論文：

Increasing Japanese university students' intercultural communication competence

Jim Rebstock

Abstract

This paper discusses the intersection of intercultural communication and foreign language instruction. Presents possible cultural factors that might contribute to Japanese not achieving higher levels of intercultural competence. These factors also have implications in Japanese students' performance in the foreign language classroom. Reviews possible methods of improving students' intercultural competence and potential areas for further study. Concludes that raising both instructors' and students' levels of self-awareness is a crucial starting point for achieving higher levels of intercultural communication competence.

Keywords

Culture, Intercultural Communication, intercultural competence, Japanese, language instruction, multicultural person, self-awareness

Introduction

In an interview with American journalist Bill Moyers, author and Public Broadcast Station television commentator Richard Rodriguez was asked whether he considered himself "American or Hispanic" (2005, p.169). Rodriguez answered, "I think of myself as Chinese" (2005, p.169). He then went on to detail and explain the different cultural forces which had shaped his identity, from his Mexican parents to the Irish nuns at his Catholic elementary school to his Chinese neighbors in San Francisco, to the white, middle class, I Love Lucy, Walt Disney, "American" mass culture to which he assimilated (Rodriguez, 2005, p.169). Rodriguez has been widely criticized and attacked by various groups both for his cultural assimilation and his professed views of that assimilation (2005, p.169). Apparently, members of these and other groups believe that culture is a pure, static component of one's identity, immovable, unbending, unchanging, impervious to influence whether from inside or outside.

Rodriguez claims that "(c)ulture is not something opposite us, it is rather something we breathe and sweat and live" (2005, p.169). Hall (1981) calls culture "a series of situational models for behavior and thought" (p.13). Stewart and Bennett (1991) talk about subjective culture and objective culture (p.2). Subjective culture is "the psychological features of culture, including assumptions, values and patterns of thinking" (1991, p.2). Objective culture is "the institutions and artifacts of a culture, such as its economic system, social customs, political structures and processes, arts, crafts, and literature" (1991, p.2). Weaver (1993) compares culture to an iceberg (p.159). Behavior and some beliefs form the tip of the cultural iceberg easily visible above the world ocean in which it floats. Other beliefs, as well as values and thought patterns, form the broader, submerged base, unseen and dangerous (Weaver, 1993, p.160). Implicit in this concept of culture is the idea of collision and potential for disaster. Just as the Titanic, the unsinkable ship, collided with

the unseen iceberg and sank, killing the majority of its passengers and crew, passing into history as a disaster of epic proportions, so do sojourners, individuals who cross boundaries, court disaster when encountering other cultures. This paper will look at factors inhibiting Japanese efficiency as sojourners, and even as international hosts, and suggest ways to increase Japanese sojourner efficiency, especially at the university level.

In their introductory article on intercultural communication, Samovar and Porter (2003) quote the Greek playwright, Aeschylus, "(e)veryone's quick to blame the alien" (p.6). Samovar and Porter go on to give four cogent reasons for studying intercultural communication; 1) new technology in communication and transportation systems, 2) innovative communication systems, 3) globalization of the economy, and 4) changes in immigration patterns (2003, p.6). These four factors, each alone or combined, mean that many people in the modern world have become sojourners, whether they ever leave their homes or not. Bennett (1998, p.1) expands on this idea:

"How do people understand one another when they do not share a common cultural experience?... Today, living in multicultural societies within a global village, we all face the question every day. We now realize that issues of intercultural understanding are embedded in other questions: What kind of communication is needed by a pluralistic society to be both culturally diverse and unified in common goals? How does communication contribute to creating a climate of respect, not just tolerance, for diversity?"

Bennett (1998) then explains that people have historically avoided cultural difference, and when it could not be avoided, fought it (pp.1-2). Barnlund (1998) states that "(a) greater exchange of people between nations, needed as that may be, carries with it no guarantee of increased cultural empathy; experience in other lands often does little but aggravate existing prejudices" (p.37). He also finds travel and phrasebook cultural studies and second language learning to be generally inadequate. Foreign language learning and

"programs of cultural enrichment, while they contribute to curiosity about other ways of life, do not cultivate the skills to function effectively in the cultures studied" (Barnlund, 1998, p.37). This idea is echoed by Robinson, who calls it the "Magic-Carpet-to-Another-Culture-Syndrome" (1997, p.76). Barnlund calls for finding "ways of gaining entrance into the assumptive world of another culture, to identify the norms that govern face-to-face relations, and to equip people to function within a social system that is foreign, but no longer incomprehensible" (1998, p.37). However, a 2006 study conducted at the University of Nebraska at Omaha found that the top three reasons students gave for studying a foreign language were cultural understanding, job/career, and to broaden personal perspectives (Price and Gascoigne). Whether or not the language courses teach intercultural communication skills or not, the desire on the part of learners is there.

When studying or teaching intercultural communication, a number of different perspectives can be used. Samovar and Porter (2003) discuss elements such as worldview and values, social organizations, verbal and nonverbal language, perception, time, and space when introducing and defining intercultural communication (pp.6-17). Triandis (2003) uses what he calls "cultural syndromes" to examine culture (p.18). He measures cultures according to qualities on continuums such as complexity versus simplicity, tightness versus looseness, individualism versus collectivism, active-passive, universalism versus particularism, and so on (2003, pp.18-28). Using Triandis' evaluations, Japan, for example, can be viewed as a complex, tight, collectivist, passive, particularist culture. According to Bennett (1998), intercultural communication can be divided into "two major schools", the "theory-and-research school" and the "theory-into-practice school" (p.IX). He describes the theory-and-research school as "based on traditional sociological and communication perspectives and methods" whereas the theory-into-practice school "is more interdisciplinary, drawing on communication theory, psychology, anthropology, sociolinguistics, and other fields" (Bennett, 1998, p.IX). Fowler and Mumford state, "(e)xperiential learning is a hallmark of intercultural training" (1995, p.xvii).

Bennett (1998) also stresses "the practical aspects of intercultural relations" (p.IX). This paper will focus on the theory-into-practice perspective as described by Bennett.

Hall (1998) characterizes culture as "primarily a system for creating, sending, storing, and processing information" (p.53). Furthermore, it is generally accepted "that anywhere from eighty to ninety percent of the information we receive is not only communicated nonverbally but occurs outside our awareness" (1998, p.53). Barnlund (1998) rates the "individual unconscious", which developed from Sigmund Freud's, Carl Jung's, and other psychologists' work, as one of the "greatest insights of this modern age" (p.48). He connects it to what he calls the "cultural unconscious", which developed from the work of anthropologists such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict (1998, p.49). Simply put, members of a culture share a "collective unconscious" from which they operate. The members' values, their beliefs, their norms, all originate from and are supported and nurtured by this collective unconscious. According to Barnlund, people "occupy a symbolic universe governed by codes that are unconsciously acquired and automatically employed" (1998, p.49). Which is why, in the field of intercultural communication, self-awareness and understanding of one's own culture is the starting place from which to achieve understanding of others' cultures. Measurement tools such as the Four-Value Orientation Exercise (Casse, 1995, p.31), the Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer, 1995, p.61), the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelley & Meyers, 1995, p.53), and the Overseas Assignment Inventory (Tucker, 1995, p.45) have all been standard parts of intercultural training programs. All are culture-general inventories and all focus on respondents' self-assessments, gauging qualities such as respondent adaptability, flexibility, receptibility, and communication style.

Barna (1998) lists six "stumbling blocks in intercultural communication" (p.173). The focus is on the assumption of similarities across cultures, language differences between groups, nonverbal misinterpretations such as gestures and postures but also time and space relationships, preconceptions and stereotypes which hinder "the sensitive search for clues which help us understand others" (Barna, 1998, p.181), the tendency to immediately evaluate other cultures, and high anxiety, or stress, levels which distort perceptions and equilibrium and promote defensiveness and hostility. Barna advocates being aware of such cultural obstacles to communication and working to avoid them (1998, p.187). Ting-Toomey (2003) applies a cultural variability perspective in which cultural dimensions such as individualism and collectivism, low context versus high context communication, and monochronic and polychronic time patterns are examined (p.373). Ting-Toomey encourages members of individualistic, low context communication style, and monochronic time pattern cultures, such as the U.S.A., and members of collectivist, high context communication style, and polychronic time pattern cultures, such as Japan, to be mindful of differences in style between the groups and to actively work to accommodate them (2003, p.381).

Sauceda (2003) calls for awareness, both of self and others, on a number of levels to "transcend" intolerance (p.401). He calls for members of different groups to be willing "to be vulnerable and authentic", to practice "compassion", to be willing to "crisscross cultural boundaries", to be aware of ethnicity, language, and the distorting effects of racism, all in community relations, mental health services, the workplace, and the classroom (2003, pp.402-403). Collier (2003) uses a list of ten questions which apply to participants' cultural identities to try to raise sojourners' awareness of self and others (pp.413-414):

1. "What do I believe about communication and culture?"
2. "What intercultural communication question do I want to answer? Specifically, what do I want to know, understand, or change?"
3. "What cultural identity issues are relevant to the intercultural communication problem in which I'm interested?"
4. "How do power and ideology emerge and affect the intercultural communication problem in which I'm interested?"
5. "What intergroup and interpersonal

relationship processes are relevant to my intercultural problem?"

6. "What kind of communication messages will I examine?" What will be my data?"

7. "What is the context? What situational, historical, institutional, and social factors affect my intercultural problem?"

8. "What perspective and procedures should I use to analyze or interpret the communication messages?"

9. "What are my preliminary interpretations and findings? What are alternative views and interpretations?"

10. "How can I apply my interpretations to improve the quality of my own and others' intercultural experiences?"

All of these perspectives focus on the self-awareness and adaptability, and even open-mindedness, of the sojourner.

There is cross-pollination of multicultural ideas, especially between Great Britain and the U.S.A. Cultural exchange programs such as the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Programme, which was originally a British exchange program, and the English Program in Korea (EPIK), are two current examples of education exchange platforms where language, culture, and education intersect. But while certain American educators might prefer a melting pot assimilationist model for their U.S. classrooms (Janzen, 2003, p.37), educators overseas need something broader and more generally applicable, something more inclusive to a larger number of cultural and national groups. Consequently, it has become an accepted practice to teach not only language but cultural content as well in the language classroom (Brooks, 1997; Byram & Cain, 1998; Damen, 1987; Greenall, 2003; Heuskinveld, 1997; Kaikkonen, 2001; Kramsch, 1997; Kramsch, 1998; Lafayette, 1997; Lomicka, 2009; Pesola, 1997; Raggi Moore et al., 2012; Scarino, 2010; Shi, 2011; Spinelli, 1997, Stapleton, 1997). But there is an active debate as to what form cultural content should take within the foreign language course. Barnlund (1998), as mentioned earlier in this paper, disagrees with foreign language lessons for teaching culture, or rather does not think they go far enough. He believes the same about "cultural enrichment

programs" (p.37). Robinson also, feels that foreign language courses do not "develop empathy" towards foreign cultures (1997, p.76). Parents and educators from primary school to university level, all over the world, believe that language courses offer a way "to understand other peoples' way of life" (Robinson, 1997, p.77) Robinson's research does not support this belief, but rather echoes Barnlund, "(i)s it possible that language study cannot fulfill the goal of developing cross-cultural understanding?" (Robinson, 1997, p.79). She goes on to state that "cultural understanding through language study will by definition be related to such anthropological, psychological, and linguistic concepts as valuing and devaluing; prejudice, acceptance, rejection; verbal and nonverbal communicators" (Robinson, 1997, p.85). But this is exactly the direction Bennett advises going. Bennett (1993) uses a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (p.21). This model projects development of intercultural sensitivity as a continuum which he divides into two different sets of stages, ethnocentric and ethnorelative (Bennett, 1993, p.29). These steps are: Denial, Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration (Bennett, 1993, p.29). Ethnocentrism is defined as one assuming that one's values are universal and shared by all (Bennett, 1993, p.30). Ethnorelativism is defined as "the assumption that cultures can only be understood relative to one another and that particular behavior can only be understood within a cultural context" (Bennett, 1993, p.46). An important feature of this model is to "avoid premature discussion of really significant cultural differences" (Bennett, 1993, p.34). So to progress from Denial to Defense, Bennett recommends "cultural awareness activities" "where music, dance, food, and costumes are exhibited" (1993, p.34). More sophisticated participants might benefit from presentations such as on historical and political topics (Bennett, 1993, p.34). To progress from Defense to Minimization, activities which emphasize "the commonality of cultures, particularly in terms of what is generally good in all cultures" are recommended (Bennett, 1993, pp.40-41). Bennett states that there is a "paradigmatic barrier" between Minimization and Acceptance (1993, p.45). To progress to the Ethnorelative stage, Bennett recommends developing participants' cultural self-awareness

(1993, p.45). Once a certain level of self-awareness has been achieved, simulations, personal experiences, and discussions with members of other cultures are effective (Bennett, 1993, pp.45-46). To progress from Acceptance to Adaptation, Bennett recommends "emphasizing the practical application of ethnorelative acceptance" (1993, p.51). Discussions of value differences between cultures, problem-solving exercises, and cross-cultural simulations are effective (Bennett, 1993, p.51). To progress to the last stage, Bennett recommends one-on-one discussions with members of other cultures, "facilitated multicultural group discussions", interviewing people from other cultures, and empathy training (1993, p.58).

Currently in Japan it has become popular to teach courses and topics called "Global Issues" in the English classroom (Cates, 1993; Cates, 2002; Cates, 2004; Cates, Dusthimer, Jones, Chayanuvat, & Higgins, 1995; Dyer & Bushell, 2004; Henry, 1993; Hinkelman, 1993; Lokon & Perry, 2002; McIntyre, 1996; Sargent, 1993; Sargent, 2004; Smith, 2004; Swenson & Cline, 1993; Yoshimura, 1993). The goal of this type of course content is to awaken Japanese students to the world around them, to force them to look up and out and engage the world. McIntyre (1996) states, "(f)ocusing on contemporary problems and controversies acknowledged to have consequences at both the individual and social level answers the need for relevance in course design and is likely to arouse motivation and sustain interest in learners. Furthermore, introducing global issues as content in EFL (English as Foreign Language) programs at Japanese universities is timely" (p.119). Swenson and Cline (1993) go even further and call for entire curriculums to be built around Global Issues, for all English language courses at any particular university or institution of higher learning to be coordinated, "unified", linked "by type and material" (p.27). Lokon and Perry (2002) comment on their university students' participation at three annual Asian Youth Forums (AYF). They report that the students discovered "a common bond with other Asian students" through English, "broadened – as well as deepened - our students' understanding of the intertwined nature of Japan's past and present with the rest of Asia", and "showed a tremendous amount

of commitment to build peace, goodwill, and intercultural understanding among youth in Asia" (Lokon & Perry, 2002, pp.11-12). Lokon and Perry conclude with "(t)hey (the students) are learning how to transcend cultural and linguistic barriers as they build bridges across Asia. The need to use English has become very real to them" (Lokon & Perry, 2002, p.13). Smith (2004) relates the successful results of a 1995 presentation on "ways we can couple language learning with learning about our world's cultures, its problems, and efforts to create a better world" (p.9). However, not everyone agrees with this approach to content-based courses (Mark, 1993).

In the 1980's, there was a national movement to produce internationalized Japanese citizens who could function in international settings and on the international stage (Yoneoka, 2000, p.7). However, the Japanese definition of an internationalized person and other countries' definitions differ (Yoneoka, 2000, p.12). Japan still "stresses experience and cognitive attributes (i.e. knowledge of language and international affairs) over affective or heart-oriented attributes" (Yoneoka, 2000, p.12). In fact, Yoneoka states that while the Japanese definition of an internationalized person has moved away from experience as a qualifier, due to increased international experience among students, the result has been an "emphasis on cognitive factors rather than affective attributes" (2000, p.17). Yoneoka also reports a backlash against internationalization manifesting itself in subtle ways, such as decreasing numbers of students who want to travel abroad (2000, p.17).

Shaules and Inoue (2000) examine the debate from another perspective, from that of "Globalists" and "Interculturalists", or "Universalists" and "Relativists" (pp.13-14). According to Shaules and Inoue, Universalists believe "that culture is something layered on top of a deeper universal self" (2000, p.14). Universalists espouse ideas such as a "shared humanity", "global identity", and "self-evident, social justice", "concepts which transcend culture" (Shaules & Inoue, 2000, p.15). Relativists on the other hand, emphasize "cultural difference, rather than similarity" (Shaules & Inoue, 2000, p.14). Intercultural

Communication falls into this category. Indeed, Bennett (1998) states, "the intercultural communication approach is difference-based" (p.3). Bennett lists examples of "tragically frequent" genocide and hate crimes to make the point that it is not usual human behavior to welcome cultural difference (1998, p.2). He goes on to say: "Given this history of dealing with difference, it is no wonder that the topic of difference- understanding it, appreciating it, respecting it- is central to all practical treatments of intercultural communication" (Bennett, 1998, p.2). Shaules and Inoue give some examples of differences between Universalist and Relativist theory. A Universalist "ideal for a global community" would be "based on knowledge and awareness of shared humanity" (Shaules & Inoue, 2000, p.15). A Relativist "ideal for a global community" would be "based on constructive engagement between people with different social realities" (Shaules & Inoue, 2000, p.15). A Universalist would seek to "achieve greater intercultural understanding" by seeking to "understand elements of shared humanity" and emphasizing a "global point of view" (Shaules & Inoue, 2000, p.15). A Relativist would seek to "achieve greater intercultural understanding" by seeking to "understand the differences between people" and emphasizing the "process of understanding different points of view as (a) tool for viewing social issues and personal development" (Shaules & Inoue, 2000, p.15). Graves (1993) advocates teaching culture in the "areas of attitude and awareness" (p.10). The combination of concepts of communicative competence, which combines contextual and grammatical language competences, and Discourses, which are group membership "and their rules, beliefs and ways of being, and individual membership within a group" are explored and synthesized by Graves (1993, p.9). From this combination of concepts, Graves distills four principles "to explore the question:
'What can we teach when we teach culture?'

1. language and culture exist in specific contexts
2. language and culture exist in interaction among people
3. language and culture are bound up with beliefs, attitudes, and values

4. language and culture are not a monolithic entity, but an ever-changing composite" (1993, p.9).

These principles at least partially echo Hall (1981, p.13) quoted earlier in the text. Culture is "a series of situational models for behavior and thought" (Hall, 1981, p.13). Graves states, "in Japan culture is viewed as an adjunct to language and is treated as a generic version of the culture of the second language (L2). If addressed at all in the classroom, culture is typically taught as information, which can be stored in the form of knowledge, or practiced as skills" (1993, p.10). Graves goes on to say:

"(m)ost (Japanese) students in an EFL situation do not have the opportunity to engage in L2 social contexts outside of the classroom and so have little practice in developing their sociolinguistic competence. They can, however, develop an awareness of what it means to be socioculturally competent in their L1 (first language) every day as members of multiple Discourses. Students can learn about their own Discourses, the roles they play and the rules they follow" (Graves, 1993, p.10).

Graves puts the responsibility on the language teacher. By questioning his or her own values and beliefs, identity, group memberships, intercultural competence, etc., the teacher can then begin to answer questions such as what to teach when teaching culture (Graves, 1993, p.10). A method of language-culture instruction gaining popularity internationally is community-based learning, or service-learning. This approach places language learners in the target language-culture environment to perform community service as they study the language and interact with native speakers of the target language. Numerous Spanish language programs use this method: Barreneche and Ramos-Flores, 2013; Hartfield-Mendoz, 2013; Tacelosky, 2013. Jovanovic and Filipovic report on Spanish language service-learning in Serbia (2013). Biagi, Bracci, Filippone and Nash describe a service-learning program for Italian learners that focuses on situation-specific, level-appropriate, student-driven intercultural competence (2012). Byram recommends linking

language and culture teaching to citizenship education to create intercultural citizens who are active agents in a multicultural society (2010). Shi recommends detailed pre-departure orientations and manuals focusing on local culture and speech for international students (2011). Ultimately, whatever is taught in the language-culture classroom, Scarino points out that "a traditional assessment paradigm" is no longer sufficient (2010, p.327). She recommends developing assessment processes that more closely resemble data gathering and analysis in research rather than testing students on "a body of knowledge about culture" (p.326).

Robinson's research reflects that teachers and parents worldwide believe that foreign language study alone can help students understand L2 culture. Therefore teaching cultural content as information and skills in the L2 classroom does not appear to be strictly a Japanese trait. But are there any Japanese cultural traits or characteristics which might contribute to intercultural problems or misunderstandings? Hall (1981) refers repeatedly to Japan as a high-context culture. In Japan, meaning will be communicated through a situational context rather than a direct, verbal message (pp.44-45). This Eastern communication style has been an obstacle for Westerners for hundreds of years . Nakane (1970) uses the concepts of attribute and frame in her seminal study of Japanese character, Japanese Society (p.1). Nakane defines attribute as "being a member of a definite descent group or caste" (1970, p.2). It might also include membership in a profession or certain occupation. Frame is defined as "a locality, an institution or a particular relationship which binds a set of individuals into one group" (Nakane, 1970, p.1). Nakane states that Japanese people, rather than identifying with an attribute, no matter how universal, such as a profession, will identify with a frame, for example, a company, which will confer higher prestige (1970, pp.2-3). So in Japan, the level of degree the individual holds does not matter, but the level of the school attended does (Nakane, 1970, p.3).

This is connected to the Japanese concept of *ie*. Nakane defines the concept of *ie* as "a corporate residential group and, in the case

of agriculture or other similar enterprises, *ie* is a managing body" (1970, p.4). She explains that in Japanese families, people who marry into the family become more important than the actual family members who marry into other family groups (Nakane, 1970, p.5). Nakane categorizes descent group as an attribute, categorizes *ie* as a situational frame, and claims it is this early life focus on group membership which conditions Japanese and prepares them for corporate membership and identification as adults (Nakane, 1970, p.4). Fukue (1988) examines the *ie* system and how modernization has affected it. Fukue defines *ie* as "a household, and a family, and a lineal family system" (p.123). However, Fukue agrees with Nakane in that the *ie* is much more important than the individual members (Fukue, 1988, p.123). Fukue theorizes that four characteristics of Japanese culture have developed directly from the *ie* system: 1) rank consciousness, 2) group orientation, 3) emphasis on harmony, and 4) distinction between *uchi* (inside) and *soto* (outside), (1988, p.125). "How one speaks and behaves are regulated by vertical relationships in Japan, which Nakane calls *tate shakai* (vertical society)" (Fukue, 1988, p.125).

Fukue hypothesizes that rank consciousness, or awareness of one's place or rank within a group, begins in the family from childhood. This is later generalized to schools and companies. Fukue theorizes that "(o)nce a person understands his place in the hierarchy, he will feel comfortable, because he will always know how to speak and behave in the group" (Fukue, 1988, p.125). Group orientation also begins with *ie*, within the family group (Fukue, 1988, p.126). Fukue states, "family reputation had to be defended at any cost, and the family line which stretched from the distant past to the present, had to be maintained" (1988, p.126). The mountainous terrain of Japan, the isolation of rural communities, and wet rice agriculture being group-labor intensive all reinforced the "predominance of group consciousness over individuality" (Fukue, 1988, p.126). As early as the seventh century A.D., and possibly earlier, Japanese emphasized group harmony (Fukue, 1988, p.127). Fukue states that "a tolerant attitude toward people who held different views" has been more important than "unflinching

commitment to a cause" (1988, p.128). Maintaining "harmonious personal relationships" has been "far more important than proving whether one is right or wrong" (Fukue, 1988, p.128).

Fukue links the design, layout, and construction of the traditional Japanese house to the separation of inside and outside, *uchi* and *soto* (1988, p.128). Japanese houses are frequently "fenced around with high walls of thick bushes or stone which made the house less visible" (Fukue, 1988, p.128). But inside the house, walls and doors are made of paper, glass, or lightweight wood, and are removable. Also, houses and rooms tend to be small. Individual privacy is almost unheard of in the Japanese home. This lack of barriers inside the family home and impenetrable barriers outside it have contributed to the development of this distinction between inside and outside, and insider and outsider. It extends all the way to the national level. "The homogeneous construction of the nation and its geographical isolation have reinforced the consciousness of *Nihonjin* (the Japanese) as distinct from foreigners with a far greater intensity than most other societies" (Fukue, 1988, p.129). Doi (1985) discusses *omote* (front) and *ura* (back) in relation to *uchi* and *soto* (p.24). *Omote* is what is shown to *soto*. *Ura* remains within *uchi*. Doi states "the western philosophical tradition is suffused with an emphasis on the importance of words. In Japan, such a tradition does not exist" (1985, p.33). Therefore, according to Doi, Japanese are not overly concerned when "the two aspects of something contradict each other at the level of language" (1985, p.33). Japanese people are expecting these multiple dimensions of discourse and are looking for meaning on different levels.

According to McDaniel (2003), "Confucian-based collectivism exerts a significant influence on Japanese communication patterns" (p.253). This collectivism combined with other cultural characteristics such as vertical hierarchy, emphasis on harmony, and formality, among others, "discourages verbal exchanges" (McDaniel, 2003, p.254). McDaniel examines a number of Japanese nonverbal behaviors searching for what he calls "cultural themes", to support the theory that nonverbal communication is "culturally

based and motivated" and should be interpreted culturally (2003, p.254). He concludes that "the use and reliance on nonverbal communication is actually a part of Japanese behavioral psychology motivated by cultural imperatives" (McDaniel, 2003, p.258).

When foreigners come to Japan, a certain amount of adaptation to the host culture on the part of the visitor can be expected. Indeed, from an intercultural communication perspective, such sojourner adaptation is desired and worked toward. Likewise, when Japanese travel abroad, a certain amount of adaptation could be expected from them. However, as Fukue points out, the Japanese affinity for groups is such that, when they do travel, it is usually in a neat, orderly group of fellow Japanese (1988, p.127). Bestor (2003) reports that the worldwide popularity of sushi has created a global market for tuna (p.202). But rather than an international diffusion of the trade, and subsequent change of the market and industry, and the product, the Japanese fishing industry has managed to center the global fish trade for sushi-quality fish in Tokyo. Japanese sushi chefs still set the industry standard in sushi restaurants, and sushi remains a high-prestige, highly identifiable Japanese cultural marker (Bestor, 2003, p.208). Indeed, McDaniel talks about the "self-perceived uniqueness as both a nation and a people" of the Japanese (2003, p.254). McDaniel states that "(t)his idea of distinctive originality provides the Japanese with a focus for social cohesiveness" (2003, p.254). This in turn affects their communication and relations with other national and cultural groups.

What impact does all this have on Japanese students in the classroom? As early as the seventh or eighth century A.D., Japanese scholars were traveling to China to study mathematics and medicine (Beasley, 1999, p.53). However, these students of Chinese technology never seemed to master the theories and philosophies behind the skills. The Chinese lunar and solar calendars used for ritual purposes in Japan, soon became inaccurate (Beasley, 1999, p.53). Japanese physicians seemed not to understand Chinese medical theory (Beasley, 1999, p.54). Similarly, in the nineteenth century A.D., a group

of Japanese studying in London complained about receiving a "general western-style education" rather than the more practical, "technical training" they wanted (Beasley, 1999, p.54). The participants were not interested in becoming "an educated man" (Beasley, 1999, p.54).

　　Hood (2001) discusses the Japanese education system and its origins in Confucianism (p.5). Hood states that "(o)ne aim of the Japanese education system that has remained constant through much of the post-war period, and that has been repeatedly high-lighted by the (Japanese Education Ministry), has been to create an egalitarian system" (2001, p.6). According to him, the "idea that students may have differences in natural ability has traditionally not been a popular one in Japan" (Hood, 2001, p.7). This idea disrupts the group identification which is so carefully constructed in Japanese society. In recent years there have been efforts to make the Japanese education system, and indeed the Japanese workplace, meritocratic. But this Western concept of rewarding individual ability and effort conflicts with Japanese group orientation and emphasis on group harmony, as well as Japanese society's vertical hierarchy, and has met with typically unspoken but very tangible resistance (Hood, 2001, p.7; McVeigh, 2001, p.31). The Japanese proverb which says "the nail which sticks up gets hammered down" provides an accurate image of the Japanese socialization process at all levels (Fukue, 1988, p.126).

　　But what about Japanese students themselves? A study by Pribyl, Keaten, and Sakamoto (2001) reports on Japanese university students and communication apprehension (p.148). Indeed, Peter MacIntyre reports that student anxiety appears to affect not only classroom performance, but also the actual learning process as well (1995). While similar studies in the U.S. reported measurable levels of apprehension toward public speaking among American university students, there were significant differences in the results of the studies (Pribyl, et al., 2001, p.152). For example, no gender differences were reported in the American studies. Another difference was that American

subjects discriminated between group meetings and discussions in relation to public speaking. Japanese subjects reported higher levels of general communication apprehension than American subjects. They also reported distinct gender differences. Public speaking is viewed primarily as a male role in Japan. Japanese subjects also did not distinguish between group meetings and discussions. Both were considered a form of public speaking and both were rated as stressful (Pribyl, et al., 2001, p.153). This is worth consideration in the language classroom especially, since American English has been characterized as a "public" language which focuses on external descriptions of things and has come to represent the world outside Japan for young Japanese students (Friday, 2003, p.97; Rodriguez, 2005, p.172; Yashima, 2002, p.57). In addition to apprehension, Doyon mentions shyness as a very real obstacle to communication inside and outside the classroom (2000, p.11). Doyon refers to Philip Zimbardo's research on shyness and its crippling effects on the individual. In Doyon's research, students labeled shyness as a predominantly negative attribute (2000, p.11). He links shyness to Japanese cultural characteristics such as *uchi-soto*, and vertical hierarchy (Doyon, 2000, p.14). Doyon (2000) also points out that the Japanese education system is responsible for producing passive students (p.14). McVeigh (2001) on the other hand, claims that shyness is merely "an excuse" for "excessive self-monitoring" (p.29). This self-monitoring is a result of sociocultural characteristics, in particular the education system and its over-emphasis on "test-taking and inhibition" (McVeigh, 2001, p.29). McVeigh goes on to state that shyness and apprehension are different. Students report being afraid of instructors and making mistakes and being shy. In reality, McVeigh argues that the students have been so conditioned to a passive education style and test-taking, that they are afraid of this foreign, "spontaneous learning" and due to this fear, become apathetic (McVeigh, 2001, p.30). Furthermore, the students have been socialized that anything not Japanese is foreign and therefore non-conformist. Since the Japanese enculturalization and education processes value conformity and "not standing out", the Japanese students "have developed a lack of conviction, question the value of schooling itself, and have

lost confidence in the entire learning process" (McVeigh, 2001, p.30). Greer (2000) reports on Japanese university student "sensitivity to *hito* (person, people, group), or the third-person 'other'" (p.183). *Hito* as a self-monitor is enculturated into the Japanese identity from infancy (Greer, 2000, p.187). Mothers use it to discipline their children (Greer, 2000, p.187). And while *hito* may remain an unknown, unseen third party, it becomes a primary source of shame and self-monitoring in the Japanese identity (Greer, 2000, p.187). These Japanese cultural characteristics and values bring the students into direct conflict with Western values in the foreign language classroom.

Sasaki (1996) surveyed native speaker (NS) language instructors at Japanese universities about "NS-teacher preferences and Japanese college-student behavior" (p.229) She found a significant "classroom-culture gap exists" (Sasaki, 1996, p.236). NS teachers prefer student interaction and active learning which are "valued in their cultures" (Sasaki, 1996, p.237). Japanese students meanwhile, "follow their cultural code of classroom conduct" (Sasaki, 1996, p.237). Sasaki calls for NS teachers to "be sensitive to cultural factors operating on the behavior of their students" but also for students "to be aware of cultural influences on the interaction style of NS teachers" (1996, p.237). She goes on to state the need "for students to understand that NS teachers are more than teachers: They are cultural beings" (Sasaki, 1996, p.237). Students' preferred learning styles can function as obstacles as well. Ozeki (1995) used a self-reporting survey to measure student preferences in learning styles (p.120). The results of the six perceptual learning styles categorized in the survey, visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group, and individual, indicated Japanese university students "have no single, strong learning preference" which seems to contrast with Western educational philosophy (Ozeki, 1995, p.121). But while the students had no single, strong preference, they quite clearly liked group learning least (Ozeki, 1995, p.121). This creates a conflict in the classroom, since instructors "tend to believe that communicative activities are the most effective for fluency development", but students "tend to believe that traditional learning activities such as grammar exercises and rote

memorization are useful for learning" (Ozeki, 1995, p.124). Ryan (1995, p.112) and Cogan (1995) argue that foreign teachers should not simply expect Japanese students to conform to the culture of the teacher in the classroom. Rather, Ryan suggests that "teachers who work across cultures need to reflect more deeply" and be sensitive to Japanese students' culturally informed behavior (1995, p.115). Cogan (1995) echoes this and advises NS teachers to "partially adapt to Japanese patterns of communication and classroom interaction" (p.107). Eradication of Japanese cultural behavior in the language classroom is not necessarily a desirable goal.

Recent advances in technology have increased both pedagogical options and opportunities for intercultural exchange. Levy discusses the successes and drawbacks of five web-based English language intercultural communication programs (2007). Lomicka documents the outcome of an online joint English-French year-long exchange program focusing on intercultural communication (2009). Raggi Moore, Rizzi and Ristaino report on a virtual video curriculum for Italian learners that was developed by university instructors in opposition to the traditional language skills-based texts, that focuses on cultural study and pushes grammar to the side (2012). Garatti describes the use of clickers, or audience response systems, in Italian language classes (2013). The anonymity afforded by this technology would probably appeal to shy Japanese students. All of these studies stress the importance of cultural instruction, and the added importance of not reducing culture to discrete components of information to be memorized. Garatti, Lomicka and Levy all also point out that as Bennett has said, exposure to foreign culture must be appropriate to the level of the student.

Discussion

Socrates said, "I am not an Athenian or a Greek, but a citizen of the world."
Perhaps he was, but at the time he said it, it was predominantly a Greek world. By contrast, Richard Rodriguez humorously refers to himself

as Chinese. It could arguably be said that just as in Socrates' time it was a Greek world, now with America as the only remaining superpower, it can be said to be an American world. So why does Rodriguez not identify himself as an American? By his own admission, he assimilated to mainstream American culture. Because he is making a point about the diversity in America, the broad spectrum of colors and cultures that make up the current American identity, not the cultural hegemony of the society. He says that "Americans have lately been searching for a new multi-cultural metaphor for America" (Rodriguez, 2005, p.174). The melting pot model is unpopular nowadays, especially with ethnic minorities. Some people like the metaphor of a cultural tile mosaic (Janzen, 2003, p.38; Rodriguez, 2005, p.174). But Rodriguez still favors the melting pot metaphor for three reasons. The first is that America, indeed any culture, "is fluid" (Rodriguez, 2005, p.174). The second is for "its suggestion of pain-and there is pain⋯ Fall in and you are burned" (Rodriguez, 2005, p.174). The third reason is strongly connected to the second reason. While the person who enters the melting pot is burned, he or she is also transformed. "But there is to the metaphor also a suggestion of alchemy or magic. Fall into the melting pot and you become a new person, changed like magic, to gold" (Rodriguez, 2005, p.174). Rodriguez's words, though addressing the American acculturation experience, bear a remarkable similarity to Adler's as he describes what he calls a "multicultural person" (1998, p.226). Due to the "erosion of barriers that have throughout history, geographically, linguistically, and culturally separated people", the multicultural person has emerged (Adler, 1998, p.226). Adler describes the multicultural person as "(a) new type of person whose orientation and view of the world profoundly transcends his or her indigenous culture" (1998, p.227). Further, "(t)he multicultural person is intellectually and emotionally committed to the basic unity of all human beings while at the same time recognizing, legitimizing, accepting, and appreciating the differences that exist between people of different cultures" (Adler, 1998, p.227). Adler identifies three defining characteristics of the multicultural person's identity. "First, the multicultural person is psychoculturally adaptive; that is he or she is situational in relationships

with others" (Adler, 1998, p.234). In other words, "attitudes, values, beliefs, and a worldview are relevant only to a given context" (Adler, 1998, p.234). "Second, the multicultural person seems to undergo continual personal transitions" (Adler, 1998, p.234). He or she "is always re-creating his or her identity" (Adler, 1998, p.235). "Third, the multicultural person maintains indefinite boundaries of the self" (Adler, 1998, p.235). The boundaries of identity "are neither fixed nor predictable, being responsive, instead, to both temporary form and openness to change" (Adler, 1998, p.235). He also ascribes three postulates that he believes contributes to the cross-cultural success of the multicultural person. Multicultural people recognize that:

"1) Every culture or system has its own internal coherence, integrity and logic
2) no one culture is inherently better or worse than another
3) All persons are, to some extent, culturally bound" (Adler, 1998, p.236).

Adler's multicultural person is responsible only for his or her own transformation. And, just as importantly, he or she recognizes and accepts others' differences. Bennett (1998) states, "intercultural communication envisions a reality which will support the simultaneous existence of unity and diversity, of cooperation and competition in the global village, and of consensus and creative conflict in multicultural societies" (p.31). But now that an intercultural communication model has been selected, how do we apply it to Japanese students?

The overwhelming consensus from interculturalists seems to be to focus on students' self-awareness and attitudes (Bennett, 1993; Graves, 1993; Moran, 2001; Shaules & Inoue, 2000). Stapleton (1997) advocates students discussing topics in relation to Japanese culture and then comparing that information to American culture (p.78). Long (1999) recommends using strategic interactions (p.29). Students are presented with questions, opinions, requests, invitations, etc., from foreigners and must respond appropriately (p.31). Guest (2002), however, cautions against focusing exclusively on cultural differences

which are disconnected and taken out of context (p.15). Damen (1987) recommends a number of different activities, all of which stem from an interculturalist perspective. These include case studies, critical incidents, culture self-awareness techniques, dialogues, interviews, problem-solving, and simulations (pp.280-291). Colliers's ten-step cultural identity inventory emphasizing researcher self-awareness also seems to suggest a starting place from which to increase students' awareness of themselves as well as others (2003, p.412). And of course, Bennett's six stages of intercultural sensitivity, discussed previously, support and connect most of these ideas. Applying Bennett's model to Japanese university students, most seem to be at the Denial or Defense stage. So perhaps cultural difference and commonality activities such as mentioned previously, coupled with activities designed to nurture a sense of self-responsibility would be most appropriate for them. While exchange programs can be prohibitively expensive, technology offers more affordable options in email exchanges, online chat rooms, discussion boards, blogs and video conferencing. For the students who can afford to go abroad, community-based service-learning programs offer an attractive alternative to sitting in a classroom all day.

Conclusion

While Socrates claimed he was a citizen of the world, Confucius looked at things a little differently. "Human beings draw close to one another by their common nature, but habits and customs keep them apart." Someone operating from an interculturalist perspective might appear to be more comfortable with Confucius' worldview acknowledging differences than Socrates', which seems to ignore them. The interculturalist view does not so much dwell on specific cultural differences as the awareness and acceptance of those differences. It leaves the sojourner responsible for her- or himself. That is important to note, since Japanese society and the Japanese education system stress responsibility not for the self, but rather to the group. The previously-mentioned model courses and activities, while

successful at other universities and in other environments, have not been tried by the author. Trial implementation is recommended as well as further study. The goal to keep in mind is the increased intercultural competence of the Japanese students, and their instructors. As Bennett says, "the focus brought by interculturalists rests on individuals and relationships" (1998, p.31). By increasing Japanese student awareness of relationships, between concepts, people, and cultures, it is hoped that students' intercultural competence and sensitivity will increase as well.

References

Adler, P. S. (1998). Beyond cultural identity: Reflections on multiculturalism. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp.225-245). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Barna, L. (1998). Stumbling blocks in intercultural communication. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp.173-189). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Barnlund, D. (1998). Communication in a global village. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp.35-51). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Barreche, G. I. & Ramos-Flores, H. (2013). Integrated or isolated experiences? Considering the role of service-learning in the Spanish language curriculum. *Hispania, 96*(2), 215-228.

Beasley, W. G. (1999). *The Japanese experience: A short history of Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). How not to be a fluent fool: Understanding the cultural dimension of language. *The language teacher, 17*(9), 3-5.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp.21-71). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1998). Intercultural communication: A current perspective. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp.1-34). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. & Stewart, E. C. (1991). *American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Bestor, T. C. (2003). How sushi went global. In D. W. McCurdy & J. Spradley (Eds.) *Conformity and conflict: Readings in cultural anthropology, (11th ed.)* (pp.201-211). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Biagi, F., Bracci, L., Filippone, A. & Nash, E. J. (2012). Instilling reflective competence in education abroad experiences in Italy: The FICCS approach + reflective education. *Italica, 89*(1), 21-33.

Brooks, N. (1997). Teaching culture in the foreign language classroom. In P.R. Heusinkveld (Ed.) *Pathways to culture* (pp.11-37). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Byram, M. (2010). Linguistic and cultural education for "bildung" and citizenship. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(2), 317-321.

Byram, M. & Cain, A. (1998). Civilisation/cultural studies: An experiment in French and English schools. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.) *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp.32-44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Casse, P. (1999). The Four-Value Orientation Exercise, using a self-awareness inventory. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.) *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods, (Vol. 2)* (pp.31-44). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Cates, K. A. (1993). LINGUAPAX, language teaching and global education. *The language teacher, 17*(5), 3-4.

Cline, B. & Swenson, T. (1993). Global issues in a content-based curriculum. *The language teacher, 17*(5), 27-40.

Cogan, D. (1995). Classroom cultures: East meets west. Cornwell, S., Morikawa, H., & van Troyer, G. (Eds.). *On JALT 95: curriculum & evaluation. Proceedings of the JALT 1995 International Conference on Language Teaching/ Learning*. 104-108. JALT: Tokyo.

Collier, M. J. (2003). Understanding cultural identities in intercultural communication: A ten-step inventory. In L. A. Samovar & R.

E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader, (10th ed.)* (pp.412-429). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Damen, L. (1986). *Culture learning: The fifth dimension in the language classroom.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Doi, T. (1985). *The anatomy of self.* Tokyo: Kodansha.

Doyon, P. (2000). Shyness in the Japanese EFL class: Why it is a problem, what it is, what causes it, and what to do about it. *The language teacher, 24*(1), 11-37.

Fowler, S. M. & Mumford, M. G. (1995). Introduction. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.) *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods,* (Vol. 1) (pp.xi-xviii). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Friday, R. A. (2003). Contrasts in discussion behaviors of German and American managers. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader, (10th ed.)* (pp.94-103). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Fukue, H. (1988). The persistence of *ie* in the light of Japan's modernization. In J. S. Wurzel (Ed.) *Toward multiculturalism* (pp.123-130). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Garatti, M. (2013). Clickers and the teaching-assessment of culture in the beginning-level Italian classroom. *Italica, 90*(1), 72-94.

Global Issues in Language Education. (2002). Newsletter (#46). Tottori, Japan: K. A. Cates.

Graves, K. (1993). Teaching culture: Knowledge? Skills? Attitude? Awareness? *The language teacher, 17*(8), 9-10.

Greenall, S. (2003). Current concerns in socio-cultural training in the classroom. *The language teacher, 27*(7), 11-13.

Greer, D. L. (2000). "The eyes of *hito*": A Japanese cultural monitor of behavior in the communicative language classroom. *Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) journal 22*, 183-195.

Guest, M. (2002). Time for a revolution in culture teaching and learning? *The language teacher, 26*(3), 15-16.

Hall, E. T. (1981). *Beyond culture.* New York: Random House.

Hall, E. T. (1998). The power of hidden differences. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.) *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp.53-67). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Hammer, M. R. (1999). A measure of intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.) *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods, (Vol. 2)* (pp.61-72). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Hartfield-Mendez, V. (2013). Community-based learning, internationalization of the curriculum, and university engagement with latino communities. *Hispania, 96*(2), 355-368.

Henry, J. (1993). The "Model United Nations": A language learning simulation for global awareness. *The language teacher, 17*(5), 45-47.

Heusinkveld, P. R. (1997). The foreign language classroom: A forum for understanding cultural stereotypes. In P.R. Heusinkveld (Ed.) *Pathways to culture* (pp.487-497). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Hinkelman, D. W. (1993). Overseas tours to research social issues: Language learning through experiential education. *The language teacher, 17*(5), 5-10.

Hood, C. P. (2001). Is Japan's education system meritocratic? *The language teacher, 25*(10), 5-10.

Hoopes, D. S. & Ventura, P., eds. (1995). Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methodologies. Washington, DC: Society for intercultural education, training,

and research (SIETAR International), 1979. (Out of print). In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.) *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods*, (Vol. 1) (pp.xi-xviii). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Inoue, A. & Shaules, J. (2000). Relativism and universalism- opposing views of education for internationalization. *The language teacher, 24*(5), 13-17.

Janzen, R. (2003). Five paradigms of ethnic relations. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader, (10th ed.)* (pp.36-42). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Jovanovic, A. & Filipovic, J. (2013). Spanish teacher education programs and community engagement. *Hispania, 96*(2), 283-294.

Kaikkonen, P. (2001). Intercultural learning through foreign language education. In C. N. Candlin (Ed.) *Experiential learning in foreign language education* (pp.61-105). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Keaten, J., Pribyl, C., & Sakamoto, M. (2001). The effectiveness of a skills-based program in reducing public speaking anxiety [Electronic version]. *Japanese psychological research, 43*(3), 148-155.

Kelley, C. & Meyers, J. (1999). The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.) *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods, (Vol. 2)* (pp.53-60). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Kramsch, C. J. (1997). Culture and constructs: Communicating attitudes and values in the foreign language classroom. In P.R. Heusinkveld (Ed.) *Pathways to culture* (pp.461-485). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lafayette, R. C. (1997). Integrating the teaching of culture into the foreign language classroom. In P.R. Heusinkveld (Ed.) *Pathways to*

culture (pp.119-148). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Levy, M. (2007). Culture, culture learning and new technologies: towards a pedagogical framework. *Language learning & technology, 11*(2), 104-127.

Lokon, E. & Perry, B. (2002). Becoming global citizens: Students' thoughts and impressions of the second Asian Youth Forum. *The language teacher, 26*(10), 10-13.

Lomicka, L. L. (2009). An intercultural approach to teaching and learning French. *The French review, 82*(6), 1227-1243.

Long, R. W. (1999). Curriculum for developing cross-cultural competency. *The language teacher, 23*(10), 29-34.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1995). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *The modern language journal, 79*(1), 90-99.

Mark, K. (1993). Some thoughts about "global" education. *The language teacher, 17*(5), 37-43.

McDaniel, E. R. (2003). Japanese nonverbal communication: A reflection of cultural themes. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader, (10th ed.)* (pp.253-261). Belmont: Wadsworth.

McIntyre, D. (1996). Global issues in EFL: Why and how? *Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) journal 18*, 117-131.

McVeigh, B. J. Higher education, apathy and post-meritocracy. *The language teacher, 25*(10), 29-32.

Moran, P. R. (2001). *Teaching culture: Perspectives in practice*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Nakane, C. (1970). *Japanese society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ozeki, N. (1995). Learning styles of Japanese

students. Cornwell, S., Morikawa, H., & van Troyer, G. (Eds.). *On JALT 95: curriculum & evaluation*. *Proceedings of the JALT 1995 International Conference on Language Teaching/ Learning*. 120-128. JALT: Tokyo.

Pesola, C. A. (1997). Culture and the curriculum in the elementary school foreign language classroom. In P.R. Heusinkveld (Ed.) *Pathways to culture* (pp.173-190). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Porter, R. E. & Samovar, L. A. (2003). Understanding intercultural communication: an introduction and overview. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader, (10th ed.)* (pp.6-17). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Price, J. & Gascoigne, C. (2006). Current perceptions and beliefs among incoming college students towards foreign language study and language requirements. *Foreign language annals*, *39*(3), 383-394.

Raggi Moore, J., Rizzi, A., & Ristaino, C. (2012). Linking texts in Italian culture and language teaching: an Australian and a US perspective. *Italica*, *89*(1), 93-108.

Robinson, G. L. (1997). The Magic-Carpet-Ride-to-Another-Culture syndrome: An international perspective. In P.R. Heusinkveld (Ed.) *Pathways to culture* (pp.75-95). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Rodriguez, R. (2005). The Chinese in all of us. In M. James & A. P. Merickel (Eds.) *Reading literature and writing argument, (2nd ed.)* (pp.169-175). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Ryan, S. M. (1995). Student behaviour: Whose norms? Cornwell, S., Morikawa, H., & van Troyer, G. (Eds.). *On JALT 95: curriculum & evaluation*. *Proceedings of the JALT 1995 International Conference on Language Teaching/ Learning*. 112-116. JALT: Tokyo.

Sargent, T. (1993). Conflict resolution in the communicative classroom. *The language teacher*, *17*(5), 25-26.

Sasaki, C. L. (1996). Teacher preferences of student behavior in Japan. *Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) journal 18*, 229-239.

Sauceda, J. M. (2003). Effective strategies for mediating co-cultural conflict. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader, (10th ed.)* (pp.385-405). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Scarino, A. (2010). Assessing intercultural capability in learning languages: a renewed understanding of language, culture, learning, and the nature of assessment. *The modern language journal*, *94*(2), 324-329.

Shi, X. (2011). Negotiating power and access to second language resources: a study on short-term Chinese MBA students in America. *The modern language journal*, *95*(4), 575-588.

Smith, C. (2004). EFL and international community work. *The language teacher*, *28*(11), 9-11.

Spinelli, E. (1997). Increasing the functional culture content of the foreign language class. In P.R. Heusinkveld (Ed.) *Pathways to culture* (pp.213-224). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Stapleton, P. (1997). A Japan-America cross-cultural syllabus: Focusing on some essential elements of culture. *The language teacher*, *21*(10), 77-79.

Tacelosky, K. (2013). Community-based service-learning as a way to meet the linguistic needs of transnational students in Mexico. *Hispania*, *96*(2), 328-341.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2003). Managing intercultural conflicts effectively. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader, (10th ed.)* (pp.373-384). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Triandis, H. (2003). Culture and conflict. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural*

communication: A reader, (10th ed.) (pp.18-28). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Tucker, M. F. (1999). Self-awareness and development using the Overseas Assignment Inventory. In S. M. Fowler & M. G. Mumford (Eds.) *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods, (Vol. 2)* (pp.45-52). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Weaver, G. R. (1993). Understanding and coping with cross-cultural adjustment
stress. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp.137-167). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: the Japanese EFL context. *The modern language journal, 86*(1), 54-66.

Yoneoka, J. (2000a). Ten years of *Kokusaika*: Has progress been made? *The language teacher, 24*(10), 13-18.

Yoneoka, J. (2000b). What is a Kokusaijin? A 10-year study. *The language teacher, 24*(9), 7-13.

Yoshimura, M. (1993). Teaching global issues to children. *The language teacher, 17*(5), 11-15.