

Perceptions, effectiveness and language strategies

Can interlocutors' perceptions predict the actual effectiveness of a conversation in ELF and RM? And what are the consequences for international companies' language strategies?

By Martine Korthals

Radboud University

MA thesis International Business Communication

Student nr.	4489780
Topic	The effectiveness of communication
Supervisor	Frank van Meurs
Assessor	Marianne Starren
Date	04 - 12 - 2017
Word count	13.241



Declaration plagiarism and fraud

The undersigned
[first name, surname and student number],

Master's student at the Radboud University Faculty of Arts,

declares that the assessed thesis is entirely original and was written exclusively by himself/herself. The undersigned has indicated explicitly and in detail where all the information and ideas derived from other sources can be found. The research data presented in this thesis were collected by the undersigned himself/herself using the methods described in this thesis.

Place and date:

Signature:

Abstract

Most companies base their company's language strategy on the anticipated effectiveness of that strategy. However, international companies also often turn to English as a corporate language (Marchan, Welch & Welch, 1997). In addition to the question whether English is the best language international companies can implement to improve communicational effectiveness, some researchers have argued that perceptions may also have a significant influence on the effectiveness of cross-cultural communication (e.g. Henderson & Louhiala-Salminen, 2011). Thus, the current study not only researched the effectiveness of two different communication modes – ELF and RM – but also investigated whether a relation existed between the actual effectiveness of a conversation and the perceptions interlocutors may have about the communication and the conversation partner. Finally, the consequences of such a relationship for international companies' language strategies were discussed. A within-subject experiment was carried out among 48 participants. They performed two spot-the-difference tasks, one in ELF and one in RM. Strikingly, even though several studies indicated that RM would be more effective than ELF, RM was not found to be more or less effective than ELF in the current study. Additionally, no relation between actual effectiveness and perceptions of the communication nor the conversation partner were found. Finally, even though no consequences for international companies' language strategies were found based on the findings of the current study, it is stressed that managers in such companies do pay attention to these strategies since they could benefit not only employee's individual but also the companies' effectiveness.

Key words: English as a lingua franca, receptive multilingualism, effectiveness, perceptions, perceived effectiveness, language strategy.

Introduction

Globalization has caused the English language to become the most widely used lingua franca in the world (Braunmüller, 2013). As a result, English seems to have become pivotal to international business communication and employees of such companies are expected to be able to communicate effectively in this language (Hülmbauer, Böhringer & Seidlhofer, 2008). English has become dominant to the extent that other language strategies are rarely even being considered by internationally operating companies (Marchan, Welch & Welch, 1997) despite the fact that other language strategies can also be effective. Especially recently, research regarding the effectiveness of not only English as a lingua franca but also other communication modes that can be used during international communication has increasingly been executed (e.g. van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014, 2015; Ribbert & ten Thije, 2007). Despite positive findings regarding the effectiveness of several communication modes, companies still often turn to English. Of course, English has been proven to successfully facilitate international communication (Lønnsman, 2014) but since such a large part of the English speakers are non-native, it is likely that interlocutors have different proficiency levels. This could be caused by, for example, the fact that some non-native English speakers (NNES) learn the language to such an extent to where they also include the language's grammatical correctness and other NNES only seem to use the language for its functional effectiveness (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014).

Van Mulken (2010) further emphasized the importance of considering proficiency differences during international communication. She explains that a difference in the proficiency level of interlocutors could cause linguistic imbalance. This unequal linguistic power between interlocutors might cause the more proficient interlocutor to have to explain his/her utterances to a greater extent or misunderstandings might arise due to the limited vocabulary of the less proficient interlocutor. These factors might in turn decrease the overall effectiveness of the conversation (Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen & Piekkari, 2006). Linguistic balance, on the other hand, is achieved when both interlocutors have the same proficiency in a given language. Researchers such as Blees, Mak and ten Thije (2014), van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) and Edmondson and House (1991) all investigated the effectiveness of several communication modes and attribute most of their findings to interlocutors' different proficiency levels, emphasizing the importance of this variable. Additionally, these studies seem to indicate the importance of managing language strategies since having proficient employees could significantly influence the effectiveness of communication within that company.

Another angle in research regarding the effectiveness of communication is explored in studies by Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) and Fredriksson et al. (2006). These researchers claim that the effectiveness of communication can also be influenced by perceptions interlocutors have about the communication itself or the conversation partner. For example, Fredriksson et al. (2006) argue that in a linguistically imbalanced interaction, the more proficient interlocutor could become more dominant in the conversation. These proficiency differences could also cause interlocutors to become annoyed with each other and cause them to be less focused on the goal of the interaction, resulting in a less effective conversation. However, these studies only indicate that negative/positive perceptions could negatively/positively affect the effectiveness of a conversation. The way in which perceptions might play a part in the effectiveness of cross-cultural interactions exactly is not known. Some researchers seem to imply some kind of relation exists between perceptions and effectiveness, but to date no conclusive evidence of such an occurrence has been found (e.g. Fredriksson et al., 2006; Henderson & Louhiala-Salminen, 2011).

The present study aims to fill this gap in information by exploring whether a relationship exists between perceptions interlocutors might have of the communication or the conversation partner and effectiveness in two different communication modes, namely English as a lingua franca (ELF) and receptive multilingualism (RM). A relation between perceptions and effectiveness could have serious consequences for the focus of a company's language strategy. For example, instead of focussing on effectiveness alone, managers might need to consider activities such as team building exercises to increase feelings of solidarity and togetherness. Additionally, it was chosen to not only research such a relation for ELF but also for RM, a communication mode that was found to be an effective alternative for international communication. These two communication modes will be further explained next.

English as a lingua franca

English as a lingua franca (ELF) is defined as “*a common language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common national culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication*” (Firth, 1996; p. 240). This language has become the most dominant lingua franca in today's business world. It is therefore not surprising that managers often choose English as their company's corporate language since they, for example, often have many employees with different national backgrounds in service (Zander, Mockaitis & Harzin, 2011). Additionally, Lønnsman (2014) states that English has been found to facilitate

international communication and Yanaprasart (2016) found that one common corporate language (usually English) could increase linguistic equality and give all interlocutors equal access to the interaction. Furthermore, House (2007) found that when two NNES both spoke English and thus both engaged in a non-native (L2) language, it could create linguistic balance if both interlocutors had a similar proficiency level.

The studies mentioned above give some well-grounded arguments that speak in favour of implementing English as a corporate language. However, there are also some downsides to consider. For example, even though ELF operates on a basis of linguistic balance, it can occur that interlocutors have significantly different proficiency levels which could result in linguistic imbalance (Fredriksson et al., 2006). Additionally, NNES often seem to have difficulties in areas such as comprehension and production due to vocabulary limitations (Rogerson-Revell, 2007) which could contribute to proficiency differences. Furthermore, it is argued that these differences in proficiency could hurt the effectiveness of that interaction. Rehbein (1987) explains that if NNES are not able to fall back on their native competencies, as is the case during ELF interactions, they have to completely rely on their knowledge of the L2 language, creating more room for misunderstandings which might decrease effectiveness.

Not much theory exists about whether perceptions actually have any influence on the effectiveness of a conversation. It is, however, argued that when linguistic imbalance occurs, perceptions of the conversation partner may be negatively affected because interlocutors are not as focused on the interaction as they are on the conversation partner him/herself (Rogerson-Revell, 2007; Welch, Welch & Piekkari, 2005). For example, interlocutors might get annoyed with the lack of skills of the less proficient interlocutor and the perceived dominance of the more proficient interlocutor (Rogerson-Revell, 2007). Additionally, the chance that NNES employees with different national backgrounds also have different proficiency levels is relatively high. However, since no evidence of this occurrence has been found before, it can only be argued that such negative feelings towards a conversation partner could decrease the effectiveness of ELF interactions.

Considering the studies discussed above, English can be an effective means of communication. However, due to the increasing number of NNES, and therefore the increased possibility of linguistic imbalance during cross-cultural communication, it is relevant for companies that operate on an international level and/or have employees with different national backgrounds in service, to consider other communication modes they could implement in their internal language strategies: for example receptive multilingualism.

Receptive multilingualism

Receptive multilingualism (RM) is defined as “*a mode of multilingual communication in which interactants employ a language and/or language variety different from their partner’s and still understand each other without the help of any additional lingua franca*” (Rehbein, ten Thijs & Verschik, 2012; p. 248). As opposed to ELF interactions, where interlocutors both speak in a non-native language, during RM interactions both interlocutors communicate in their native (L1) language. While interlocutors speak in their native L1 they ‘receive’ an L2 – the conversation partner’s L1. It is therefore necessary for both interlocutors to have at least a receptive knowledge of their conversation partner’s language to be able to communicate successfully in RM. Van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) investigated the effectiveness of several communication modes and found that RM was the most effective in communication between Dutchmen and Germans, thus supporting the statement that interlocutors in RM interactions need to have at least a receptive competence of their conversation partners’ L1 to be able to be successful in RM conversations. However, due to the dominance of ELF in international business communication, RM has not gained much attention (Zeevaert & ten Thijs, 2007). Despite being relatively unknown among professionals, research such as that of van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) suggests that RM can be an effective alternative in cross-cultural communication.

Like ELF, RM also has some downsides to consider. First, as mentioned before, interlocutors need to have at least a receptive knowledge of the language of their conversation partner (e.g. Rehbein et al., 2012; Charles & Marschan-Piekkari, 2002). The ability to understand the conversation partner’s utterances during RM interactions is also called receptive competence (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014). When interlocutors do not have the same receptive competence a linguistic imbalanced situation can occur which may cause a decrease in effectiveness, similar to what could happen in ELF interactions (e.g. Verschik, 2011).

A second factor that might come into play is that interlocutors might feel uncomfortable speaking in their own language when this is not also the native language of the conversation partner. For example, Yanaprasart (2016) investigated language strategies in international companies based in Switzerland. This researcher interviewed several managers within these companies and found the following: one of the managers stated that she noticed that “*French speakers or certainty Italian speakers, they speak German because they’re afraid that they won’t be understood if they speak French [...]*” (p. 101). This quote seems to indicate that people tend to adapt to their conversation partner when they feel uncomfortable speaking their

native language. Additionally, Barnlund and Araki (1985) and Boxer (1993) found that interlocutors tend to be more adaptive when they are unfamiliar with each other. In international interactions it is highly likely that interlocutors are not familiar with each other, which could increase the chance that these speakers would adapt to their conversation partner instead of speaking in their native L1.

A third disadvantage is that the success of RM seems to be limited to whether the two languages involved are typologically related. For example, several studies have researched RM in interactions between Dutchmen and Germans whose languages are typologically related. As mentioned before, van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) executed such a study and found RM to be a successful means of communication between two interlocutors from these countries. Additionally, communication between Swedish and Norwegian and Italian and Spanish interlocutors has also previously been found to successfully facilitate RM interactions (e.g. Ribbert & ten Thije, 2007).

When RM is the chosen means of communication, both interlocutors are able to fall back on their native competencies (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014). The fact that during RM interactions both interlocutors are able to speak in their native L1 could be beneficial to the effectiveness of the conversation since less effort seems to be required to compensate for lexical difficulties (i.e. not understanding each other; Rehbein et al., 2012). Additionally, van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) found that interlocutors in RM interactions could concentrate better on the task at hand, resulting in more effective communication. Lastly, since both interlocutors can speak in their native L1, linguistic balance between speakers often occurs (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014; 2015).

As discussed before, during RM interactions both interlocutors speak in their native L1 which is likely to be beneficial for both the effectiveness of the interaction (Rehbein et al., 2012; van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014) as well as the perceptions of the communication and the feelings towards the conversation partner (Stoll, 2014). For example, Stoll (2014) argues that when linguistic balance exists due to similar proficiency and receptive competence, no interlocutor is dominant which could result in more positive feelings towards the conversation partner during RM interactions. These positive feelings might in turn increase the effectiveness of the interaction since interlocutors are focused on the conversation instead of annoyances regarding their conversation partner. It is however important to note that the exact manner in which perception may affect the overall effectiveness is not yet known and therefore no direct

comparison can be made with previous theory despite of research by for example Fredriksson et al. (2006) or Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011).

Besides ELF and RM another frequently researched communication mode is L1-L2 communication. In such interactions interlocutors communicate in one interlocutor's L1, meaning that one interlocutor adapts to the other (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2015). A case can be made for using L1-L2 communication during international interactions as the non-native speaker is then able to "*lean on the language proficiency of the mother tongue speaker*" (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2015; p. 407). However, during these interactions linguistic imbalance often occurs when the L2 speaker is not proficient enough which in turn could decrease the effectiveness of the conversation (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2015). Therefore it was decided to not include L1-L2 interactions in the current study since the chances that linguistic imbalance could occur are significantly higher than is expected for ELF and RM interactions, which both operate on a basis of linguistic balance because both speakers either both speak in an L2 language (English) or in their L1.

Effectiveness

Companies mostly base their language strategies around the (anticipated) effectiveness of that strategy. The choice for a language strategy within a company therefore encounters much consideration (Charles & Marschan-Piekkari, 2002; Lønsmann, 2014). The effectiveness of ELF and RM have often been researched, however, the outcomes of such studies are not always similar. For example, van Mulken and Hendriks (2014; 2015), van Engen et al. (2010) and House (1999) all found ELF to be the least effective communication mode when compared to other communication modes. On the other hand, Blees et al. (2014) found ELF to be the most effective. Lastly, two master thesis studies executed on the same topic found no difference between the effectiveness of ELF and RM at all. As demonstrated above, researchers do not all seem to be in agreement about which communication mode in most effect in which situation.

Additionally, the concept of 'effectiveness' itself can also be of some difficulty. Some studies have therefore made a distinction between actual and perceived effectiveness. Rogerson-Revell (2008), for example, investigated the influence of languages on trust of European business professionals. It was found that negative perceptions about the communication could lead to a decrease of the actual effectiveness of the interaction, implicating that these concepts are different. In addition, these findings also suggest that

perceived effectiveness (how effective we think we are) is able to influence actual effectiveness (how effective we actually are). Similar distinctions between these concepts of effectiveness were made in several other studies such as those of Gudykunst and Nishida (2001), Gudykunst and Shapiro (1996) and Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011). Considering these studies it was decided to also make a distinction between actual and perceived effectiveness in the current study.

Actual effectiveness

A consistent problem in most studies researching the effectiveness of communication seems to be the very concept of actual effectiveness and how to measure it. The current study based its measurements of effectiveness on previous studies. Similar to studies by van Mulken and Hendriks (2014; 2015) the current study will use a spot-the-difference task, in which two interlocutors have a certain amount of time to find 10 differences in two pictures by communicating with each other via an online chat service. This task was selected because it was found to elicit task-oriented dialogue between interlocutors. The 10 differences that needed to be found during the task were the first measurement of actual effectiveness. Additionally, the number of words spoken by the interlocutors was a measurement of effectiveness in the current study. However, using the number of words as a reliable measurement of the actual effectiveness of a conversation is not always supported. On the one hand Edmondson and House (1991) found that non-native speakers were more verbose than native speakers because they tend to ‘waffle’ due to lower proficiency levels. On the other, van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) found the opposite: native speakers used more words than non-native speakers. These researchers explain this finding by stating that more proficient speakers type faster because the interlocutors understand each other quicker. Due to these findings it remains unclear whether number of words is an accurate measurement of the actual effectiveness of a conversation. However, since van Engen et al. (2010) suggest that non-native speakers might need more time to find all differences in the spot-the-difference task and may therefore also use more words, it was decided to include this variable as a measurement of effectiveness in the present study. The last measurement of actual effectiveness was time needed to find all 10 differences, based on the study of van Engen et al. (2010). Even though van Engen et al. (2010) did not directly compare ELF and RM to each other it was found that non-native speakers needed more time to find all differences than native speakers did therefore suggesting that a significant difference

between ELF and RM regarding the time interlocutors might need to find all differences is likely.

Most studies researching the effectiveness of communication often also investigate the communication strategies interlocutors might employ to achieve successful communication or a mutual understanding (e.g. van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014). Even though, communication strategies seem to be a central focus in most studies regarding the effectiveness of several communication modes, this aspect was not included in the current study. The focus of the current study lies especially in the relation between perceptions and actual effectiveness and how this relation might affect companies' language strategies. The researcher therefore decided to not include communication strategies in the current analysis. However, excerpts from the conversations, which are often used to analyse communication strategies, were included in the analysis of the results of the current study. These excerpts served as supporting evidence of a finding, in which interlocutors often explain why they made a certain choice. It was decided to include some excerpts as supporting evidence since the use of communication strategies (explanations of why interlocutors make certain choices) are especially visible in Computer Mediated Communication (CMC; Arnhold, 2007; Smith, 2003), and therefore the researcher determined that this potentially valuable information could not be overlooked completely.

Perceived effectiveness

Earlier, it was explained that a distinction would be made between actual and perceived effectiveness in the current study. The fact that perceptions by themselves are important in research regarding the effectiveness of communication and that they might even depend on the communication mode itself is demonstrated by Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011), who state that: "*unfamiliar communication patterns of metacommunicative routines – which often occur in interactions with strangers or people from foreign countries – influence interpersonal perceptions and attitudes [...]*" (p. 22). In other words, a foreign language or an unfamiliar communication pattern may influence perceptions which might in turn have the ability to influence the actual effectiveness of the interaction (e.g. Fredriksson et al, 2006). Despite these hints that seem to suggest perceptions are of at least some importance, research regarding this topic has not been executed much at all. Due to the lack of research, similar to the concept of actual effectiveness, it remains unclear how to properly define and measure perceived effectiveness. One of the few studies which has investigated this concept is that of Gudykunst and Nishida (2001), who researched perceived effectiveness in relation to feelings of

uncertainty. These researchers define perceived effectiveness as how effective interlocutors think they are in their communication in a certain communication mode. Additionally, these researchers used five questions to measure perceived effectiveness. These five questions were found to be a reliable manner to measure perceived effectiveness of the communication and therefore served as a basis for the analysis of perceived effectiveness in the current study.

As mentioned before, Gudykunst and Nishida (2001) investigated perceived effectiveness in relation to interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty. This study found that interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty significantly predicted perceived effectiveness, suggesting that uncertainty may also be relevant in the current study. Additionally, this study found that interlocutors were more uncertain in communication with strangers, which often occurs in cross-cultural communication. These findings are supported by Gudykunst and Shapiro (1996) and Hubbert et al. (1991), whose studies both found similar results, suggesting that managing such feelings of uncertainty may be beneficial for perceived effectiveness and thus possibly also the actual effectiveness of the interaction (e.g. Gudykunst, 1993). Due to these findings and the fact that uncertainty seems of great importance to any study researching the effectiveness of international communication, it was decided to include this variable in the current study. Additionally, according to Kouwenhoven and van Mulken (2012) non-native speakers experience feelings of uncertainty to a greater extent than native speakers do, suggesting that interlocutors in ELF interactions will be more uncertain than interlocutors in RM interactions, which makes the inclusion of this variable even more relevant for the present study.

Feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner

Besides perceptions regarding the communication itself, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner may also be of some importance, as suggested by van Mulken (2010) and Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011). These researchers have argued that such feelings and perceptions may be able to influence the actual effectiveness of an interaction directly. For example, van Mulken (2010) found that the actual effectiveness of an interaction improved, the more positive the conversation partner was evaluated. Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) do explain that negative perceptions of the conversation partner may result in a decrease in the actual effectiveness of the interaction because the interlocutors are not focused as much on the goal of the interaction as they are on the conversation partner. However, besides

these researchers suggestions that perceptions about the conversation are important, no study so far has found conclusive evidence for this statement.

Some researchers also argue that linguistic (im)balance may partially cause perceptions to be positive or negative. For example, Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) and Rogerson-Revell (2008) both describe that linguistic imbalance could cause the more proficient interlocutor to become more dominant over the less proficient interlocutor, which could in turn lead to negative feelings towards the dominant interlocutor such as frustration and mistrust. On the other hand, linguistic balance could increase emotions such as mutual trust which could result in more positive perceptions of the conversation partner (Henderson & Louhiala-Salminen, 2011).

These studies seem to indicate that feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner may be able to (partially) cause the actual effectiveness of an interaction to increase/decrease, adding to the suggestion that some kind of relationship does exist between perceptions and actual effectiveness. Even though such a relationship has not been found as of yet in an international communication context, there are, however, some studies that seem to have found evidence for a relation between perceived and actual effectiveness in different contexts. For example, Fransen et al. (2017) researched whether perceptions of a team leader's quality of leadership predicted the actual results of the sports team: this was found to be the case. In addition, Dillard and Ha (2016) researched whether perceived message effectiveness was a significant predictor for information-seeking behaviour. Again, this was found to be the case. These studies seem to imply that positive perceptions are able to influence actual effectiveness positively. It is, however, important to consider the experimental settings of the current study, which were different than the settings in the studies by Dillard and Ha (2016) and Fransen et al. (2017). These findings therefore serve as implications for a possible relation only rather than material for direct comparisons.

Language strategies in international companies

As previously discussed, companies often seem to turn to English by default with regard to their language strategies. In addition, alternatives such as RM are often overlooked. This is partly due to RM being a relatively unknown communication mode among professionals (Zeevaert & ten Thije, 2007). Besides the fact that companies often turn to English by default, some companies do not consider their company's language strategies much at all (Yanaprasart, 2016).

According to Planken (2012) this reluctance to invest time in language strategies is due to the fact that, according to some companies, there is no objective way to measure the language effects on the individual or organizational effects. Thus, it seems that it cannot be proved that other language strategies besides English, which is familiar for most internationally operating companies, would be as effective or more effective.

Yanaprasart (2012), however, does emphasize that it is important for companies to invest time in their company's language strategy. This researcher spoke to several large international companies based in Switzerland about their language strategies. He found that one company, a bank, obligated their employees to speak at least one other language besides German, usually English or French. This decision was made so that the bank could accommodate to both their local as well as their international clients by making it possible for them to speak in their native language.

Yanaprasart (2016) suggests that paying attention to a company's language strategy could be beneficial for employees as well as a company's clients and the company itself. For example, RM has already been successfully implemented in businesses in border areas for some time now (Rehbein et al., 2001), suggesting that companies can benefit from implementing a multilingual language strategy.

Besides investigating the effectiveness of several communication modes the current study also aims to find out whether perceptions could be of influence on a conversation's actual effectiveness. If so, managers should not only take a language strategies' effectiveness into consideration, but also perceptions employees may have about their co-workers, managers or clients.

The present study and research questions

The current study's first main aim is to find out whether any differences exist in the actual effectiveness of the communication, perceived effectiveness of the communication, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner and feelings of uncertainty of ELF and RM conversations. Secondly, this study aims to investigate the relation between perceptions in general (perceived effectiveness plus feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner) and actual effectiveness. No conclusive evidence of an occurrence has been found so far despite the fact that some researchers have mentioned such a relationship (e.g. Henderson & Louhiala-Salminen, 2011). Finally, the consequences of such a relationship for international

companies' language strategies will be discussed. Therefore the following research questions were constructed:

- RQ1 To what extent do ELF and RM interactions differ with regard to actual effectiveness?
- RQ2 To what extent do ELF and RM interactions differ with regard to interlocutors' perceived effectiveness of (a) their own communication, (b) their conversation partners' communication and (c) the communication mode?
- RQ3 To what extent do ELF and RM interactions differ with regard to interlocutors' feelings towards and perceptions of their conversation partner?
- RQ4 To what extent to interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty before ELF and RM interactions differ?
- RQ5 To what extent do interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty before the experiment predict interlocutors' perceptions of and feelings towards their conversation partner and the perceived effectiveness of the interlocutors' (a) own communication, (b) the conversation partners' communication and (c) the communication mode in ELF and RM interactions?
- RQ6 To what extent do interlocutors' perceptions of and feelings towards the conversation partner and perceived effectiveness of the (a) interlocutors' own communication, (b) conversation partners' communication and (d) the communication mode predict the actual effectiveness of the interaction in ELF and RM interactions?

Method

Materials During the current study participants took part in an experiment and filled in several questionnaires. During the experiment Dutch and German participants took part in a spot-the-difference task. The spot-the-difference task was chosen to elicit task-oriented dialogue between interlocutors. Since all sets of conversation partners took part in the experiment twice (once in ELF and once in RM), two sets of pictures were used which can be found in Appendix I. One set of pictures was derived from van Mulken and Hendriks (2014; 2015) and one from Stoll (2014).

Subjects A total of 48 participants took part in the experiment. 24 participants were Dutch and 24 were German. The Dutch (mean age: 29; $SD = 1.04$; range: 22-66; 51.7% male) and German (mean age: 27; $SD = 1.58$; range: 22-65; 55.2% female) participants all had at least a Bachelor's degree. Participants were recruited via the researcher's own network and via online/offline acquisition. The current study aimed to find most, if not all of its participants in the border area between the Netherlands and Germany, since it was anticipated that these potential participants would be able to speak, or at least understand, both languages. Almost all interlocutors who participated in the current study either lived, worked or studied in the border area. A chi-square test showed no significant difference between communication mode and gender ($\chi^2 (1) = .17, p = .682$) and neither did the t-test for communication mode and age ($t (94) = .04, p = .836$).

Additionally, participants were asked about the amount of English and Dutch/German they used during their work. It was found that neither Dutch nor German participants used English frequently during their work and no significant difference existed between participants regarding their use of English. For an overview of the percentages of English all participants used, see Table 1 below.

The amount of Dutch/German the participants used was also measured. A difference was found with Germans using significantly more Dutch than the Dutch used German during their everyday working life ($\chi^2 (3) = 31.39, p < .001$).

Table 1. Percentages of English or Dutch/German used in the participant's everyday working life ($n = 48$)

	Dutch				German			
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
English	64.6%	27.1%	8.3%	0%	47.9%	31.3%	8.3%	12.5%
Dutch					18.8%	31.3%	41.7%	8.3%
German	70.8%	16.7%	4.2%	8.3%				

Furthermore, a LexTALE test was admitted among all participants twice: once in English and once in the language of the conversation partner (Dutch/German). During this proficiency test participants had to indicate whether a given word existed or not by clicking 'yes' or 'no'. For the English proficiency test Dutch participants scored on average 74.2% and German participants scored on average 74.3%, which is somewhat above the average of 70.7% set by Lemhöfer and Broersma (2012). These results suggest that both Dutch and German participants had a reasonable knowledge of the English language and that a lack of proficiency could not have been a factor in the current analysis.

The LexTALE test was also admitted in the conversation partners' language: Dutch for German participants and German for Dutch participants. On these proficiency tests Dutch participants scored on average 73% and German participants scored 73.5%. Since these scores are almost equal it was concluded that all participants had similar knowledge of the language of the conversation partner, meaning that no participant had an unfair linguistic advantage in the chat conversation.

In addition, the scores for the ELF and RM proficiency test in general were also similar. A t-test confirmed this finding ($t(94) = 5.06, p = .103$), meaning that Dutch and German participants combined did not score better on their English proficiency tests than they did on their Dutch/German proficiency tests and vice versa. These findings confirm that proficiency differences were not likely to have had any significant influence on the results in the current study.

It does, however, seem somewhat striking that no difference seems to exist in participants' Dutch/German proficiency tests since German participants were found to use more Dutch than the Dutch use German during their work.

Design The current study had a within-subjects design, meaning that every pair of participants (one Dutch and one German participant) took part in the experiment twice. The order of which communication mode to start with was varied to prevent order effects. At the beginning of the experiment, the researcher decided whether to start with ELF or RM randomly. The order of the two sets of pictures used during the spot-the-difference task was also randomly varied. The experimenter decided which set of pictures was used before every experiment.

Instruments As mentioned before, participants had to fill in several questionnaires during the experiment: four in total. One before and one after each spot-the-difference task. The first questionnaire, that was admitted before the spot-the-difference task, measured participants' general feelings of uncertainty towards their own and their conversation partner's understandability during the upcoming task. Furthermore, participants were asked to rate the amount of English and Dutch/German they used during their work. The results of this question can be found in Table 1.

The questionnaire admitted after the spot-the-difference task measured participants' perceived effectiveness of the interaction along with interlocutors' evaluation of their feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner which were conceptualized as comprehensibility and competence. Furthermore, a LexTALE was admitted test to test the

participants' proficiency in English and Dutch/German and some background questions were asked such as gender, age and education level. All questionnaires were admitted in the participant's native language to prevent proficiency issues from occurring and negatively influence the results. The Dutch version was created by the researcher herself since she was native Dutch. For the German version of the questionnaires, back-translation was used with the help of a native German.

Interlocutor's general feelings of uncertainty towards their own and their conversation partner's understandability was measured on a 7-point Likert scale following two statements: 'I am confident that I will understand my partner during the chat conversation' and 'I am confident that my partner will understand me during the chat conversation', anchored by 'completely disagree-completely agree' (based on Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001). These items could, however, not be computed since the reliability was not found to be high enough. Therefore these items were analysed separately during the further study.

Actual effectiveness of the interaction was measured with the number of differences, the number of words used by the interlocutors, which were both based on van Mulken and Hendriks (2014; 2015) and the time interlocutors needed to find all differences (based on van Engen et al., 2010).

Perceived effectiveness of the interaction was subdivided into different categories to be able to more accurately measure this variable: perceived effectiveness of the interlocutor's own communication, their conversation partner's communication and the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode. These three categories were also analysed separately to be able to give a more detailed and accurate representation of the final results.

Perceived effectiveness of the interlocutor's own communication was measured with five statements based on Gudykunst and Nishida (2001): 'I communicated effectively with this person', 'My communication with this person was successful', 'I felt competent when I communicated with this person', 'I communicated appropriately with this person' and 'My communication with this person was a failure', anchored by 'completely disagree-completely agree'. Similar to other variables, perceived effectiveness of the interlocutor's own communication was also measured on a 7-point Likert scale. The reliability of the perceived effectiveness of the interlocutor's own communication was acceptable (ELF: $\alpha = .76$; RM = $\alpha = .77$) after the last item 'My communication with this person was a failure' was excluded.

Perceived effectiveness of the conversation partner's communication was, similarly to the previous variable, measured with five statements anchored by 'completely disagree-completely agree' on a 7-point Likert scale. Since the perceived effectiveness of the conversation partner's communication has not been measured before, no direct material was found to base this variable on. Therefore the five statements used for the perceived effectiveness of the interlocutor's own communication were slightly adapted to shift the focus from the interlocutor's own communication to the conversation partner's communication. Stoll (2014) did the same in her master thesis, which was found to be a reliable way to measure the perceived effectiveness of the conversation partner's communication. In the current study the reliability of the five statements ('My partner communicated effectively with me', 'My partner's communication was successful', 'My partner is competent', 'My partner communicated appropriately with me' and 'My partner's communication was a failure') was weak. However, if the final item was deleted, similar to the previous measurement, reliability improved significantly (ELF: $\alpha = .81$; RM: $\alpha = .85$).

The perceived effectiveness of the communication mode has also not been researched directly before. Here too, Stoll's (2014) study was used as a basis for the current analysis. She measured this variable with two statements: 'I felt like I communicated effectively in English' for ELF interactions and 'I felt like I communicated effectively in Dutch/German while my partner communicated in German/Dutch' for RM interactions. These questions were found to be a reliable way to accurately measure the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode. These two statements were anchored by 'completely disagree-completely agree' and measured on a 7-point Likert scale.

Feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner were conceptualized as comprehensibility and competence. The researcher decided to name these variables differently since they cannot both be placed under the name perceptions (i.e. comprehensibility is not a perception an interlocutor can have about their conversation partner). Thus, it was decided to conceptualize these two variables differently.

Comprehensibility was measured on a 7-point Likert scale with one statement: 'I find this speaker understandable', anchored by 'completely disagree-completely agree' (based on Derwing & Munroe, 1997).

Competence was also measured on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by 'completely disagree-completely agree'. Six items were used to measure perceived competence: competent,

high educated, intelligent, professional, ambitious and hard worker. The reliability of these items was reliable for both communication modes (ELF $\alpha = .75$; RM $\alpha = .75$; based on Hendriks, 2010).

Furthermore, participants were asked to take a proficiency test. According to Lemhöfer and Broersma (2012) the LexTALE test is a reliable test to measure a participant's proficiency level. These researchers compared the LexTALE test to several other proficiency tests in their study of which this test was found to be one of the most reliable. The test is offered in Dutch, German and English of which all versions were used for the current study. During ELF interactions, participants were tested on their knowledge of the English language. During RM interactions, participants were tested on their knowledge of the language of the conversation partner: Dutch or German. Earlier it was found that all results of the LexTALE test admitted during the current experiment were around the average. Additionally, similar results were found on both tests for Dutch and German participants. Since interlocutors' proficiency levels did not significantly differ from each other in ELF or RM it was decided that proficiency could not have of any influence on the results of the present study.

Lastly, excerpts of the conversations that were held via the online chat network WhatsApp were used as additional evidence for a certain finding. These excerpts solely served as additional evidence or to illustrate a certain finding and were not used as a finding on its own.

Procedure All participants were gathered via the researcher's own network and via active acquisition through emails and phone calls to local companies. Both potential participants and those who accepted immediately were sent additional information about the study and their role in the experiment. Only practical information that could not negatively influence the results and reveal the true purpose of the current study was made available at this point in time. Because of this reason questions that could not be answered before the experiment were answered afterwards. In addition, all correspondence in the WhatsApp group apart from during the RM experiment was in English since all interlocutors were expected to speak English to such an extent where they did not have trouble communicating in this language.

A few minutes before the experiment the researcher would create a WhatsApp group in which the experiment would take place. The sets of pictures were sent to the participants as close to the start of the experiment as possible so participants did not have the time to examine these pictures beforehand. After both participants had made their presence known, the researcher explained the upcoming process. After the warm-up task, that took about 5-10

minutes, participants were given the opportunity to ask any questions about the experiment. If they did not have any questions or after all questions were answered by the researcher, participants were given a participant number and were sent the first questionnaire. After both participants had made clear that they had finished the questionnaire, the first spot-the-difference task started. The researcher emphasized clearly beforehand that she would not interfere once the task had started. The researcher also kept the time with a stopwatch, which was started immediately after the researchers had given the GO signal to start the task and was stopped after the participants had agreed on finding the last difference or after the time ran out. Participants had up to a maximum of 30 minutes to find all 10 differences. It was previously determined that 15 or 20 minutes, as is the case in most similar research (e.g. van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014, 2015; van Engen et al., 2010), was not enough time to include time as a reliable measurement of effectiveness. It was therefore decided to increase the time participants had to find all differences to 30 minutes.

After the participants were successful in finding all 10 differences or after the time ran out the researcher sent the participants the second questionnaire. All participants went through the process described above twice: once in ELF and once in RM. The order of which communication mode to start with was varied to prevent order effects from occurring. Also, the order of the sets of pictures used was varied. Both were randomly selected before the experiment started by the researcher.

Finally, participants were thanked for their participation in the experiment. The researchers gave them a final opportunity to ask about the study in more detail before the participants left the WhatsApp group. The researcher remained in all groups until after the analyses were finished.

Statistical procedure All analyses were carried out using the statistical program SPSS. Firstly, Cronbach's alpha was calculated to check whether several items could be computed into one overarching variable. A two-way analysis of variance was used to find out whether the actual effectiveness of the two communication modes researched in the current study (ELF and RM) differed from each other. Furthermore, three MANOVA's were used to check for differences in interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty, perceived effectiveness of the interactions and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner. Additionally, individual multiple regression analyses were carried out to find out whether the feelings of uncertainty were significant predictors for perceived effectiveness and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner. Lastly, a regression analysis was also used to find out whether perceived

effectiveness and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner were significant predictors for the actual effectiveness of the conversation.

Results

The main purpose of this study was to investigate whether any differences existed between ELF and RM regarding their actual and perceived effectiveness, feelings of and perceptions of the conversation partner and feelings of uncertainty towards interlocutors' own and their conversation partners' understandability. Additionally, it was researched whether a relationship existed between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness. Finally, the consequences of the possible relation between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness for an international company's language strategy were discussed.

Actual effectiveness

First, it was investigated whether any differences existed in the actual effectiveness of ELF and RM interactions. Actual effectiveness was measured with the number of differences found, the number of words used by interlocutors and the timeframe within which all differences were found. Almost all sets of conversation partners found all 10 possible differences. Only 2 participants (in 1 RM conversation) were not able to find all differences. However, since interlocutors had up to 30 minutes to find all differences, which is relatively long compared to similar studies on this topic, this was to be expected. Therefore results concerning this measurement of effectiveness were not significantly different and was taken out of any further analysis.

The timeframe in which the differences were found, did seem to differ between ELF and RM conversations. Interlocutors in ELF conversations took slightly longer (mean time; 12:21) to find all differences than interlocutors in RM conversation (mean time; 11:07). However, the difference was not significant, which is supported by a one-way analysis of variance ($F(1, 46) = 2.07, p = .157$).

Table 2. Average time in which participants were able to find the differences ($n = 48$)

Communication mode	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
ELF	12:24	2.51
RM	11:18	3.28
Average time	11:42	

Furthermore, the number of words used by the interlocutors during the experiment was a measurement of actual effectiveness. A two-way analysis of variance was carried out to find out whether nationality (Dutch/German) or communication mode (ELF/RM) had any influence on the number of words used in the experiment. This was found to not be the case (nationality: $F(1, 92) = .40, p = .530$; communication mode: $F(1, 92) = .19, p = .665$). All means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations for the number of words used ($n = 48$)

	Dutch $n = 24$		German $n = 24$		Total $n = 48$	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
ELF	122.04	28.27	118.58	21.12	120.31	24.75
RM	123.79	27.15	121.08	17.59	122.44	22.67
Average	122.92	27.43	119.83	19.27	121.38	23.63

Perceived effectiveness

The second research question dealt with the extent to which ELF and RM interactions differed with regard to perceived effectiveness of the interaction. Perceived effectiveness was subdivided into perceived effectiveness of the interlocutors' own communication, the conversation partners' communication and the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode.

A MANOVA test was carried out to find out whether the communication mode was of any influence on the variables mentioned above. Additionally, possible nationality effects on perceived effectiveness were checked. All means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations for the perceived effectiveness of interlocutors' own communication, their conversation partners' communication and the communication mode ($n = 48$)

	Dutch $n = 24$		German $n = 24$		Average $n = 48$	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Own effectiveness						
ELF	6.30	.37	6.33	.31	6.32	.34
RM	6.32	.35	6.33	.25	6.33	.30
Total	6.31	.38	6.33	.28	6.32	.32
Partners' effectiveness						
ELF	6.36	.34	6.20	.38	6.28	.37
RM	6.37	.35	6.06	.49	6.21	.45
Total	6.36	.34	6.13	.44	6.25	.41
Communication mode						
ELF	6.08	.41	6.29	.62	6.19	.52
RM	6.25	.44	6.08	.28	8.17	.36
Total	6.17	.43	6.19	.53	6.18	.46

The MANOVA for the perceived effectiveness of the interlocutors' own effectiveness, their conversation partners' effectiveness and the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode, with communication mode (ELF/RM) and nationality (Dutch/German) as factors, found a significant multivariate effect of nationality ($F(3, 90) = 2.97, p = .036$). The analysis showed an effect of nationality on the perceived effectiveness of the conversation partners' communication ($F(1, 92) = 8.34, p = .005$). Dutchmen evaluated their German conversation partners as more effective ($M = 6.36, SD = .34$) than Germans did their Dutch counterparts ($M = 6.13, SD = .44$). No further effects were found. Thus, nationality, not communication mode was found to significantly influence perceived effectiveness.

Feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner

Where the previous measurement of perceptions focused on the communication between the interlocutors, the third research question focused on the conversation partner. It measured the extent to which ELF and RM interactions differed in their evaluation of the interlocutors' feelings towards and perceptions of their conversation partner. These feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner were conceptualized as comprehensibility and competence in the current study. A MANOVA was calculated here as well. And, similar to the previous measurement of perceived effectiveness, nationality effects were also checked. All means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. Means and standard deviations regarding interlocutors' feelings towards (comprehensibility) and perceptions of (competence) the conversation partner ($n = 48$)

	Dutch $n = 24$		German $n = 24$		Average $n = 48$	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Comprehensibility						
ELF	6.29	.46	6.13	.61	6.21	.54
RM	6.33	.57	6.13	.54	6.23	.56
Total	6.31	.51	6.14	.57	6.33	.55
Competence						
ELF	6.07	.21	6.19	.32	6.13	.28
RM	6.15	.28	6.08	.29	6.11	.29
Total	6.11	.25	6.14	.31	6.12	.28

The MANOVA carried out above for comprehensibility and competence with as factors communication mode (ELF/RM) and nationality (Dutch/German) showed no significant main effect of communication mode ($F(2, 91) < 1$) nor nationality ($F(2, 91) = 1.77, p = .176$) on comprehensibility and competence. The interaction effect of communication mode and nationality was also not significant ($F(2, 91) = 1.59, p = .211$). Communication mode nor the nationality of the interlocutors was therefore found to affect feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner.

Uncertainty

The next research question aimed to answer whether differences existed between ELF and RM interactions regarding interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty towards their own and their conversation partners' understandability before the spot-the-difference task. Uncertainty was conceptualized with two questions which were analysed separately in the current analysis since they could not be computed. Another MANOVA was used with communication mode (ELF/RM) as well as nationality (Dutch/German) as factor.

Table 6. Means and standard deviations regarding interlocutors' uncertainty towards their own and their conversation partners' understandability ($n = 48$)

	Dutch $n = 24$		German $n = 24$		Average $n = 48$	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Own understandability						
ELF	6.17	.57	4.96	1.08	5.56	1.05
RM	6.08	.50	5.29	1.00	5.69	.88
Total	6.13	.53	5.13	1.04	5.63	.97
Partners' understandability						
ELF	5.88	.54	5.79	.59	5.83	.56
RM	5.91	.59	5.83	.59	5.85	.56
Total	5.87	.53	5.78	.58	5.82	.56

The MANOVA for interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty towards their own and their conversation partners' understandability with as factors communication mode (ELF/RM) and nationality (Dutch/German) showed a significant multivariate effect of nationality ($F(2, 91) = 17.64, p < .001$). The analysis showed an effect of nationality on interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty towards their own understandability during the upcoming conversation ($F(1, 92) = 24, p < .001$). German interlocutors were more uncertain towards their own understandability during the conversation ($M = 6.13, SD = .53$) than Dutch interlocutors were ($M = 5.13, SD = 1.04$). It therefore seems that, similar to the results found for the perceived effectiveness of the conversation partners' communication, nationality and not communication mode can be of influence on the variables measured.

Uncertainty as a predictor for perceived effectiveness, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner

The next research questions attempted to find out whether feelings of uncertainty predicted perceptions (in general) and whether perceived effectiveness and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner were able to significantly predict actual effectiveness. In the analysis below, findings for both communication modes were reported together. Additionally, interlocutors' uncertainty towards their own and their conversation partners' understandability were analysed separately since it was found to be unreliable to compute the two items.

Regression analyses showed that interlocutors' uncertainty regarding their own understandability during the experiment could not predict perceived effectiveness. Not

interlocutors' perceived effectiveness of their own communication (ELF: $F(1, 46) < 1$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$), nor interlocutors' perceived effectiveness of their conversation partner's communication (ELF: $F(1, 46) = 3.59, p = .064$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$) or the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode (ELF: $F(1, 46) < 1$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$). Additionally, feelings of uncertainty towards the interlocutors' own understandability could also not predict feelings towards (comprehensibility ELF: $F(1, 46) < 1$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$) and perceptions of (competence ELF: $F(1, 46) = 1.28, p = .264$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$) the conversation partner.

Furthermore, interlocutors' uncertainty towards the understandability of the communication of their conversation partner was also found to be unable to significantly predict any of the variables measured including interlocutors' perceived effectiveness of their own communication (ELF: $F(1, 46) = 2.83, p = .099$; RM: $F(1, 46) = 3.83, p = .056$), their conversation partners' communication (ELF: $F(1, 46) < 1$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$), the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode (ELF: $F(1, 46) = 1.52, p = .224$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$) and feelings towards (comprehensibility ELF: $F(1, 46) < 1$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$) and perceptions of (competence ELF: $F(1, 46) < 1$; RM: $F(1, 46) < 1$) of the conversation partner.

Perceived effectiveness, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner as predictors for actual effectiveness

As mentioned earlier, the final research question aimed to find out whether any relation existed between perceptions and actual effectiveness. More specifically, it was aimed to find out whether perceived effectiveness, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner could significantly predict actual effectiveness. Again, regression analyses were carried out. Since almost all couples found all differences, this measurement of actual effectiveness was not included in these analyses. Additionally, it was decided to analyze number of words used during the experiment and time needed to find all differences separately.

The first regression analysis measured perceived effectiveness, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner as possible predictors for the number of words used in ELF interactions. None of the variables entered were shown to be significant predictors for the number of words used during ELF interactions ($F(5, 42) = 1.73, p = .148$).

A second regression analysis did not find perceived effectiveness and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner as significant predictors for the time interlocutors needed to find all differences in ELF interactions ($F(5, 42) = .87, p = .521$).

Additionally, no significant results were found in a regression analysis measuring perceived effectiveness and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner as predictors for time needed to find all differences in the spot-the-difference task during RM interactions ($F(5, 42) = 1.73, p = .179$).

The final regression analysis measured perceived effectiveness and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner as possible predictor variables for the number of words in RM interactions. The analysis showed that the variables entered explained 25% of the variance in the number of words used during RM experiments ($F(5, 42) = 4.08, p = .004$). Competence was found to significantly predict the number of words used during the experiment ($\beta = -.37, p = .020$) and the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode was found to marginally predict the number of words used in RM experiments ($\beta = .28, p = .063$). This would mean that when the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode goes up, the amount of words interlocutors use during the experiment also goes up with 28 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant. The opposite was found for competence. When competence evaluations go up, the number of words used during RM experiments go down with 37 SD, given that all other variables are kept constant.

The perceived effectiveness of the interlocutors' own communication ($\beta = -.20, p = .136$), the conversation partners' communication ($\beta = .18, p = .246$) and comprehensibility ($\beta = -.22, p = .109$) were not found to be able to significantly predict the number of words used during the experiment (Table 7).

Table 7. Regression analysis for perceived effectiveness of the interlocutors' own communication, their conversation partners' communication, the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode and feelings towards (comprehensibility) and perceptions of (competence) the conversation partner as predictors of actual effectiveness in RM interactions ($n = 48$)

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Intercept	292.81	97.59	
Effectiveness own communication	-14.69	9.68	-.20
Effectiveness conversation partner' communication	8.94	7.59	.18
Effectiveness communication mode	16.54	8.66	.28
Comprehensibility	-9.08	5.34	-.22
Competence	-29.18	12.07	-.37*
R^2	.25		
F	4.08**		

* $p < .050$, ** $p < .010$

Interaction between interlocutors

In the literature review it was discussed that the current study would not be analysing communication strategies. It was, however, decided to use excerpts (in which interlocutors often explain why they made certain choices) from the experiments as supporting evidence for some findings. These excerpts were from during the experiment as well as comments made by interlocutors before or after the experiment. It is important to mention that these excerpts will not serve as results themselves but as supporting evidence of a finding.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to find out whether a relationship existed between the actual effectiveness of a conversation and perceptions in ELF and RM interactions. However, before such a relationship could be explored the differences between ELF and RM conversations regarding their actual effectiveness, perceived effectiveness, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner and interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty were measured. Finally, the consequences of a possible relation between the perceived effectiveness of the

communication, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner and the actual effectiveness of a conversation for international companies' language strategies were discussed.

Generally, no relation was found between perceptions (perceived effectiveness plus feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner) and actual effectiveness in the current study. Expectations, based on findings by studies such as Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) and Fredriksson et al. (2006), were therefore not met. Also, it is important to mention that one of the measurements of actual effectiveness – the amount of differences found – was taken out of any analysis since almost all conversation pairs found all differences. This measurement of effectiveness will thus not be discussed. Also, even though perceived effectiveness was subdivided into three individual variables which were analysed separately, these three variables will be mostly reported together as 'perceived effectiveness [of the interaction]'.

RQ1 The first research question aimed to find out to what extent ELF and RM interactions differed with regard to their actual effectiveness. The results of the current study show that no difference was found between the actual effectiveness of ELF and RM conversations. However, earlier similar research regarding this topic has yielded some different results, suggesting that to date no conclusive answer exists to the question regarding which communication mode is most effective (in which situation). For example, researchers often find that ELF is the least effective communication mode (e.g. van Engen et al., 2010; House, 1991). Van Mulken and Hendriks (2015) also investigated the actual effectiveness of ELF and RM conversations and found ELF to be the least effective communication mode. These researchers explain that RM was found to be more effective between Dutch and German interlocutors, whose languages are typologically related. This typological relation, although an important condition of a successful RM interaction, was not a deciding factor in the present study, which as opposed to findings in van Mulken and Hendriks's (2015) study, did not find any significant differences in the actual effectiveness of ELF and RM conversations.

A different result regarding the actual effectiveness of conversations in ELF and RM was found by Blees et al. (2014) who did not find ELF but RM to be the most effective communication mode. However, only eight conversations were analysed, meaning that the low number of participants could have influenced the reliability of the overall study. What is interesting, however, is that Blees et al. (2014) attribute most of their findings to their

participants' different levels of proficiency. Participants were found to be significantly more proficient in English than they were in their conversation partners' L1. It was therefore determined that proficiency was the most likely explanation for their findings. Even though it is not clearly mentioned, proficiency differences among participants can also be an explanation for the findings in the previously discussed study (van Mulken & Hendriks, 2015). If participants were more proficient in their conversation partners' L1 than in English, it might explain why RM was found to be more effective. The present study did not find any differences regarding interlocutors' proficiency. Interlocutors were equally proficient in English and their conversation partners' L1, which could have caused the lack of differences. Also, since no proficiency differences were found among interlocutors, all conversations were linguistically balanced which could have contributed to the lack of results regarding actual effectiveness. Studies, such as that of van Mulken and Hendriks (2015), among other, often only perceive differences in effectiveness if conversations in one communication mode are linguistically imbalanced.

The actual effectiveness of conversation in ELF and RM were measured with the number of differences, the number of words interlocutors used and the time they needed to find all differences. Earlier it was mentioned that the number of differences was not included in any analysis since almost all conversation pairs found all differences. The number of words interlocutors used during the experiment and the time they needed to find all differences was analysed. The present study found small – yet no significant – differences in both measurements of actual effectiveness, which is not in line with earlier research executed on this topic. For example, van Engen et al. (2010) executed similar research, however they compared native and non-native speakers instead of ELF and RM. These researchers found that non-native speakers, which most closely resemble ELF speakers, needed more time to find all differences in a spot-the-difference task than native speakers did. Therefore it was expected that interlocutors in ELF conversations needed more time to find all differences. Expectations were, however, not confirmed.

Similarly, no significant differences were found between both communication modes regarding the number of words interlocutors used during the conversation. Edmondson and House (1991) have argued that non-native speakers typically use more words than native speakers because they tend to elaborate more extensively on their utterances because they, for example, might not know the name of something. On the other hand, van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) argue that native speakers use more words. Similarly to Edmondson and House (1991),

van Mulken and Hendriks also attribute their findings to proficiency. However, their explanation is opposite to Edmondson and House's explanation, namely: native speakers use more words not because they need to but because they are able to elaborate on their utterances in more detail.

Even though studies such as that of van Engen et al. (2010) and Edmondson and House (1991) attribute most of their findings to interlocutors proficiency differences, the present study did not find any differences in interlocutors' proficiency levels which may in turn have caused the lack of findings. Interlocutors in both ELF and RM conversations did explained that they experienced similar difficulties relating to them not knowing a word or understanding their conversation partner.

NL58/ELF Sometimes I did not know the word for some thing so I just said other things that I thought were related to the item. For example when I said blue bath thing for the lufa, which I will never forget now haha

NL32/RM I found it really hard to keep talking in dutch when I knew he didn't understand me. I wanted to say it in English but that wasn't allowed.

GER44/ELF Also for me, I also found it difficult when I did not know some word so I just described what was next to it or typed random words. Maybe then he knew what I was talking about.

RQ2 The second research question aimed to investigate whether any differences existed in the perceived effectiveness of the communication. For the current study, perceived effectiveness was subdivided into perceived effectiveness of the interlocutors' own communication, their conversation partners' communication and the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode. It is important to add that not much research has been carried out about topic, thus hardly any material exists to compare the results to.

Generally, no difference in the perceived effectiveness between ELF and RM conversations was found. Interestingly, it seemed that not communication mode but nationality was of influence on the perceived effectiveness of the communication. Dutch interlocutors evaluated German interlocutors as more effective in their communication, meaning that the perceived effectiveness of the communication of Germans was evaluated as higher. Thus, again, no effect of communication mode was found. An explanation for these results could be found

in the amount of English and Dutch/German interlocutors use during their work. It was previously found that Germans use significantly more Dutch and slightly – even though not significantly – more English. Even though the effect of interlocutors use of English and the conversation partners' L2 on perceived effectiveness was not measured in the current study, it could have caused Germans to be perceived as more effective by Dutch participants as they have more practice in these languages.

RQ3 Next, the difference between ELF and RM regarding interlocutors' feelings towards (comprehensibility) and perceptions of (competence) the conversation partner were researched. Similarly to previous research questions, no differences between ELF and RM were found. An explanation for the lack of findings can be found in earlier studies that have investigated the effectiveness of communication. These studies imply that linguistic (im)balance may be able to cause an increase/decrease in interlocutors' perceptions of their conversation partner. For example, Rogerson-Revell (2008) found that linguistic imbalance could lead to feelings of discomfort because of one interlocutor being dominant over the other. On the other hand, Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) argue that linguistic balance could lead to an increase in mutual trust, which might positively affect perceptions of the conversation partner. Interestingly, proficiency differences return as the main explanation for certain findings or implications. Since the current study did not find any differences in interlocutors proficiency levels, it is not surprising that no significant results were found.

Despite the lack of significant results, the fact that the individual scores for comprehensibility and competence are relatively high, is in line with theory by, for example Rogerson-Revell (2008). In addition, Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) have argued that linguistic balance could increase perceptions of the conversation partner, which is what also seems to be the case in the current study. Since no differences in proficiency were found the conversation was linguistically balanced. This linguistic balance could in turn explain the high comprehensibility and competence scores.

RQ4 The fourth research question concerned the difference between ELF and RM regarding interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty towards their own and their conversation partners' understandability. According to Kouwenhoven and van Mulken (2012), interlocutors who are able to speak in their native L1 should be more confident in themselves and their understandability. Additionally, Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) state that if a

conversation is linguistically balanced, feelings of uncertainty should be less present. These studies suggest that interlocutors would be more uncertain in ELF interactions as opposed to RM interactions. However, these expectations were not confirmed. The analysis showed that communication mode had no effect whatsoever on the level of uncertainty interlocutors felt towards their own and their conversation partners' understandability. The results do however show that, again, nationality was of influence on the results. Results show that German interlocutors were more uncertain than Dutch interlocutors about their own understandability, which is striking since it was found earlier that Germans use more English and Dutch during their work.

An explanation for the lack of significant differences might be that Germans are generally less confident in their skills than Dutchmen are, which was not researched in the current study but is illustrated in the following excerpts:

GER13/ELF I am not very good at English I think so I am very happy that we find all differences!

GER34/ELF I think my English is pretty good, but sometimes I don't know the words for something so I panic. I was worried something like that would happen but it didn't.

GER41/RM I was really afraid that he wouldn't understand me when I spoke German. I tried to use only easy words.

NL66/RM I think everything went really well! I was a little afraid that we would not be able to understand each other when I spoke Dutch and she spoke German but we did. Like what if she didn't know the Dutch word I was saying or what if I did not understand the German word she was saying. It was much easier that I thought before.

In addition to these experts, some other studies also provide evidence for why Dutchmen and Germans were equally (un)certain in the current study. According to some studies, Dutch speakers of English often overestimate their competence in this L2. For example, van Onna and Jansen (2006), who compared Dutch speakers' self-reported and actual English skills, found that generally Dutch speakers rate their proficiency a level higher than it actually is. Despite the lack of research regarding German speakers' confidence in their English competence and

proficiency, the overestimation of Dutch speakers' their skills in English seems to be a likely explanation for these findings.

A second explanation could be interlocutors' (un)familiarity with their conversation partner. Researchers such as Gudykunst and Shapiro (1996) explain that a concept such as feelings of uncertainty could become more visible when interlocutors are unfamiliar with each other. Additionally, Gudykunst and Nishida (2001) suggest that unfamiliarity with the conversation partner could result in feelings of insecurity, which is what might have happened with the interlocutors in the excerpts above. However, since familiarity was not directly measured in the current study and some conversation pairs did know each other, these are only suggestions, not direct conclusions or explanations.

Finally, uncertainty scores were generally high among all interlocutors. This is in line with previous research by Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011). Since all conversation in ELF as well as RM experiments were linguistically balanced, feelings of uncertainty were less present. This linguistic balance could also have caused the relatively high scores, meaning that interlocutors were not uncertain about their own as well as their conversation partners' understandability.

RQ5 The fifth research question's purpose was to investigate whether interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty could predict the perceived effectiveness of the interaction as well as interlocutors' feelings towards and perceptions of their conversation partner.

As a consequences of the insignificant findings of the last research question, results of this research question were not much surprising: feelings of uncertainty did not predict perceived effectiveness in either ELF or RM. Additionally, feelings of uncertainty was also found to not be able to predict feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner. These findings are opposed to findings of studies such as Gudykunst and Shapiro (1996) and Gudykunst and Nishida (2001), who all did find that feelings of uncertainty were related to, at least, perceived effectiveness of the communication.

However, Gudykunst and Shapiro (1996) do state that the effect of such feelings of uncertainty towards the interlocutors' own and their conversation partners' understandability are most visible when the conversation partners are unfamiliar with each other, which was not always the case in the current study. A explanation for the findings might be the generally high

uncertainty scores among interlocutors. Since these scores were all relatively high, the effect they could still have had was limited. Interlocutors in similar studies that have investigated uncertainty in relation to perceived effectiveness are usually significantly more uncertain than those in the current study (e.g. Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001). The fact that interlocutors generally were not uncertain and that not all interlocutors were unfamiliar with each other might have caused the lack of a relation between feelings of uncertainty and perceptions (in general).

RQ6 The final research question measured to what extent a relationship existed between perceived effectiveness of the interaction, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner and the actual effectiveness of the conversation in both ELF and RM. As mentioned before, generally, no relation was found between the variables mentioned above. Though some minor results were found, these results were not significant to the extent that relation between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness can be concluded.

The current study is one of the first that explored that relation between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness after other researchers have only hinted at such a relation (e.g. Henderson & Louhiala-Salminen, 2011; Fredriksson et al., 2006). As mentioned before, generally no relationship between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness was found despite of some minor results. For example, the number of words used by interlocutors during RM conversations was significantly predicted by the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode as well as by perceptions of the conversation partner (which was conceptualized as competence). When the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode went up, so did the number of words that were used. Van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) offer a possible explanation for this finding. These researchers did not research a possible relation between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness but they do note that interlocutors in RM interactions may use more words because they speak in their native L1 and are therefore able to elaborate more extensively on their utterances, thus using more words. When RM is evaluated as an effective communication mode interlocutors might also feel more confident that their conversation partner is able to understand them when they speak in their native L1, causing them to use more words.

In addition, perceptions of the conversation partner (competence) was also found to be able to significantly predict the number of words used in RM conversations. However, as opposed to the effect the perceived effectiveness of the communication mode had, when the

perceptions of the conversation partner go up, the number of words went down. This finding too could be explained by interlocutors' proficiency levels. When interlocutors evaluate their conversation partner as more competent, they might feel that the conversation partner does not need many words to understand a certain meaning. However, using less words as a consequence of high perceptions of competence of the conversation partner could also have a negative effect on the effectiveness of the conversation, as can be seen in what happened in the sixth experiment: The German interlocutor thought the Dutch interlocutor knew what he meant so he continued searching for the remaining differences. However, the Dutch interlocutor did not fully understand his partner's utterances and needed more explanation.

[...]

GER45/RM Einen stift. Über dem Hefter

NL46/RM Eh

GER47/RM Ja?

NL48/RM Een stift

GER49/RM Genau! Wie viele Münzen siehst du?

NL50/RM De munten in het midden bedoel je? Ik zie er 9

[...]

Since they could not agree on finding a difference, the time was not stopped after they thought they found the last difference. Afterwards, the German interlocutor explained that he thought the Dutch interlocutor knew the German language quite well since they worked at the same company and spoke both Dutch and German during their work. The Dutch interlocutor, however, did not understand and got confused.

GER88/RM I thought he knew what I was talking about because we speak German at work sometimes. My fault!

NL91/RM I am glad that you think my German is good, haha! I had to ask what a 'hefter' was. Now I know

Conclusion

The first main aim of the current study was to find out if any differences existed between ELF and RM conversation. Even though differences were expected, most were not confirmed. Additionally, it was found that not communication mode (which was expected), but nationality seemed of greater influence. For example on perceived effectiveness and on the feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner. In other words, it seemed to matter more whether the interlocutors were Dutch or German as opposed to whether they were communicating in ELF or RM. Furthermore, despite the fact that some researchers suggest that RM is more effective in border areas (e.g. van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014; van Engen et al., 2010; House, 1999), no evidence of this statement was found in the current study. RM was not found to be more or less effective than ELF. These findings seem to suggest that the effectiveness of a communication mode depends on more factors than just the communication mode itself.

The two main explanations for the findings or the lack of findings regarding the differences between ELF and RM conversations in the current study were found to be proficiency and familiarity. Other studies in which proficiency and familiarity seemed to have played a large role are those of van Mulken and Hendriks (2014; 2015) and Gudykunst and Nishida (2001), among others. For example, van Mulken and Hendriks (2014; 2015) found a significant difference in the actual effectiveness of the communication modes compared as well as a significant difference in interlocutors' proficiency levels. In addition, Gudykunst and Nishida (2001) found that feelings of uncertainty were more visible in interactions with strangers. These feelings of uncertainty as a (partial) consequence of interlocutors' unfamiliarity with each other was found to, in turn, influence the perceived effectiveness of the conversation. Thus, it is concluded that at least part of the lack of results of the current study can be attributed to the lack of differences in interlocutors' proficiency levels and the fact that some interlocutors were familiar with each other. It can also be concluded that, according to the trend observed above, these two variables definitely need to be taken into consideration when researching the effectiveness of communication.

The second aim of the present study was to find out whether a relationship existed between perceptions (in general) and the actual effectiveness of a conversation. This turned out not to be the case. Perceptions generally could not predict actual effectiveness. However, first, it was measured to what extent interlocutors' feelings of uncertainty could predict the perceived effectiveness of the communication: they did not. This is most likely due to the generally high

scores, meaning that generally interlocutors were not uncertain about their own and their conversation partners' understandability. In addition, Gudykunst and Nishida (2001) argued that feelings of uncertainty could significantly influence perceived effectiveness if these feelings were present. However, since interlocutors in the current study were not uncertain, such feelings were not present of which the lack of a relation between this variable and perceived effectiveness in the current study is a likely consequence.

Finally, the relation between the perceived effectiveness, feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner and the actual effectiveness of the conversation was explored. Generally no relation between these variables was found, which is not surprising since also no differences between ELF and RM were found regarding their actual effectiveness, perceived effectiveness and feelings towards and perceptions of the conversation partner. The lack of findings regarding these differences between ELF and RM conversations was mostly attributed to the lack of differences in interlocutors' proficiency levels and some interlocutors' familiarity with each other. It can therefore be argued that outcomes would have been different had there been a difference in interlocutors' proficiency levels or their familiarity with each other.

Practical Implications

The present study was roughly divided into three parts: (1) differences between ELF and RM, (2) the relationship between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness and (3) consequences for international companies' language strategies. The first two were discussed in the conclusion, this study will touch upon the final part next.

Based on the results of the current study, there are no consequences for international companies' language strategies regarding their consideration of perceptions employees might have. It is, however, still believed to be important for manager to pay attention to their company's language strategy. For example, Yanaprasart (2016) did find that language strategies can significantly influence inter-organizational communication. Even though the current study did not find any relation between perceptions and actual effectiveness, it did find that proficiency and familiarity were two important concepts that could explain most findings. Therefore companies need to take these concepts into careful consideration and for example, base their company's language strategy around the abilities of their employees and if needed improve their skills.

The lack of significant findings also prevents the present study to make definitive statements about which communication mode is most effective and which communication mode companies can implement in their language strategies best. Even though no difference in the actual effectiveness of ELF and RM conversations was found in the current study, most similar studies did find a difference in actual effectiveness (e.g. van Engen et al., 2010; van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014, 2015), thus the results of this study should not be seen as definitive, especially considering the seemingly significant influence of interlocutors' proficiency levels.

In addition it can also be argued that managers implement both communication modes in their company's language strategy. For example, English has been found to facilitate international communication (Lønnsman, 2014) and could be an effective means of communication for large group interactions, according to Yanaprasart (2016), who spoke to several large Swiss companies and found that employees are mostly uncomfortable speaking in their own language during meetings since they are afraid they won't be understood. Additionally, employees cannot be expected to have a certain level of receptive competence in several languages to the extent that they can communicate in them. On the other hand, RM could be an effective alternative in interactions between two employees from typologically related language backgrounds, such as Dutch and German (van Mulken and Hendriks, 2014) or Italian and Spanish interlocutors (Ribbert & ten Thije, 2007) since they often have an existing receptive competence of their conversation partners' language. Managers of international companies can thus also consider a combination of the two.

Even though no statements can be made about which communication mode is most effective based on the findings of the current study, earlier studies did find significant differences regarding the effectiveness of ELF and RM as discussed above. Regarding the findings of especially earlier studies such as that of Blees et al. (2014) – who found ELF to be most effective - and van Mulken and Hendriks (2014) – who found RM to be most effective - it seems that both communication modes can be effectively implemented in international companies' language strategies. In conclusion: it seems important for managers to consider more than only one language strategy.

Limitations and future research

One of the limitations of the current research could have been that only 24 conversations were analysed. In other similar research, such as that of van Mulken and Hendriks (2014; 2015),

usually more conversations are analysed, which may make such studies more reliable. Additionally it seems relevant to include some type of interview before and/or after the experiment. In the current study some valuable information was obtained not during the experiment but afterwards when interlocutors explained some of their choices. Combining both qualitative and quantitative data seems relevant to obtain the most complete picture.

A second limitation was that proficiency and familiarity were no conditions: participants were not selected based on their proficiency and conversation pairs did not need to be unfamiliar with each other. Earlier studies (e.g. van Mulken & Hendriks, 2014; Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001) as well as the outcomes of the current study suggest that these two concepts are among the most important when investigating the effectiveness of communication. Therefore, future research should include proficiency differences and unfamiliarity as conditions.

Third, another interesting angle might be the effect of time on effectiveness. For example, it could be interesting to investigate whether interlocutors experience more pressure when they have a limited amount of time as opposed to when there is no time limit. A study about this topic might also be relevant in the discussion about whether time is a reliable measurement in research about the effectiveness of communication in different communication modes.

Lastly, both professionals and students took part in the current study, which is another limitation. Since both professionals and students were used in the current study, the results cannot be fully translated into a business context, since students might not yet have the experience some professionals might have and therefore the outcome may not be fully representative for a business environment. It might therefore be useful for future studies to include only professionals as participants. Insights might be different since professionals may, for example, already have experience with a certain communication mode.

Contribution to theory

The main of the current study was to find out whether a relationship existed between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness as was previously suggested by Henderson and Louhiala-Salminen (2011) and Fredriksson et al. (2006). Even though these studies mention such a relationship, no study to date has specifically investigated a possible relationship

between the variables mentioned above. The current study therefore was the first. Unfortunately it generally did not find any significant results. Some small implications of a relationship were found. For example, perceptions of the speaker did predict the number of words interlocutors used during RM conversations. However, these results are not significant enough to definitively speak of a relation between perceptions (in general) and actual effectiveness. Thus, the current study does not offer new and interesting insights regarding theory about a relationship between perceptions and effectiveness. The most important result found was the significant influence of proficiency and familiarity. However, other studies have also indirectly found such results regarding the importance of these two variables. In conclusion, even though hints were found that suggest a relationship between perceptions and effectiveness which future research could explore further, no striking contributions to the theory were made by the current study in the sense of contributing new insights.

References

- Barnlund, D.C., & Araki, S. (1985). Intercultural encounters: The management of compliments by Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16, 9-26.
- Blees, G.J., Mak, W.M., ten Thije, J.D. (2014). English as a lingua franca versus lingua receptiva in problem-solving conversations between Dutch and German students. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 5, 173-193.
- Braunmüller, K. (2013). Communication based on receptive multilingualism: Advantages and disadvantages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 10, 214-223.
- Boxer, D. (1993). Social distance and speech behaviour: The case of indirect complaints. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 103-125.
- Charles, M., & Marchian-Piekkari, R. (2002). Language training for enhanced horizontal communication: A challenge for MNC's. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65, 234-254.
- Derwing, T., & Munroe, M. (1997). Accent, intelligibility and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1's. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 1-10.
- Dillard, J.P., & Ha, Y. (2016). Perceived message effectiveness predicts information-seeking behaviour. *Communication Research Reports*, 33, 356-362.
- Edmondson, W., & House, J. (1991). Do learners talk too much? The waffle phenomenon in interlanguage pragmatics. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. (Eds.), *Foreign/Second language Pedagogy Research* (pp. 273-287). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Engen van, K.J., Baese-Berk, M., Baker, R.E., Choi, A., Kim, M., & Bradlow, A.R. (2010). The wildcat corpus of native- and foreign-accented English: Communicative efficiency across conversational dyads with varying language alignment profiles. *Language and Speech*, 53, 510-540.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment or normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237-259.
- Fransen, K., Haslam, A., Mallet, C.J., Steffens, N.K., Peters, K., & Boen, F. (2017). Is perceived leadership quality related to team effectiveness? A comparison of three professional sports teams. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 20, 800-806.
- Fredriksson, R., Barner-Rasmussen, W., & Piekkari, R. (2006). The multilingual corporation as a multilingual organization: The notion of a common corporate language. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 11, 406-423.
- Gudykunst, W.B. (1993). Toward a theory of effective interpersonal and intergroup communication: An anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) perspective. In R. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication Competence* (pp. 33-71). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W.B., & Nishida, T. (2001). Anxiety, uncertainty, and perceived effectiveness of communication across relationships and cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 55-71.

- Gudykunst, W.B. & Shapiro, R.B. (1996). Communication in everyday interpersonal and intergroup encounters. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 19-45.
- Henderson, J.K., & Louhiala-Salminen, L. (2011). Does language affect trust in global professional context? Perceptions of international business professionals. *Rhetoric, Professional Communication and Globalization*, 2, 15-33.
- Hendriks, B. (2010). An experimental study of native speaker perceptions of non-native request modification in e-mails in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7, 221-255.
- Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H., & Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). *Precursor and Partner in International Communication Synergies Europe*, 3, 25-36.
- House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication. Interactions in English as Lingua Franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzman (Eds.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language* (pp. 73-89). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- House, J. (2007). Unity in diversity: English as a lingua franca for Europe? In C. Leung, & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Reconfiguring Europe – the contribution of applied Linguistics* (pp. 87-104).
- Kouwenhoven, H., & van Mulken, M. (2012). The perception of self in L1 and L2 for Dutch – English compound bilinguals. In N. de Jong, K. Juffermans, M. Keijzer, & L. Rasier (Eds.), *Papers of the Anéla 2012 Applied Linguistics Conference* (pp. 326-335). Delft: Eburon.
- Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTale: A quick and valid lexical test for advanced learners of English. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44, 325-345.
- Lønnsman, D. (2014). Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion. *Multilingua Journal of cross-cultural and interlanguage communication*, 33, 89-116.
- Marschan, R., Welch, L.S., & Welch, D.E. (1997). Language: The forgotten factor in multilingual management. *European Management Journal*, 15, 591-598.
- Mulken van, M. (2010). Het plezier van vreemde taal. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing*, 32, 268-279.
- Mulken van, M., & Hendriks, B. (2014). Effective communication modes in multilingual encounters: Comparing alternatives in computer mediated communication (CMC). *Multilingua*, 00, 1-23.
- Mulken van, M., & Hendriks, B. (2015). Your language or mine? Or ELF? Comparing effectiveness in English as a lingua franca and L1-L2 interactions: Implications for corporate language policies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural development*, 36, 402-422.
- Onna, van B., & Jansen C. (2006). How multilingual are the Dutch really? On proficiency in Dutch, English, French, and German in Dutch organizations. *Belgian Journal of English Language and Literatures, New Series*, 4, 169-180.
- Planken, B. (2012). The changing landscape of business communication: Developments and directions in research. In P. Heyndericks, S. Dieltjes, G. Jacobs, P. Giéaerts and E. de Groot (Eds.), *The language factor in*

- international business: New perspectives on research, teaching and practice* (pp. 17-40). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Rehbein, J. (1987). Diskurs und verstehen. Zur Rolle der Muttersprache bei der Textverarbeitung in der Zweitsprache; Discourse and Understanding. The role of the mother tongue in word processing in the second language. In E. Apelaeur (Eds.), *Gesteuerter Zweitspracherwerb; Controlled Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 113-172). München: Heuber.
- Rehbein, J., ten Thije, J.D., & Verschik, A. (2012). Lingua receptiva (LaRa) – Remarks on the quintessence of receptive multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 16, 248-264.
- Ribbert, A., & ten Thije, J.D. (2007). Receptive multilingualism in Dutch-German intercultural team cooperation. Ten Thije, J.D., & Zeevaert, L. (red) *Receptive multilingualism. Linguistic analysis, language policies and didactic concepts*. (pp. 73-103) Amsterdam.
- Rogerson-Revell, P. (2007). Using English for international business: A European case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 103-120.
- Rogerson-Revell, P. (2008). Participation and performance in international business meetings. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27, 338-360.
- Stoll, L. (2014). 'In my mind I knew what I wanted to say' – An experimental study into the actual and perceived effectiveness in German-Dutch task-based online communication in ELF and Receptive Multilingualism. Master thesis International Business Communication, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Verschik, A., (2011). Practising receptive multilingualism: Estonian-Finnish communication in Tallinn. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 16, 265-286.
- Welch, D., Welch, L., & Piekkari, R. (2005). Speaking in tongues: The importance of language in international management processes. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 35, 10-27.
- Yanaprasart, P. (2016). Managing language diversity in the workplace: Between 'one language fits all' and 'multilingual model in action.' *Universal Journal of Management*, 4, 91-107.
- Zander, L., Mockaitis, A.I., & Harzing, A. (2011). Standardization and contextualization: A study of language and leadership across 17 countries. *Journal of World Business*, 46, 296-304.
- Zeevaert, L., & ten Thije, J.D. (2007). Introduction. In J.D. ten Thije & L. Zeevaert (Eds.), *Receptive multilingualism, linguistic analysis, language policies and didactic concepts* (pp. 1-25). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Appendix I: Pictures used during the spot-the-difference task

Both sets of pictures were used during both the ELF and RM experiment in random order to prevent order effects.



Derived from Stoll (2014)



Derived from van Mulken and Hendriks (2014)

Appendix II: Questionnaires

The first questionnaire that was administered before the experiment as well as the questionnaire for the ELF experiment are in Dutch. The RM version of the experiment is in German. All version below existed both in Dutch and in German. The Dutch versions were created by the researchers herself since she was native Dutch. For the German versions back-translation was used with the help of a native German person.

Questionnaire before the experiment:

Beste participant,

Hartelijk bedankt voor uw medewerking aan dit experiment. Let op: zowel voor, als na afloop van het experiment zal u een korte vragenlijst voor worden gelegd.

Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen en twee experimenten zult uitvoeren. U kunt op elk moment tijdens het invullen van de vragenlijst en het experiment uw deelname stopzetten.

De gegevens die in dit onderzoek verzameld worden zullen uitsluitend gebruikt worden voor het huidige onderzoek. Natuurlijk zijn deze gegevens volledig anoniem.

Als u vragen heeft over het onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met Martine Korthals via martinekorthals@gmail.com

Door op akkoord te klikken stemt u ermee in dat u:

- vrijwillig meedoet aan dit onderzoek
- dat uw gegevens gebruikt mogen worden voor het huidige onderzoek
- dat u 18 jaar of ouder bent.

De eerste vragenlijst zal bestaan uit drie onderdelen. Hierna kunt u direct door met het daadwerkelijke experiment.

Nogmaals, hartelijk dank

Martine Korthals

Radboud Universiteit

Q1 Vul hier het participantennummer in wat u van de onderzoeker toegewezen heeft gekregen

.....

Q2 Ik heb er vertrouwen in dat mijn partner mij kan verstaan gedurende het chat gesprek

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Volledig	Mee	Een beetje	Neutraal	Een beetje	Mee eens	Volledig
Mee oneens	oneens	mee oneens		mee eens		mee eens

Q3 Ik heb er vertrouwen in dat ik mijn partner kan verstaan gedurende het chat gesprek

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Volledig	Mee	Een beetje	Neutraal	Een beetje	Mee eens	Volledig
Mee oneens	oneens	mee oneens		mee eens		mee eens

Q4 Hoe groot is het aandeel Engels in uw werk?

0	0	0	0	0
0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	n.v.t.

Q5 Hoe groot is het aandeel Duits in uw werk?

0	0	0	0	0
0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	n.v.t.

Bedankt! Dit waren de eerste vragen. U mag nu door naar het experiment. Let op: na het experiment zal u nog een vragenlijst worden voorgelegd.

Nadat u op volgende hebt geklikt en uw antwoorden verstuurd zijn kunt u de beginnen aan de eerste task.

ELF questionnaire after experiment:

Beste participant,

Welkom bij het tweede deel van het onderzoek. Deze vragenlijst zal ongeveer 5-10 minuten duren en zal gaan over het uw belevingen tijdens het experiment en zal uw kennis van de Engelse taal testen.

Hartelijk dank,

Martine Korthals

Radboud University

Q1 Vul hier het participantennummer in wat u van de onderzoeker toegewezen heeft gekregen

.....

Q2 Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen

	Volledig mee oneens	Mee oneens	Beetje mee oneens	Neutraal	Beetje mee eens	Mee eens	Volledig mee eens
Ik heb effectief gecommuniceerd met mijn gesprekspartner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mijn communicatie met mijn gesprekspartner was succesvol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ik voelde me competent tijdens het gesprek	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mijn communicatie met mijn gesprekspartner was passend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mijn communicatie met mijn gesprekspartner was een mislukking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q3 Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen

	Volledig mee oneens	Mee oneens	Beetje mee oneens	Neutraal	Beetje mee eens	Mee eens	Volledig mee eens
Ik heb effectief gecommuniceerd met mijn gesprekspartner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mijn communicatie met mijn gesprekspartner was succesvol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ik voelde me competent tijdens het gesprek	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mijn communicatie met mijn gesprekspartner was passend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mijn communicatie met mijn gesprekspartner was een mislukking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q4 Ik heb effectief gecommuniceerd in het Engels

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Volledig Mee oneens	Mee oneens	Een beetje mee oneens	Neutraal	Een beetje mee eens	Mee eens	Volledig mee eens

Q5 Ik vind mijn gesprekspartner...

	Volledig mee oneens	Mee oneens	Beetje mee oneens	Neutraal	Beetje mee eens	Mee eens	Volledig mee eens
Competent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hoogopgeleid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intelligent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professioneel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ambitieuus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harde werker	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q6 Ik vond mijn gesprekspartner...

Moeilijk te begrijpen 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Makkelijk te begrijpen

De volgende test zal uw kennis van de Engelse taal testen. Lees de onderstaande instructies goed door voordat u begint aan de test.

Deze test bestaat uit ongeveer 60 trials. U krijgt steeds een letterreeks te zien. Uw taak is om te beslissen of dit een bestaand Engels woord is of niet. Als u denkt dat het een bestaand Engels woord is klikt u op "ja", als u denkt dat het geen bestaand Engels woord is klikt u op "nee".

Als u er zeker van bent dat het woord bestaat, ook als u niet precies weet wat het betekent, mag u toch met "ja" antwoorden. Maar als u twijfelt of het wel een bestaand woord is, kies dan "nee".

In dit experiment zijn de woorden meer British English dan American English wat betreft spelling. Bijvoorbeeld: "realise" in plaats van "realize"; "colour" in plaats van "color", enzovoorts. Laat dit u niet verwarren. Deze test is niet bedoeld om deze kleine verschillen te detecteren.

U heeft zoveel tijd als u wilt voor elke beslissing. Dit deel van het experiment duurt ongeveer 5 minuten.

Als alles duidelijk is kunt u door gaan naar de test.

Q7 Geef aan of u denkt dat de onderstaande woorden niet bestaande (nee) of bestaande (ja) woorden zijn.

	Nee	Ja
Platery	0	0
Denial	0	0
Generic	0	0
Mensible	0	0
Scornful	0	0

Stoutly	0	0
Ablaze	0	0
Kermshaw	0	0
Moonlit	0	0
Lofty	0	0
Hurricane	0	0
Flaw	0	0
Alberation	0	0
Umkempt	0	0
Breeding	0	0
Festivity	0	0
Screech	0	0
Savoury	0	0
Plaudate	0	0
Shin	0	0
Fluid	0	0
Spaunch	0	0
Allied	0	0
Slain	0	0
Recipient	0	0
Exprate	0	0
Eloquence	0	0
Cleanliness	0	0
Dispatch	0	0
Rebondicate	0	0
Ingenious	0	0
Bewitch	0	0
Skave	0	0
Plaintively	0	0

Kilp	0	0
Interfate	0	0
Hasty	0	0
Lenghty	0	0
Fray	0	0
Crumper	0	0
Unkeep	0	0
Majestic	0	0
Magrity	0	0
Nourishment	0	0
Abergys	0	0
Proom	0	0
Turmoil	0	0
Carbohydrate	0	0
Scholar	0	0
Turtle	0	0
Fellick	0	0
Destription	0	0
Cylinder	0	0
Censorship	0	0
Celestial	0	0
Rascal	0	0
Purrage	0	0
Pulsh	0	0
Muddy	0	0
Quirly	0	0
Pudour	0	0
Listless	0	0
Wrought	0	0

Q8 Wat is uw leeftijd?

.....

Q9 Wat is uw geslacht?

0 Man

0 Vrouw

0 Anders

Q10 Wat is uw nationaliteit?

0 Nederlands

0 Anders

Q11 Wat is uw moedertaal?

0 Nederlands

0 Duits

0 Engels

0 Anders, namelijk

Q12 Wat is uw hoogstgenoten opleidingsniveau?

0 Basisonderwijs

0 VMBO/MAVO

0 HAVO

0 VWO

0 MBO

0 HBO

0 Universiteit

0 Anders, namelijk

RM questionnaire after experiment:

Sehr geehrte(r) Teilnehmer/Teilnehmerin,

Dies ist der zweite Teil der Studie. Das Ausfüllen des Fragebogens dauert ungefähr 5-10 Minuten in denen Ihnen Fragen zu Ihren Eindrücken während des Experiment und zu Ihren Englischkenntnissen gestellt werden.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

Martine Korthals

Radboud University

Q1 Füllen Sie hier Ihre Teilnehmernummer ein, welche Sie vom Studienleiter zugewiesen bekommen haben.

.....

Q2 Geben Sie an, in wie weit Sie mit den folgenden Aussagen übereinstimmen

	Ich stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Ich stimme nicht zu	Ich stimme eher nicht zu	Neutral	Ich stimme eher zu	Ich stimme zu
Ich habe mit meinem Gesprächspartner effektiv kommuniziert	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meine Kommunikation mit meinem Gesprächspartner war erfolgreich	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ich fühlte mich kompetent während das Gesprächs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ich habe auf angemessene Weise mit meinem Gesprächspartner kommuniziert	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meine Kommunikation mit meinem Gesprächspartner war ein Misserfolg	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q3 Geben Sie an, in wie weit Sie mit den folgenden Aussagen übereinstimmen

	Ich stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Ich stimme nicht zu	Neutral stimme eher nicht zu	Ich stimme eher zu	Ich stimme zu
Mein Gesprächspartner kommunizierte effektiv mit mir	0	0	0	0	0
Die Kommunikation meines Gesprächspartner war erfolgreich	0	0	0	0	0
Mein Gesprächspartner ist kompetent	0	0	0	0	0
Mein Gesprächspartner hat angemessen mit mir kommuniziert	0	0	0	0	0
Die Kommunikation meines Gesprächspartner war ein Misserfolg	0	0	0	0	0

Q4 Ich habe effektiv in Deutch kommuniziert, während mein Partner in Niederländisch kommunizierte

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ich stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Ich stimme nicht zu	Ich stimme eher nicht zu	Neutral	Ich stimme eher zu	Ich stimme zu	Ich stimme völlig zu

Q5 Ich finde meinen Gesprächspartner...

	Ich stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Ich stimme nicht zu	Ich stimme eher nicht zu	Neutral	Ich stimme eher zu	Ich stimme zu	Ich stimme völlig zu
Kompetent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hochgebildet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intelligent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professionell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ehrgeizig	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fleißig	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q6 Ich fand meinen Gesprächspartner...

Schwer zu verstehen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Einfach zu verstehen
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

Der folgende Test wird Ihre Kenntnisse der niederländische Sprache testen. Bitte lesen Sie sich die nachfolgenden Anweisungen gut durch bevor Sie mit dem Test beginnen.

Dieser Test besteht aus ungefähr 60 Durchgängen, in denen Sie jeweils eine Buchstabenreihe sehen. Ihre Aufgabe ist es, zu entscheiden, ob diese Buchstabenreihe ein existierendes niederländische Wort ist oder nicht. Falls sie glauben, dass es ein niederländische Wort ist, klicken Sie auf "ja", andernfalls auf "nein".

Sollten Sie sich sicher sein, dass ein Wort existiert, aber seine Bedeutung nicht kennen, können Sie trotzdem mit "ja" antworten. Sind Sie sich aber unsicher, ob das Wort überhaupt existiert, sollten Sie mit "nein" antworten.

Sie haben so viel Zeit wie Sie möchten für jede Antwort. Der Test dauert etwa 5 Minuten.

Wenn Sie bereit sind, können Sie selbst das Experiment starten.

Q7 Geben Sie an ob die nachfolgenden Wörter nicht existierende (nein) oder existierende (ja) Niederländische Wörter sind

	Nein	Ja
Pastitie	0	0
Scheur	0	0
Fobisch	0	0
Markatief	0	0
Laakbaar	0	0
Slaags	0	0
Riant	0	0
Joutbaag	0	0
Doornat	0	0
Woelig	0	0
Paviljoen	0	0
Doop	0	0
Starkatie	0	0
Onledig	0	0
Toetsing	0	0
Affiniteit	0	0
Mikken	0	0
Knullig	0	0
Streuren	0	0
Rups	0	0
Paars	0	0
Speven	0	0
Geraakt	0	0
Martelaat	0	0
Ontpelen	0	0
Stagnatie	0	0
Dronkenschap	0	0
Voornemen	0	0
Vertediseren	0	0
Normatief	0	0
Zetelen	0	0
Zolf	0	0
Publiekelijk	0	0
Vluk	0	0

Compromeeet	0	0
Romig	0	0
Getint	0	0
Gelovig	0	0
Nopen	0	0
Kluiper	0	0
Geloei	0	0
Retorisch	0	0
Maliteit	0	0
Verspilling	0	0
Haperie	0	0
Proom	0	0
Fornuis	0	0
Exploitatie	0	0
Acteur	0	0
Hengel	0	0
Flajoen	0	0
Aanhekking	0	0
Kazerne	0	0
Avonturier	0	0
Leurig	0	0
Chagrijnig	0	0
Bretel	0	0
Klengel	0	0
Etaal	0	0
Matig	0	0
Futeur	0	0
Onbekwaam	0	0
Verguld	0	0

Q8 Was ist Ihre Alter

.....

Q9 Was ist Ihre Geschlecht

- 0 Männlich
- 0 Weiblich
- 0 Andere

Q10 Was ist Ihre Nationalität

- 0 Deutsch
- 0 Niederländisch
- 0 Andere

Q11 Was ist Ihre Muttersprache

- 0 Deutsch
- 0 Niederländisch
- 0 Englisch
- 0 Andere

Q12 Was ist Ihre höchste abgeschlossene Ausbildung?

- 0 Grundschule
- 0 Hauptschule
- 0 Realschule
- 0 Gymnasium (Gesamtschule)
- 0 Fachhochschule
- 0 Bachelor
- 0 Master
- 0 Andere, nämlich,