En tant que tel, l'article comporte une revue de littérature exhaustive synthétiser des bourses consacrées à la communication de respect de disciplines académiques et professionnels, y compris les domaines de la communication, psychologie sociale, la gestion, l'éducation et la santé. S'appuyant sur la base de cette littérature, une catégorisation des différentes dimensions de la communication de respect est fourni afin d'informer les futures recherches sur l'expression de respect interpersonnel.

Mots-clés: Communication; Le respect; La compétence transculturelle

Lauren Mackenzie, Megan Wallace (2011). The Communication of Respect as a Significant Dimension of Cross-Cultural Communication Competence. *Cross-Cultural Communication, 7*(3), 10-18. Available from: URL: http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/ccc/article/view/j.ccc.1923670020110703.175
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.ccc.1923670020110703.175

Copyright © Canadian Research & Development Center of Sciences and Cultures

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture

INTRODUCTION

The communication of respect has been established as a significant dimension of cross-cultural communication competence (Arasaratnam & Doerfel, 2005; Ruben, 1976). Culture has a profound influence on perceptions of respect, and the ways in which respect is communicated across cultures can take on a variety of forms. It can be communicated verbally (i.e.; appropriate word choice), nonverbally (i.e.; appropriate use of touch during a greeting), and paralinguistically (i.e; appropriate use of intonation during question-asking). Often, it isn't a single instance of disrespectful communication that damages a relationship, but instead a "constellation of interactional features" in cultural practices which communicate disrespect (Bailey, 1997: 329). Although there have been several noteworthy studies devoted to the differences in respectful communication across cultures, more research is needed to define and fully understand respect in cross-cultural interaction.

The purpose of this article is to *provide* a strong rationale for the importance of continued study devoted to the communication of respect and to *suggest* a framework for categorizing the culture-general dimensions of the communication of respect that can be used for future study. As such, the remainder of the article will include a comprehensive literature review synthesizing scholarship devoted to the communication of respect from both academic and professional disciplines including the fields of management, education, healthcare, social psychology and communication. Building on the basis of this literature, a categorization of the various dimensions of the communication of respect will be provided in order to inform future research into the interpersonal expression of respect.

If it is true, as Stewart (2006) writes, that there is a direct connection between the quality of our communication and the quality of our relationships; and that there is a direct connection between the quality of our relationships and the quality of our lives, then respect is the social lubricant enabling the smooth flow from one to the next (van Quaquebeke, Henrich & Eckloff, 2009:197).

1. RATIONALE

Several research projects have marked respect as key to communication competence. In the article *Intercultural communication competence: Identifying key components from multicultural perspectives*, Arasaratnam & Doerfel (2005) set out to define cross-cultural communication competence by asking interviewees from a variety of cultures how they would define it and conducting a semantic analysis. Of interest was the fact that one of the key terms used by interviewees in this particular study to describe good communication was "respect" (with words such as "able", "polite", and "competent" clustering around this dimension (Arasaratnam & Doerfel, 2005:158). However, as stated by de Cremer (2002: 1336) respect is not something people assess themselves, but is *communicated* by other group members. Consequently, he argues, if one feels respected by the person with whom one interacts, this may increase one's motivation to reciprocate the positive relational information by acting more in favor of the group's interest.

A clear rationalization for studying the communication of respect is provided by Manusov's (2008: 315) research on stereotypes. She found that "if people act more favorably than we expected someone from their culture to act, we are likely to judge them based, at least in part, on the positive interaction we had with them rather than on our stereotypes." Further, she notes that "emergent" (p. 319) interaction behaviors (i.e.; the behaviors people actually use in interactions) appear to have quite a strong link with how people judge a conversation and their partners (Manusov, 2008); in other words people have the chance to alter the evaluations others make of them and, potentially, of other people in their group. This statement creates a necessity for communication scholars to devote serious and specific study to the communication of respect across cultures, so as to better understand and promote the power of initial interactions to counteract potential negative stereotypes.

Evidently there are serious consequences related to respect or the lack thereof (Dillon, 2007). Relational success is often dependent on being able to communicate respect and avoiding the communication of disrespect (DeLellis, 2000). Sometimes communicating respect is simply viewed as a means to an end, but the key is for the respected to perceive an unconditional respect rather than feeling manipulated (Dillon, 2003). These unconditional respect messages may be difficult or complicated to send but when respectful communication occurs successfully it almost always leads to positive outcomes (Simon, 2007; van Quaquebeke et al., 2009). Communicating respect can lead to the perception of a successful interaction and competent communicator evaluations (Garcia, 2010) even in often difficult intergroup contexts (Simon, 2007). As such, the inability to skillfully employ respectful communication can compromise co-communicator evaluations of cross-cultural communication competence.

Because respect is a perceived feature of communication in context, asking people in those situations or who have navigated them what worked, what didn't, and what factors of respect are key in these situations is the only way to effectively understand respect (van Quaquebeke et al., 2009). An answer to the scholarly challenge to understand respect, catalog, and measure it in context is needed (DeLellis, 2000). Due to the fact that most bases for understanding and displaying respect imply prior exposure and sustained interaction with a particular person of a similar culture to the subject, there is a deficiency in the scholarship of the communication of

respect (Spears, Ellemers & Doosje, 2005). To properly frame research that focuses on the communication of respect across cultures in an emergent interaction context, a comprehensive review of the scholarship of respect is essential. A variety of scholars from varied disciplines have focused their research on defining respect, understanding the components of respect, and investigating the ways in which respect and disrespect are communicated across cultures. A review of this work follows.

2. A "COMMUNICATION OF RESPECT" LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Respect

Despite its importance and ubiquity (Dillon, 2003), few scholars have devoted significant resources to examining the concept of respect (Lalljee, Lahaṁ & Tam, 2008). Because respect is a socially and psychologically constructed concept, it is defined and understood only in human interaction (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999). As such, interest in the study of respect is developing in humanities and social sciences as well as professional disciplines dependent upon communication. Kantian philosophical perspectives on human interaction and the fundamental human right to be respected laid the groundwork for today's scholarship of respect in the disciplines of communication and social psychology (Dillon, 2003). Respect is simultaneously group and individually defined and oriented (de Cremer, 2002) and is inseparable from communication as there is no way to show respect in the absence of verbal or nonverbal communication in human social interaction (Simon, 2007).

A review of the existing conceptualizations of respect is necessary as a starting point from which to operationalize the communication of respect. Despite the consensus that respect is a social phenomenon, determining a universal conceptualization of the communication of respect has proven problematic. Many researchers allow respect to go undefined, relying entirely on participant perception of the term (Baxter, Dun & Sahistein, 2001; Grosse, 2002; Hartog, 2009; Mercer et al., 2008; Ok, Marks, & Allegrante, 2008; Ota, Giles & Somera, 2007; Yelsma & Yelsma, 1998). This is certainly a testament to the perceived universality of the term. There is a substantial amount of scholarship on politeness (See Watts, 2003 for a comprehensive review of scholarship on politeness). However, the communication of respect is a complex concept going beyond simple politeness and courtesies (Carroll, 2005; Garcia, 2010; Rogers & Lee-Wong, 2003; Thorne, Harris, Mahoney, Con & McGuinness, 2004; Trees, Kerssen-Griep, & Hess, 2009).

Although its prominence is indisputable, the conceptualization and operationalization is anything but consistent. Studying a variable without operationalizing or explicitly defining it renders results unreliable and studies unable to be replicated. Without an explicitly defined variable, the possibility exists that researchers are comparing apples and oranges. Studies that have attempted to measure respect as a construct have done so by aggregating items measuring various attitudes and behaviors. Thorne, et al. (2004) defined it as "the expression of regard for a specific individual" as manifested in listening, recognition of contributing value, awareness of social context, expressing empathy and offering information (p. 301). Salacuse (2005) similarly defines it as the communication of equality, valuation and genuine interest. Beach, Roter, Wang, Duggan & Cooper, (2006) and Gremigni, Sommaruga, & Peltenburg (2008) define the communication of respect as the act of communicating positive regard and recognition of autonomy. Giles, Dailey, Sarkar & Makoni, (2007) define respect as a combination of politeness and deference. Other scholars have cited the communication of respect as occurring through such varied communication behaviors word choice (Bernnardo, 2008; Carroll, 2005; Sriussadaporn-Charoenngam & Jablin, 1999; Longmire, 1992; McCann et al., 2003; Rogers & Lee-Wong, 2003; Thetela, 2003) grammar use (Carroll, 2005; Crystal, 1987 as cited in Carroll, 2005), kinesics (Carroll, 2005; Longmire, 1992), paralanguage (McCann et al., 2003; Thetela, 2003; Rogers & Lee-Wong, 2003), communication style (Sriussadaporn-Charoenngam & Jablin, 1999) and attentiveness (Tamam, 2010).

In a review of the social psychological literature on the concept of respect, the only consensus on the definition of respect was that there was no singular definition (de Cremer, 2002; de Cremer & Muldner, 2007; DeLellis, 2000; Lalljee et al., 2008; Simon, 2007). It is a uniquely human social concept, derived from and defined in communicative interaction (de Cremer, 2002; Garcia, 2010). Several scholars have attempted to define the term by distinguishing its level of variance from closely related synonyms and antonyms including the communication of empathy, perspective taking (Simon, 2007), encouragement, cooperation (Dreikurs Ferguson & Page, 2003), politeness (Lalljee et al., 2008), dignified treatment (Simon & Sturmer, 2005) appreciation, admiration, esteem, honor, reverence, deference, fear (DeLellis, 2000), liking, equality (Spears et al., 2005), and tolerance (van Quaquebeke et al., 2009). Unfortunately operationally defining a concept or construct simply by explaining what it is not is neither logically nor scientifically sound. Simon (2007) claims that the term itself is enigmatic and asserts that respect "means different things to different people and not seldom it means different things to the same person in different discursive contexts" (Simon, 2007: 309). It is the specific context of emergent cross-cultural interaction that is such a problematic landscape to understand the communication of respect because most

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture

available definitions of respect involve value judgments formed from sufficient knowledge about and contact with an individual in order to form opinions based on feelings and shared cultural values. It is in the search for an operationalization appropriate for initial interaction that the need for a culture-general component-based formula definition emerges.

Although a consensus definition of the concept is not available in the current academic literature, many social psychological scholars agree that there are two major components to the communication of respect: attitudinal and interactional (Simon, 2007). A useful formula for defining respect is offered by Dillon (2003) who defines respect as "a relation between a subject and object in which the subject responds to the object from a certain perspective in some appropriate way" (Dillon, 2003: 3). The attitudinal response is comprised of the subject's beliefs, attitudes, emotions, and motives while the interactional component is the way the subject's attitudinal response and motives are communicated to the object. Because the definition and conceptualization of respect is so multi-faceted, idiosynchratic, and contextually dependent, each attempt to study the phenomenon of respect will have to have a participant-derived definition drawn from the environmental context currently under examination. It is here that the cross-cultural communication perspective excels.

Cross-Cultural Study

One of the earliest comprehensive cross-cultural communicative competence frameworks was developed by Ruben (1976) who outlined seven behavioral dimensions of cross-cultural competence: display of respect, interaction posture, orientation to knowledge, empathy, self-oriented behavior, interaction management, and tolerance for ambiguity. Several years later, Ruben & Kealey (1979) expanded the behavioral model to nine dimensions by dividing "self-oriented behavior" into three distinct dimensions: task-related roles, relational roles, and individualistic roles. In their study "Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation", they found that two dimensions, display of respect and interaction management, predicted how participants adjusted to their surrounding culture (Ruben & Kealey, 1979). This is the first and most directly stated study correlating "display of respect" with cross-cultural communication competence.

Some important psychological components of personal perception of respect are competence and warmth (Fiske et al., 1999) which roughly translate to effectiveness and appropriateness in the discipline of communication. Both effectiveness and appropriateness are culturally variant. Situational factors such as cultural preferences, location, and environment (i.e. context) affect the likelihood of respectful interaction (Dreikurs, Ferguson & Page, 2003). Assigning positive and negative valence, (i.e. respectful or disrespectful labels) to behaviors is a culturally dependent process that occurs only in context because those evaluations rely on the perception of the co-communicator (Simon, 2007). Respect messages are often difficult or complicated to send (Simon, 2007). This is only made more difficult due to the cultural variability in the perception of respect because each culture has a specific orientation to what constitutes respectful communication in that sphere of experience (DeLellis, 2000; Thorne et al., 2004).

Although many scholars have conducted research surrounding the communication of respect, the main difference is that practitioners in the field of cross-cultural communication take communication to be not only their primary data but moreover, their primary theoretical concern (Carbaugh, 2007). As described by Carbaugh (1988: 40):

> The culture concept is used best in our empirical studies when it describes communication patterns of action and meaning that are deeply felt, commonly intelligible, and widely accessible, and when it explores situated contexts of use through conceptual frames, treats cultural terms as focal concerns, and exploits the benefits of comparative study.

As such, there have been a variety of Ethnography of Communication (EC) studies surrounding the communication of respect that are communication-centered in their data collection, methodology, and analysis. In line with the EC philosophy of communication, a focus on not just what communicates respect but *how* respect is (appropriately) communicated, has been examined by EC scholars. Research and writing from an EC perspective examines how respect is communicated *in interaction* and has focused primarily on asymmetry in cross-cultural expectations regarding respectful communication.

For example, an EC-based chapter devoted to the communication of respect within a military context is Miller and Mackenzie's (2009: 5) "The seventh sense: Understanding cultural differences" which provides an example of an cross-cultural dialogue between a U.S.American Air Force Captain and his Korean counterpart in order to illustrate the cultural differences in communicating respect. The authors note that for many Koreans, respect is communicated via: *formality* (especially in introductions), *using the correct name* (i.e.; not one's given name unless it is a close friend and/or informal setting), and *acknowledging one's age and status* (i.e.; treating elders with deference). Whereas for many U.S.Americans, respect is communicated in initial interactions by *treating others as equals* (i.e.; using first names instead of titles) and *expressing sincere pleasure* in making a new acquaintance (i.e.; smiling, shaking hands, and using direct, verbal communication in expressing politeness). A portion of Miller and Mackenzie's article draws from Kim's (1998: 208) work which discusses the Korean value of "neutrality of expression" when

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture

among strangers. This can be somewhat confusing for U.S.Americans who are accustomed to waving and smiling politely at strangers (when walking in their neighborhood, for instance) and can be perceived as rude or disrespectful while in Korean culture, for many men, smiling can be perceived as a sign of weakness.

This cross-cultural complication is highlighted in Bailey's (1997) article *Communication of Respect in Interethnic Service Encounters*. In his study, he looks at the contrasting communicative practices of politeness and respect by Koreans (K) and African Americans (AA). Bailey's fieldwork is conducted at K-owned convenience stores where many retailers interviewed had been robbed at gunpoint by their AA customers. The results of his study highlight the point that because neither cultural group understood each other's values, respect was not effectively communicated – and the lack of respect was interpreted as threatening. Several examples of interactional features that communicated disrespect in service encounters were as follows: AA culture often privileges "involvement politeness" (i.e.; laughter, animation, joking) whereas K often use "restraint politeness" (i.e.; silence, terse verbal response, if any).

These communicative differences and mismatch in politeness orientations, when interpreted through culture-specific frameworks, often reinforced stereotypes of Korean store-owners as unfriendly and racist, and of African American customers as selfish and poor-mannered. In fact, Bailey found that the communicative devices used by K's caused AA's to react by intensifying the opposing behavior and vice versa. Further, the lack of knowledge/awareness of how values and respect are communicated led to many individuals being robbed at gunpoint and to the boycotting of stores (Bailey, 1997).

A similar study conducted by Griefat & Katriel (1989) examines distinct communication styles employed by Arab and Israeli Jews. *Musayara* is a preferred form of interaction for many Arabs surveyed in this study, Israeli Jews prefer *dugri* speech. The authors state (p. 124) that verbal acts of *musayara* are characterized by "conversational restraint" (i.e.; deference as well as the avoidance of interruption and topic shifts) and "conversational effusiveness" (interactional tactics that dramatize and intensify interpersonal bonds such as affectionate forms of address as well as the effusive use of many layers of greetings). *Dugri* speech, however, privileges "straight talk" that is "direct", "sincere", and "straightforward" in nature. The Arabs in this study note that this style "smacks of unfathomable literal-mindedness" (p. 135). The unmatching assumptions surrounding politeness and respect illustrated in this study offer insight into why: "intercultural encounters between Arabs and Jews are all too often deflected due to conflicting cultural communication styles" (p. 132).

There are a variety of other EC studies. See, for example, Chen (1990/1991) for thick description devoted to how politeness and respect are interactionally accomplished at the Chinese dinner table; see also Wilkins (2005) for an analysis of the key nonverbal aspects connected to "the optimal form" for respectful communication in Finland. In addition to EC scholarship, communication scholars using a variety of methods have contributed to the understanding of diverse cultural orientations to respect as well as the cross-cultural variance in how respect is communicated. Respectful behavior is defined differently and these differences and the problems related to them are described in cross-cultural research comparing the perception of respect in Cambodia and the United States (Longmire, 1992), in Thailand, Japan, and the United States (McCann et al., 2003), and in Japan, the Phillipines and the United States (Ota et al., 2007). Many cultural orientations to respectful verbal communication are shifting, especially as it relates to communicated respect that is age or status-dependant in India (Giles et al., 2007), Japan (Carroll, 2005), and Romanic language speaking European nations (Crystal, 1987 as cited in Carroll, 2005: 235). Despite cross-cultural differences, research in culturally diverse Malaysia has shown that respect is indicated as a significant element of communication competence (Chua, 2004; Tamam, 2010). This, combined with the comparative scholarship, lends support to the universality of the human desire to be the recipient of respectful communication.

Consequences of Respect and Disrespect

Academics agree that there are serious consequences related to respect or the lack thereof and therefore the phenomenon merits scholarly attention (Dillon, 2007). Relational success is often dependent on being able to communicate respect and avoiding the communication of disrespect (DeLellis, 2000). When respect is communicated successfully, it is highly likely that no negative consequences will occur (van Quaquebeke et al., 2009). Communicating respect leads to the perception of a successful interaction and can even have a "social healing effect" on the psychological perceptions of previously strained relationships (Simon, 2007).

In recognizing the significant outcomes of communicating respect, several professional disciplines have addressed respect empirically and theoretically. This scholarship has added significantly to understanding the consequences of the practical application of respectful communication in cross-cultural contexts. The Harvard Busniness School published a report touting respect as a key building block of successful international business practice (Salacuse, 2005). Respect was cited as important in managing superior-subordinate relationships in culturally diverse organizations (Rogers & Lee-Wong, 2003) as well as in facilitating communication in virtual intercultural teams (Grosse, 2002). Education scholars have linked respect to student treatment of teachers (Martinez-Egger & Powers, 2007) as well as evaluation of

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture

instructors (Trees, Kerssen-Griep & Hess, 2009). Health communication has also been a field that has increasingly focused on the consequences of respect. Competent healthcare is dependent on effective physician-patient interaction (Mercer et.al., 2008) and communicating respect was found to be among the most important factors patients considered when evaluating their satisfaction with their provider's care (Gremigni et al., 2008; Ok et al., 2008; Thorne et al., 2004; Weismannn, Haidet, Branch, Gracey & Frankel, 2010).

This review of the literature firmly establishes the communication of respect as an important component of competent communication, both interpersonally and professionally. This article seeks not only to recognize the important work devoted to the communication of respect that has already been published, but also to call for more work to be done. The authors will now suggest a framework for categorizing the key dimensions of the communication of respect to help guide future work.

3. FRAMEWORK FOR CATEGORIZING THE KEY DIMENSIONS OF THE COMMUNICATION OF RESPECT

One of the key conceptual frameworks devoted to the communication of respect is presented by van Quaquebeke et al. (2009) which distinguished respect from tolerance and elaborates on two distinct types of respect. Whereas tolerance is aligned with appraisal, respect is more closely aligned with recognition. Originally stated by Darwall (1977), appraisal respect is evaluative and focuses on a result, while recognition respect is more process-focused and occurs in interaction. van Quaquebeke et al. (2009: 197) characterize these differences as "the vertical kind of appraisal respect" (which is concerned with one's decision to evaluate another positively or negatively) and "the horizontal kind of recognition respect" (which is concerned more with perceiving and responding to another as an equal). This distinction between tolerance and respect, vertical and horizontal, as well as appraisal and recognition, are illustrated in the table below:

Table 1
Tolerance vs. Respect

Tolerance	Respect
Vertical	Horizontal
Appraisal Respect	Recognition Respect
Focus on Results	Focus on Process and Interaction

Additionally, scholars have aligned respect with over 16 different terms (for citations, see preceding literature review). These terms are distinguishable according to their emphasis on "recognition respect" (focus on process and interaction) and "appraisal respect" (focus on results) as differentiated by van Quaquebeke et al (2009):

Table 2
Recognition vs. Appraisal Respect

Recognition Respect (focus on process)	Appraisal Respect (focus on results)
Communication of empathy, perspective-taking, encouragement, cooperation, appreciation, honor, equality	Able, polite, competent, dignified treatment, admiration, esteem, reverence, deference, liking

To be clear, the authors of this article are placing emphasis on the "horizontal", interactional nature of how respect is communicated. The tables above illustrate how respect has been defined and differentiated from tolerance and acceptance. In their study, Weissmann et al., (2010) went beyond simply defining respect and had patients describe specific physician behaviors they perceived as respectful or disrespectful. This information has been beneficial in developing physician education and training programs, but no research has been performed examining what general communication behaviors communicate respect cross-culturally. From a culture-general communication perspective, the following quadrant captures four domains of communication competence that determine how respect is communicated interpersonally. It is a proposed framework for conceptualizing the dimensions of the communication of respect.

Table 3
Framework for Categorizing the Dimensions of the Communication of Respect

Verbal Communication	Non-verbal Communication
i.e.; appropriate use of title, conversation topic, word choice, etc. in both formal and informal settings.	i.e.; appropriate use of space (proxemics), touch (haptics), time (chronemics), gestures (kinesics), and dress (attire) in both formal and informal settings.
Paralanguage	**Interaction Management**
i.e.; appropriate use of intonation, volume, pauses, silence, word emphasis, rate of speech in both formal and i nformal settings.	i.e.; appropriate turn-taking, back-channeling, conversation initiation, and termination in both formal and informal settings.

This suggested framework provides a structure for examining communicative conduct and culturally appropriate displays of interpersonal respect. As mentioned in the introduction, it often isn't a single instance of disrespectful communication that damages a relationship, but instead a "constellation of interactional features" in cultural practices which communicate disrespect (Bailey, 1997: 329). The framework provided here can be used to guide future study as well as to better prepare individuals to communicate respect through the appropriate use of verbal and nonverbal communication, paralanguage and interaction management. If used appropriately and

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture

effectively, and researched in advance of a cross-cultural interaction, this small "constellation" can lead to smoother conversations, and potentially, smoother relationships.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this article was to present a strong rationale for the need to develop scholarship devoted to understanding the communication of respect from a culture-general perspective to facilitate more effective initial cross-cultural interaction. It also provided a comprehensive literature review of the scholarship on respect, and suggested a framework for categorizing the dimensions of the communication of respect that can be used by cross-cultural communication scholars in future research. After reviewing existing frameworks and categorizing the variety of terms associated with respect, a new framework was suggested consisting of four culturally-universal "constellations" of communicative conduct including: verbal and nonverbal communication, paralanguage, and interaction management. Taken together, they characterize the various ways in which respect can be communicated in a cross-cultural interaction.

This article provides scholars of cross-cultural communication further insight into respect, a very significant dimension of cross-cultural communication competence. This is accomplished by amassing a comprehensive collection of the extant literature from diverse disciplines devoted to both the communication of respect and the conceptualization and operationalization of the term. It also serves as a call for future research, particularly in the discipline of communication, dedicated to examining the communication of respect across cultures in emergent interaction contexts.

REFERENCES

Arasaratnam, L., & Doerfel, M. (2005). Cross-Cultural Communication Competence: Identifying Key Components from Multicultural Perspectives. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Relations, 29*, 137-163.

Bailey, B. (1997). Communication of Respect in Interethnic Service Encounters. *Language in Society, 26*(3), 327-356.

Baxter, L. A., Dun, T., & Sahistein, E. (2001). Rules for Relating Communicated Among Social Network Members. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18*(2), 173-199. Doi: 10.1177/0265407501182002

Beach, M., Roter, D., Wang, N., Duggan, P., & Cooper, L. (2006). Are Physicians' Attitudes of Respect Accurately Perceived by Patients and Associated With More Positive Communication Behaviors? *Patient Education and Counseling, 62*(3), 347-354. Doi: 10.1016/J.Pec.2006.06.004

Bernnardo, G. (2008). Metaphors, Source Domains, and Key Words in Tongan Speech About Social Relationships: Of a 'Love' Is Giving. *Anthropological Linguistics, 50*(2).

Carbaugh, D. (1988). Comments on "Culture" in Communication Inquiry. *Communication Reports, 1*(1), 38-41.

Carbaugh, D. (2007). Cultural Discourse Analysis: Communication Practices and Cross-Cultural Encounters. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Communication Research, 36*(3), 167-182.

Carroll, T. (2005). Beyond Keigo: Smooth Communication and the Expression of Respect in Japanese as a Foreign Language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 233-247.

Chen, V. (1990/1991). Mien Tze at the Chinese Dinner Table: A Study of the Interactional Accomplishment of Face. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 24*, 109-140.

Chua, C. M. (2004). The Malaysian Communication Competence Construct. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 33*(3), 131-146.

Darwall, S. (1977). *Two Kinds of Respect. Ethics, 88* (1), 36-49.

De Cremer, D. (2002). Respect and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas: The Importance of Feeling Included. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(10), 1335-1341.

De Cremer, D., & Muldner, L. B. (2007). A Passion for Respect: On Understanding the Role of Human Needs and Morality. *Gruppendynamik Und Organisationsberatung, 38*(4), 439-449.

Delellis, A. J. (2000). Clarifying the Concept of Respect: Implications for Leadership. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(2), 35-49.

Dillon, R. S. (2003). Respect. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy/Fall 2010 Edition.* Retrieved May 3, 2011, from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2010/entries/respect.

Dillon, R. S. (2007). Respect: A Philosophical Perspective. *Gruppendynamik Und Organisationsberatung, 38*(2), 201-212.

Dreikurs Ferguson, E., & Page, L. J. (2003). Work Relationships, Lifestyle, and Mutual Respect. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 59*(4), 501-506.

Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick (1999). (Dis) Respecting Versus (Dis)Liking: Status and Interdependence Predict Ambivalent Stereotypes of Competence and Warmth. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 473-489.

Garcia, C. (2010). "Cuente Conmigo": The Expression of Sympathy by Peruvian Spanish Speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*, 408-425.

Giles, H., Dailey, R., Sarkar, J., & Makoni, S. (2007). Intergenerational Communication Beliefs Across the Lifespan: Comparative Data from India. *Communication Reports, 20*(2), 75-89. Doi: 10.1080/08934210701643701

Gremigni, P., Sommaruga, M., & Peltenburg, M. (2008). Validation of the Health Care Communication Questionnaire (HCCQ) To Measure Outpatients' Experience of Communication With Hospital Staff. *Patient Education and Counseling, 71*(1), 57-64. Doi: 10.1016/J.Pec.2007.12.008

Griefat, Y. & Katriel, T. (1989). Life Demands Musayara: Communication and Culture Among Arabs in Israel. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.) *Language, Communication, and Culture: Current Directions.* Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grosse, C. U. (2002). Managing Communication Within Virtual Intercultural Teams. *Business Communication Quarterly, 65*(4), 22-38. Doi: 10.1177/108056990206500404

Hartog, C. S. (2009). Elements of Effective Communication—Rediscoveries from Homeopathy. *Patient Education and Counseling, 77*(2), 172-178. Doi: 10.1016/J.Pec.2009.03.021

Kim, M. (1998). A Comparative Analysis of Nonverbal Expressions as Portrayed by Korean and American Print-Media Advertising. In J. Martin, T. Nakayama, and L. Flores (Eds) *Readings in Cultural Contexts* (P. 206-217). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Lalljee, M., Laham, S. M., & Tam, T. (2008). Unconditional Respect for Persons: A Social Psychological Analysis. *Gruppendynamik Und Organisationsberatung, 38*(4), 451-464.

Longmire, B. J. (1992). Communicating Social Identity in a Job Interview in a Cambodian-American Community. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 3*(1), 49-58.

Manusov, V. (2008). Stereotypes and Nonverbal Cues: Showing How We Feel About Others During Cross-Cultural Interactions. In L. Guerrero & M. Hecht (Eds.) *The Nonverbal Communication Reader*, (Pp. 314-320). Langrove, IL: Waveland Press.

Martinez-Egger, A. D., & Powers, W. G. (2007). Student Respect for a Teacher: Measurement and Relationships to Teacher Credibility and Classroom Behavior Perceptions. *Human Communication, 10*(2).

Mccann, R. M., Ota, H., Giles, H., & Caraker, R. (2003). Accommodation and Nonaccommodation Across the Lifespan: Perspectives from Thailand, Japan, and the United States of America. *Communication Reports, 16*(2), 69-91.

Mercer, L., Tanabe, P., Pang, P., Gisondi, M., Courtney, D., Engel, K., ... Makoul, G. (2008). Patient Perspectives on Communication With the Medical Team: Pilot Study Using the Communication Assessment Tool-Team (CAT-T). *Patient Education and Counseling, 73*(2), 220-223. Doi: 10.1016/J.Pec.2008.07.003

Miller, J. & Mackenzie, L. (2009). The Seventh Sense: Understanding Cultural Differences. *Squadron Officer College Expeditionary Leadership Coursebook*. Maxwell AFB: Air University.

Ok, H., Marks, R., & Allegrante, J. (2008). Perceptions of Health Care Provider Communication Activity Among American Cancer Survivors and Adults Without Cancer Histories: An Analysis of the 2003 Health Information Trends Survey (HINTS) Data. *Journal of Health Communication, 13*(7), 637-653. Doi: 10.1080/10810730802412172

Ota, H., Giles, H., & Somera, L. P. (2007). Beliefs About Intra- and Intergenerational Communication in Japan, The Philippines, and the United States: Implication for Older Adults' Subjective Well-Being. *Communication Studies, 58*(2), 173-188. Doi: 10.1080/10510970701341139

Rogers, P., & Lee-Wong, S. (2003). Reconceptualizing Politeness To Accommodate Dynamic Tensions in Subordinate-To-Superior Reporting. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 17*(4), 379-412.

Ruben, B. (1976). Assessing Communication Competency for Cross-Cultural Adaptation. *Group & Organization Studies, 1*, 334-354.

Ruben, B. & Kealey, D. (1979). Behavioral Assessment of Communication Competency and the Prediction of Cross-Cultural Adaptation. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Relations, 3*, 15-48.

Salacuse, J. W. (2005). The Deal is Done - Now What? *Negotiation*, 3-5.

Simon, B. (2007). Respect, Equality, and Power: A Social Psychological Perspective. *Gruppendynamik Und Organisationsberatung, 38*(3), 309-326.

Simon, B., & StÜRmer, S. (2003). Respect for Group Members: Intragroup Determinants of Collective Identification and Group-Serving Behavior. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(2), 183-193.

Spears, R., Ellemers, N., & Doosje, B. (2005). Let Me Count the Ways in Which I Respect Thee: Does Competence Compensate Or Compromise Lack of Liking from the Group? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(2), 263-279.

Sriussadaporn-Charoenngam, N., & Jablin, F. M. (1999). An Exploratory Study of Communication Competence in Thai Organizations. *Journal of Business Communication, 36*(4), 382-418. Doi: 10.1177/002194369903600404

Stewart, J. (2006). *Bridges Not Walls: A Book About Interpersonal Communication*. Boston: Mcgraw-Hill.

Tamam, E. (2010). Examining Chen and Starosta's Model of Intercultural Sensitivity in a Multiracial Collectivistic Country. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 39*(3).

Thetela. (2003). Discourse, Culture and the Law: The Analysis of Crosstalk in the Southern African Bilingual Courtroom. *AILA Law Review, 16*, 78-88.

Thorne, S., Harris, S., Mahoney, K., Con, A., & Mcguinness, L. (2004). The Context of Health Care Communication in Chronic Illness. *Patient Education and Counseling, 54*(3), 299-306. Doi: 10.1016/J.Pec.2003.11.009

Trees, A., Kerssen-Griep, J., & Hess, J. (2009). Earning Influence by Communicating Respect: Facework's Contributions To Effective Instructional Feedback. *Communication Education, 58*(3), 397-416. Doi: 10.1080/03634520802613419

Van Quaquebeke, N., Henrich, D. C., & Eckloff, T. (2009). "It's Not Tolerance I'm Asking For, It's Respect!" a Conceptual Framework To Differentiate Between Tolerance, Acceptance and Respect. *Gruppendynamik Und Organisationsberatung, 38*(2), 185-200.

Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weissmann:F., Haidet, P., Branch, W. T., Gracey, C., & Frankel, R. (2010). Teaching Humanism on the Wards: What Patients Value in Outstanding Attending Physicians. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare, 3*(3), 291-299.

Wilkins, R. (2005). The Optimal Form: Inadequacies and

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture

Excessiveness Within the Asiallinen [Matter of Fact] Nonverbal Style in Public and Civic Settings in Finland. *Journal of Communication, 55*, 383-401.

Yelsma, P., & Yelsma, J. (1998). Self-Esteem and Social Respect Within the High School. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 138*(4), 431-441.

Copyright © Canadian Academy of Oriental and Occidental Culture