Social and Cultural Context of Intercultural Counselling

R. Vance Peavy
University of Victoria
Han Z. Li
University of Northern British Columbia

ABSTRACT

In this article, we argue two points. First, successful intercultural counselling depends on how well the counsellor understands the social contextual factors surrounding the interaction. Second, intercultural counselling is a collaborative process, the success of which depends on how well the counsellor and clients coordinate their communication on process and content. Counsellor knowledge of social and cultural contextual variables contributes to common ground with the client. However, it is the counsellor's ability to monitor and attune to the moment-by-moment changes of counselling discourse that contributes most to the success of an intercultural counselling session.

RÉSUMÉ

Dans cet article, nous faisons valoir deux points de vue. Premièrement, le succès du counseling interculturel est fonction de la compréhension par le conseiller des facteurs contextuels sociaux relatifs à l'interaction. Deuxièmement, le counseling interculturel est un processus de collaboration dont la réussite dépend de la capacité du conseiller et de celle du client à coordonner leur communication quant au processus et à son contenu. Une bonne connaissance des variables contextuelles sociales et culturelles de la part du conseiller contribue à l'établissement d'un terrain d'entente avec le client. Toutefois, c'est l'habileté du conseiller d'être à l'affût des changements pouvant survenir à tout moment dans le cours de l'entretien et sa capacité d'« accorder » sa réaction avec ces changements qui contribuent le plus au succès d'une séance de counseling interculturelle.

In North American counselling literature, the terms "cross-cultural" and "multicultural" are used as descriptors for counselling which occurs when counsellor and client are members of different cultures. These descriptors frequently contain two assumptions about which we are sceptical. The first is that the principal barrier to effective counselling between members of different cultures is a matter of language difference. This is a popular belief that many hold and we do not think that it is justified. As Lakoff (2000) has noted, language is not "just words." How language is used tells us how we are connected, and who has power and who doesn't. The use of language has as much to do with cultural coding as it does with grammar and semantics.

A second assumption implied by these terms is that "standard" counselling techniques and skills of mainstream counselling approaches can, and should be adapted to fit the multicultural counselling situation and that this adaptation will result in multi-, cross-cultural counselling efficacy. This second assumption bears examination and deconstruction. Although a large body of literature has built up around the topics of multi- and cross-cultural counselling, there is scant

reason to believe that the quality of counselling being given to minority culture clients has improved, because the approach often used is simply a transfer of mainstream counselling methods to multi-cultural counselling situations. There has been extensive criticism of this Eurocentric tendency together with recommendations for remedy. (Sue & Sue, 1990; Sue, Ivey, & Pedersen, 1996; Das, 1997; Ivey, A. E., Bradford Ivey, M., & Simek-Morgan, L. 1997; Peavy, 1998; Li & Brown, 2000).

In this article we make two arguments. First, successful intercultural counselling depends on how well the counsellor understands the social contextual factors surrounding the interaction. This highlights the need for a perspective of "cultural attunement" proposed by Hoskins (1999). This perspective urges us to recognize oppression, act toward culturally different others with respect and humility, and maintain an openly curious and reverent attitude toward difference. Intercultural counselling occurs between two people of different cultural backgrounds. Thus the context of this communication is entirely different from intracultural counselling which refers to counselling between members of the same culture.

The second argument is that counselling is a collaborative process the success of which depends on how well the counsellor and client coordinate on process and content (Clark & Brennan, 1991). To facilitate the moment-by-moment understanding of the conversation (Clark & Brennan, 1991), the counsellor needs to know the client's cultural rules of conversation or learns these rules in the process of the conversation. We will discuss how culturally embedded rules of conversation other than language can hinder or facilitate effective intercultural counselling. To emphasize the reciprocal, negotiating nature of counselling, we use the term intercultural for counselling discourse between culturally different individuals.

SOCIAL CONTEXTUAL FACTORS OF INTERCULTURAL COUNSELLING

All cultures have developed methods of "helping" or culture-specific methods for dealing with human misery (Kleinman, 1988). Members of different cultures vary considerably in language, customs, food, dress, family patterns, music, work habits, health repair, spirituality, and gender relations. Consequently, what "helping" means and how helping is practiced is always culturally defined.

Mainstream American and Euro-Canadian counselling approaches tend to mirror the beliefs, values, and expectations of white, middle-class, privileged majority culture members. There is evidence that counselling theories and methods which are the products of middle-class counsellor education and practice are not culturally relevant when applied to minority-culture clients (Wohl, 1989).

Interestingly, when confronted with clients from cultures different from their own, counsellors typically claim language incompatibility as the chief obstacle to understanding. Of course, language incompatibility often exists and does interfere with mutual understanding. However, we believe that it is not as important a determinant of success or failure in counselling as cultural incompatibility and

lack of knowledge of cultural codes in relating and communicating. Many main-stream counsellors do not know much about the cultural communication styles and the expectations of help-seekers from cultures other than their own (Sue & Sue, 1990; Pedersen, 1994).

Christine Hall (1997) has written about "cultural malpractice." She points out that unless psychology, and those activities such as counselling which use psychology as a theoretical base, change their approach to culturally different people, the current theories and practices will become increasingly obsolete and irrelevant for larger and larger numbers of people.

Christine Hall (1997) recommends that all practitioner-training programs should work toward the goal of "cultural competency." In her view culturally competent counsellors and other helping professionals must understand the impact on individuals of the following ten cultural dimensions: (a) cultural membership, including foods, music, customs, ceremonies, and spiritual/religious beliefs; (b) family structure, including gender roles and child rearing practices; (c) language of origin and literacy in majority language; (d) identity processes, including individual variations; (e) medical, personal helping, and healing proclivities; (f) relevance of testing and other assessment procedures; (g) oppression and political issues; (h) stigma of status and social location; (i) socio-economic differences within groups and between minority and majority memberships; and (j) majority culture-minority culture relations.

Expanding upon Hall's observations, Peavy (1998) has formulated four theses underlying effective intercultural counselling.

Thesis I. Intercultural counselling demands that the counsellor be able to navigate in two cultures — one's own and a secondary culture. To do so, the counsellor must have prior, or acquire, knowledge of the help seeker's personal as well as cultural expectations. Counsellors cannot always be expected to have prior knowledge or to be immediately knowledgeable about the culture of each minority culture member whom they encounter. However, they can be expected to be watchful for, and open to, the cultural nuances that will facilitate a workable counselling encounter. The capacity to "learn from the other" is the key for a counsellor to interact competently in intercultural situations.

Thesis II. Intercultural counselling research, training, and practice should take a holistic, unified perspective. Holism and inclusion should prevail over reductionism and classificatory practices in counselling.

Many cultures other than mainstream North American culture do not separate the mind from body, thinking from feeling, and theory from practice. Western psychologists and counsellors have a proclivity for classificatory practices such as diagnostic manuals and carefully bounded specialties. For example, many members of indigenous cultures such as Canada's First Nations have a worldview in which human life and nature are inter-related. Spirituality and symbolism are fused into their ideas of traditional healing. Thus, they tend to prefer intuitive counselling to majority-culture rationalistic counselling (Peavy, 1994). If majority culture counsellors and psychologists are unaware and unappreciative

of these factors, they are certainly going to frustrate themselves and their help seekers.

Thesis III. Many minority culture members experience some degree of marginalization, oppression, racial and ethnic discrimination, and economic inequality. In certain historical periods, entire minority populations have been objects of dominant majority oppression (e.g., Japanese-Canadians in Canada during World War II; indigenous peoples in nearly every majority culture, historically and at present).

The counselling and therapy methods derived from conventional psychology leave much to be desired as models for counselling with minority culture members. Most notably, all such models are implicitly based on middle class values and urge clients to comply with majority culture norms (Fancher, 1995; Pedersen, 1994). This can be interpreted as a form of cultural oppression.

Counselling with an emancipatory theme can offset the oppressive features of conventional counselling and therapy (Prilleltensky & Gonick, 1994). Emancipatory means that the counsellor assists the helpseeker to identify and find ways of overcoming both internal unfreedoms such as low esteem and undeveloped capacity, and external unfreedoms such as prejudice, poverty, and oppressive relationships.

A just and progressive society should allow its members to construct themselves from multiple values and ideals such as equality, authenticity, and diversity. The realization of these ideals depends upon people's ability to exercise choice and whether they have a legitimized voice and position in society. Choice and voice are muted and constrained under conditions of oppression. Counselling with an emancipatory theme can assist intercultural clients — not only to recognize and legitimate their own experience of oppression, marginalization, and discrimination, but to actively strive to overcome these conditions.

Thesis IV. Constructivist counselling practice (Peavy, 1997) is a promising perspective for intercultural counselling. First, constructivist counselling is a form of discourse located in a particular cultural context. It is counselling which finds sensibility in the culturally mediated communication of the participants. Second, constructivist counselling is premised on multiple realities. It depends more on the dictates of cultural knowledge than on the claims of universal scientific knowledge. Third, constructivist counselling is receptive to myth, symbol and metaphor — it eschews the "authoritative" voices and vocabularies of professional and academic psychology, as well as the pathologizing vocabularies of psychiatry and psychotherapy.

Based on experience in teaching constructivist counselling to counsellors in language schools and refugee and immigration centres in Denmark and Sweden over a six-year period, Peavy (1999) has identified constructivist principles that facilitate intercultural counselling. (a) respect for difference and diversity; (b) openness to a range of possible ways of interpreting reality; (c) encouragement of creativity, inventiveness and cultural resonance; (d) sense of real-life engagement; (e) resistance to negative effects of any final classification or categorisation; (f) helping based more on cultural than psychological hypotheses; (g) direct use

of language tools and social artefacts; (h) cooperation and consensus rather than authority and imposition; and (i) helping construed as emacipatory and capacity-building in intention.

Communication can be defined as the practice of producing meaning. Culture can be understood as the totality of communication practices and system of meaning (Schirato & Yell, 2000). Communication and culture shape and manifest each other. Intercultural counselling is concerned at once with "communication practices" and "cultural meanings" and is an interactional achievement, based largely on the negotiation of meanings. In the following sections, we discuss cultural-contextual issues that are core to intercultural counselling: self-construal, communication styles and miscommunication, silence, turn-taking and interrupting, and grounding.

Self-Construal

Individuals in Western cultures tend to construe the self individualistically with reference to their inner thoughts, feelings, and actions. In contrast, members of more "collectivistic" cultures tend to perceive the self as part of a social network. The self is, to a large extent, organized and determined by "what the actor perceives to be the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p.227). In a recent study, Li (1998) found that, compared with Anglo-Canadians, Chinese are much more likely to express closeness to, and interdependence with, family. These differences in self-construal can lead to serious miscommunication in counselling discourse. An example is the Canadian counsellor who insists on the client taking responsibility for her decisions as an individual actor while the collectivist culture client is inclined to make "group" decisions in consultation with family members.

Communication Styles and Miscommunication

As humans converse according to culturally shaped rules for discourse (Labov & Fanshel, 1977), intercultural counselling is bound to display different conversation styles than intracultural counselling. These culturally defined conversation styles can seriously hinder the success of intercultural interaction. In an early study of intercultural communication, Erickson (1975) videotaped interviews where community college students were discussing career choice and course selections with counsellors. He found that conversations proceeded more smoothly when the dyads were of the same culture (for example, two Italians) and less smoothly when the counsellor and client came from different cultures. Miscommunication in the interviews was attributed to a lack of rhythmic coordination, not lack of language understanding. Later investigations by Gumperz (1978) identified the importance of "synchronized exchanges" in conversation. Peavy (1994) found that lack of synchronized exchanges characterized communication failure in counselling where the counsellor is a majority Canadian culture member and the clients are First Nations culture members. Specifically, this

was shown by opposing interpretations of the same segments of counselling discourse as indicated by the following comparative comments when asked about specific interactions in the interview segment:

Interaction 1

First Nations client: The counsellor is asking too many questions.
Counsellor: The client resisting counselling by not replying

Interaction 2

First Nations client: The counsellor talks too much.
Counsellor: The client won't talk.

Interaction 3

First Nations client: The counsellor kept staring at me.
Counsellor: The client would not look at me.

Clearly, something is amiss here. The counsellor comes from a culture and training that advocates questioning, flow of speech, and direct eye contact. By contrast, the client comes from a culture in which questioning is moderated, talking is often replaced by respectful silence, and eye contact is regarded as a personal violation. On the basis of twenty years of research on inter-cultural communication in North America and Asia, Scollon and Scollon (1995) pointed out that "most communication doesn't arise through mispronunciation or through poor uses of grammar . . . rather it lies in differences in patterns of discourse"(p.xii). Tannen (1981) studied Greek-American conversations and found that miscommunication was attributable to directness-indirectness differences. North American styles of communication do not leave much room for ambiguity. The typical North American speaker (including counsellors) has a "get to the point," "don't beat around the bush," "don't give me flowery language" style of listening and discourse interpretation. According to Tannen (1981), miscommunication comes not just from lack of similar language fluency, but from the listener's lack of "sociocultural knowledge," and thus misinterpretation, of what the speaker had to say. Knowledge of culturally specific rules of discourse (Labov & Fanshel, 1977) allows one to feel at ease in conversation.

Silence

It is typical for North Americans to respond to silence with talk, which may be a continuation of the same topic or an introduction of a new topic in order to overcome their discomfort. Many novice counsellors who simply "fill" silence with words commonly take this approach. To deal with silence competently, one needs to know the cultural variations in the meanings attributed to silence.

Lebra (1987) has pointed out that in Japanese culture, silence is used to save a person from revealing the truth, thus avoiding embarrassment and social disapproval. In traditional Japanese culture, to argue verbally violates social harmony, so conversationalists often choose silence as an arguing strategy. In this way silence accomplishes communicative tasks that words cannot. Similarly, in Chinese culture, silence is a powerful conversational tool. A person of a few words,

an introverted individual, is perceived to have a powerful personality. Silence, as a communication strategy, is well accepted in the Chinese way of communication. The importance of silence is reflected in the Chinese saying, "those who know how to talk also know when to be silent."

While most members of North American culture believe that the means to get to know someone is by talking with them, many indigenous people prefer silence to talk when social relations are uncertain. Ross (1992) proposes the "conservation-withdrawal tactic" as a common communication strategy for First Nations people of Northern Canada and Alaska including Athabaskans, Northern Tutchone, Carrier, and Cree. This tactic reflects unfamiliarity between conversationalists and contexts, and can lead to withdrawal into physical immobility and silence. This communication tactic is also known as the "rule of the bush."

A Cree speaker once explained to the first author that silence is better than talk for three reasons: (a) one needs time to think things over, before answering, (b) talking too much is disrespectful, especially in a meeting with a stranger, and (c) it is strategic to leave enough time to figure out how to explain something that is very complex and connected to many other things.

Closely connected to the concept of silence is pause that occurs between utterances. Many First Nations cultural members exhibit a slightly longer pause between utterances than do Euro-Canadians (Scollon & Scollon, 1981). While the difference is slight, the Euro-Canadian counsellor may wait his or her own length of time for the First Nations client to say something. Failing to receive a reply according to the time he or she would wait, the counsellor starts to talk. This can be frustrating for both. While the Euro-Canadian counsellor goes on and on, the First Nations client cannot get a word in edge-wise and does not wish to interrupt since this is a sign of disrespect. This example illustrates "failure to achieve a synchronized exchange" mentioned earlier.

Turn-taking

Turn-taking refers to who speaks, how often, and how long (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). In counselling, the counsellor and client mutually construct conversation, and coordination on turn-taking is extremely important, especially for the speaker who takes most of the turns and consumes most of the talking time. There are distinct cultural differences in turn-taking. For example, Euro-Canadians tend to take long, monologic turns (ranting), permit uneven distribution of turns, and take a high percentage of turns in topics that they initiate. On the other hand, Japanese tend to take short turns, and distribute turns evenly regardless of who has introduced the topic (Yamada, 1990).

Interrupting

Closely related to turn-taking is the phenomenon of interrupting. In counselling, as in many other contexts, interruption can be regarded as negative — rude, aggressive, and disrespectful (Mishler & Waxler, 1968; Zimmerman & West,

1975). Again this is a culturally variable practice. Interruption is considered disruptive of the flow of a conversation in cultures valuing deference, independence, and territorial imperative (Murata, 1994). In cultures valuing interdependence, frequent interruption is a sign of active interest in what is being said and shows that the listener is actively participating in the conversation (Tannen, 1989). Mizutani (1988) observed that in Japanese culture, participants converse cooperatively. When one speaks, the other tries to help out. This phenomenon is called kyowa, which means literally "co-produce" or "co-operate" a conversation. Li (in press) found that Chinese interrupted each other frequently in their conversations and they do so in a cooperative (e.g., to take the floor, or change the topic or disagree) rather than intrusive manner (e.g., to agree, or assist, or clarify). On the other hand, the Canadians interrupted more intrusively, especially when they played the role of a doctor and the Chinese person played the role of a patient.

To a First Nations individual, interruption is a sign of disrespect; to a Japanese, a Chinese or a Thai, it means being cooperative and helpful; to a Hungarian or Italian, it is a sign of lively engagement and interest; to many Euro-Canadians, to interrupt is to show one's knowledge, personal power, and need to be in control of the on-going conversation. Interruption is a powerful discourse strategy influencing both relational and content dimensions of a conversation.

Grounding

Counselling is an interactional achievement (Schegloff, 1982). Successful interaction in intercultural counselling is much more difficult and complex than in intra-cultural counselling. Intercultural speakers face a much more complex task in establishing "common ground," that is, in *grounding* their communication in shared beliefs, knowledge, and values (Clark & Brennan, 1991). The primary responsibility for the success of intercultural counselling lies with the counsellor. The counsellor's knowledge of the differences in self-construal, turn-taking, interruption, and the use of silence are important to the construction of a common ground with the client. Common ground, without which there is little basis for sensible counselling, can also be aided by the use of other linguistic tools. Some commonly used tools include (Li, 1999b): (1) Listener restating, or partially restating what the speaker has said. In counselling this is usually called paraphrasing, or empathic responding. (2) Listener making a clarification request by using question words such as *what, who, where, when, I beg your pardon, I didn't quite get that.* Such questions, when asked respectfully, are requests to the speaker for clarification, reformulation, elaboration, and reiteration. After getting such a request, if the speaker gives a reply that is at least partially satisfactory to the listener, this exchange has added to their pool of shared knowledge. In other words, it has increased the common ground.

Conversational grounding is a central process in various forms of discourse (e.g, Clark & Schaefer, 1989; Clark & Brennan, 1991) and has been found to facilitate listener understanding (Schober & Clark, 1989). Li (1999b) found that,

in both intra- and inter-cultural discourse, the more interlocutors engaged in grounding activities, the better they communicated the information from the speaker to the listener. It is reasoned that effective counselling does not depend exclusively on the amount of common ground existing prior to the conversation. Rather, it depends largely upon how much common ground the interactants negotiate and create during the counselling process. To the extent that the counsellor and help seeker coordinate their conversation, and "keep track of their common background and its moment-by-moment changes" (Clark and Brennan, 1991, p. 128), the counselling conversation progresses, common ground is established, and the counselling communication is increasingly effective

In this article we have outlined conditions that we believe are important in the practice of intercultural counselling. We have argued against approaches that directly transfer mainstream counselling models and techniques to the intercultural counselling situation. We have also briefly outlined other contextual factors such as emancipatory theme, revised psychological thinking, and bringing cultural knowledge and sensibility more into the practice of counselling — factors which provide a conceptual context within which to discuss inter-cultural counselling communication. We have also indicated those communication tools of conversation: turn-taking, self-construal, silence, interrupting, and grounding procedures which we believe are important for building successful communication in intercultural counselling. To borrow a famous saying from Sunzi, an ancient Chinese war strategist (Bruya & Tsai, 1994): "To win, a marshal must know himself, his target and the context in which the war occurs." Similarly, in intercultural counselling, a winning counsellor must understand him or herself, the client and the context in which the counselling session takes place.

References

Bruya, B., & Tsai, C. C. (1994). *Sunzi speaks: The art of war.* Doubleday.

Clark, H. H., & Brennan, S. A. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.). *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition,* (pp.127-149). Washington: APA Books.

Clark, H. H., & Schaefer, E. F. (1989). Contributing to discourse. *Cognitive Science, 13,* 259-294.

Das, A. (1997). Rethinking multicultural counselling: Implications for counsellor Education. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 74,* 45-52.

Erickson, F. (1975). Gatekeeping and the melting pot: interaction in counselling encounters. *Harvard Educational Review, 45,* 44-70.

Fancher, R. (1995). *Cultures of healing.* New York: Freeman.

Ferguson, N. (1977). Simultaneous speech, interruptions and dominance. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 16,* 295-302.

Gumperz, J. J. (1978). The conversational analysis of interethnic communication. In E. L. Ross (Eds.), *Interethnic communication.* Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings, N0. 12. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Hall, C. (1997). Cultural malpractice: The growing obsolescence of psychology with the U.S. population. *American Psychologist.* 52, 642-651.

Hoskins, M. (1999). Worlds apart and lives together: Developing cultural attunement. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 28,* 72-85.

Ivey, A. E., Bradford Ivey, M., & Simek-Morgan, L. (1997). *Counseling and psychotherapy: A multicultural perspective* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Kleinman, A. (1988). *Re-thinking Psychiatry.* NewYork: Free Press.

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse.* New York: Academic Press.

Lakoff, R. (2000). *The language war.* Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.

Lebra, T. (1987). The cultural significance of silence in Japanese communication. *Multilingua, 6,* 343-357.

Li, H. Z. (2002) Culture, gender and self-close-other(s) connectedness in Canadian and Chinese samples. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 32,* 93-104.

Li, H. Z. (2001). Co-operative and intrusive interruptions in inter- and intra-cultural dyadic discourse. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 20,* 259-284.

Li, H. Z. (1999a). Grounding and communication in intra- and inter-cultural dyadic discourse. *Discourse Processes, 28,* 195-205.

Li, H. Z. (1999b) Information communication in conversations: A cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23,* 387-409.

Li, H. Z., & Browne, A. J. (2000). Defining mental health illness and accessing mental health services: Perspectives of Asian Canadians. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 19,* 143-159.

Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Mishler, E. G., & Waxler, N. E. (1968). *Interaction in families: An experimental study of family process and schizophrenia.* New York: Wiley.

Mizutani, O. (1988). Hanaskikotoba no tokushoku [Characteristics of Spoken Japanese}. In *Yutaka Miyaji and Osamu Mizutani, Nihongo [Japanese],* 55-65. Tokyo: NHK Publications.

Murata, K.T. (1994). Intrusive or co-operative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics , 21.* 385-400.

Peavy, R.V. (1994). *Counselling for First Nations Students: A research project.* Victoria, B.C.: Department of Aboriginal Education, Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Human Rights.

Peavy, R.V. (1997). *SocioDynamic Counselling: A Constructivist Perspective.* Victoria: Trafford Publishers.

Peavy, R. V. (1998). When strangers meet: Majority culture counsellors and minority culture clients, a discussion paper. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference for Trainers of Educational and Vocational Guidance Counsellors.* Tampere, Finland, 125-140.

Peavy, R.V. (1999). *A Constructivist perspective on learning, leading and intercultural counselling.* University of British Columbia: Multicultural Lecture Series, February, 1999.

Pedersen, P. (1994). *A handbook for developing multicultural awareness.*(2nd edn.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Prilleltensky, I, & Gonick, L. (1994). The discourse of oppression in the social sciences: Past, present, and future. In E.Trickett, R. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.). *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context,* (pp. 145-177). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ross, R. (1992). *Dancing with a ghost: Exploring Indian reality.* Markham, ON: Octopus Publishing Group.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation, *Language, 50,* 697-735.

Schirato, T., & Yell, S. (2000). *Communication and Cultural Literacy: An Introduction.* NSW, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of uh-huh and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981* (pp.71-93). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schober, M. F. and H. Clark (1989). Understanding by addressees and overhearers. *Cognitive Psychology, 21,* 211-232.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. W. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication,* Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. W. (1995). *Intercultural communication,* Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Sue, D.W. & Sue, P.B. (1990). *Counselling the culturally different: Theory and practice.* New York: John Wiley.

Sue, D.W., Ivey, A.E., & Pedersen, P.B. (1996). *A theory of multicultural counselling and therapy.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tannen, D. (1981). Indirectness in discourse: Ethnicity as conversational style. *Discourse Processes, 4,* 221-238.

Tannen, D. (1989). Interpreting interruption in conversation. In B. Music, R.

Graczyk, & C. Wiltshire (Ed.), *Paper from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 266-287). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Wohl, J. (1989). Cross-cultural psychotherapy. In P. Pedersen, K Draguns, W. Lonner, &

J. Trimble (Eds.). *Handbook of cross-cultural counseling and therapy* (pp. 79-113). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Yamada, H. (1990). Topic management and turn distributions in business meetings: American versus Japanese strategies. *Text, 10,* 271-295.

Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex, roles, interruptions and silences in conversations. In B.Thorne & N. Henley (Ed.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

About the Authors

Dr. R. Vance Peavy, Professor Emeritus, at the University of Victoria, died on July 1, 2002 at the age of 73. During his career, he supervised 16 PhD and over 100 Masters' students. He published more than 100 articles, several books, book chapters and professional videos. In 2000, he received the Distinguished Senior Contributor Award from the Division of Counselling Psychology of the American Psychological Association. In 2001, he was the recipient of the Stu Conger Award for Leadership in career counselling and career development by the Canadian Career Development Foundation. His most recent years were devoted to the formation of Socio-Dynamic Counselling.

Dr. Han Z. Li is an Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Northern British Columbia. Her main program of research is the micro process of intercultural conversation. She has published articles in European Journal of Social Psychology, Language and Social Psychology and Discourse Processes.

Address correspondence to Han Z. Li, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Psychology Program, University of Northern B.C., 3333 University Way, Canada, Prince George, B.C. V2N 4Z9. Phone: 250-960-6502. Fax: 250-960-5744. Email: <lih@unbc.ca>.