三カ国間 (ドイツ・日本・アメリカ) における異文化コミュニケーションの授業の基本概念の違いと類似点の比較

Basic Concepts in the Teaching of Intercultural Communication: Differences and Similarities in Three Countries: Germany, Japan and the U.S.A

Basic Concepts in the Teaching of Intercultural Communication: Differences and Similarities in Three Countries: Germany, Japan and the U.S.A.

Margit KRAUSE-ONO*, Sonoyo ISHIKAWA**

A comparative study of the concepts of ICC was conducted in Germany, Japan, and the U.S. In each country 12 randomly chosen professors (36 altogether) agreed to be interviewed, to fill in an additional questionnaire as well as to distribute a different questionnaire to their students at the end of each course. The results of the transcribed interviews were analyzed using the KJ-method. The following findings were revealed: Most of the U.S. professors see culture(s) as social groups, whereas most Japanese professors perceived them as nations. Most German professors see the term *intercultural* (or *ibunka*: meaning 'different cultures' in Japanese) as something new or third; U.S. professors see the term more as exchange or conflict within a society; however, half of the Japanese professors, perceive the term as groups other than the groups to which one belongs, or bluntly as foreign countries. Most Japanese professors are also dissatisfied with the term *ibunka.*.

Key words: Concepts, Intercultural, Communication, Culture, Japan

1 INTRODUCTION

The teaching of intercultural communication (ICC) at universities started in the U.S. in the 1960s (Rogers, Hart & Miike, 2002). The main incentive for this was brought about by E. T. Hall's (1959) book *The Silent Language*. He also coined the term *intercultural communication*. Psychology, sociology and pedagogy were the main fields of teaching and research then (Asante & Gudykunst, 1989). Research organizations which deal with the subject today are the National Communication Association, NCA; the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, (hereafter: SIETAR) USA; as well as the International Academy for Intercultural Research, IAIR.
Germany, France and the Scandinavian Countries were the countries in Europe to start and develop the pursuit of intercultural subjects or problems. A clear emphasis was put upon two areas: intercultural business

communication (management, HR, advertising, marketing) and intercultural pedagogy (Lüsebrink, 2005). Since the implementation of the Bologna Process in 2000, which demands a restructuring of the entire systems at universities in Europe by 2010, the number of ICC-courses increased substantially in Germany, especially at Universities of Applied Sciences (Bolten, 2007). SIETAR Germany is the largest organization in Europe besides SIETAR Europe.

In Japan, many initiatives started at the International Christian University in Tokyo in the 1970s (Condon & Saito, 1974). The fields, which largely dealt with ICC, were psychology and linguistics. As an equivalent to *intercultural communication* the term *ibunka communication* (*ibunka* meaning 'different cultures' in Japanese) came into existence in 1966 when Hall's book was translated into Japanese by Masao Kunihiro. Only later, the Chinese character *kan* in *ibunkakan* was added by some, which means 'between different cultures'. The creation of the Intercultural Education Society of Japan, IESJ, in 1981 and SIETAR Japan in 1985 fueled greater interest in the field (Yoshida,

*   The College of Liberal Arts, Muroran Institute of Technology
**   Sapporo Gakuin University

Yashiro, Suzuki, in print).

Nowadays ICC-courses can be found at many universities in Japan: a survey from 6-7 years ago revealed more than 250 universities (Abe, Nebashi & Sasaki, 2002). However, the following problems have been pointed out by several authors: Many lecturers are not trained in ICC (Sueda, 1999). ICC-courses are rarely integrated into a department and many courses are treated as an extension of foreign language courses and taught as such (Takai, 2003). In addition, debate about the basic definitions underlying the teaching of ICC has been growing (Hatakeyama, 2001). There is concern, that some definitions might enforce students' stereotypes and bias towards people of different cultures (Hatakeyama, 2001; Guest, 2006). Also, many lecturers seem to equate different cultures with foreign countries (Abe et al., 2002).

To test the validity of these claims, we decided to investigate the understanding of the basic concepts of *culture*, *communication*, and *intercultural* by professors in their teaching of ICC in Japan as well as in Germany and in the U.S. By comparing the basic concepts of ICC education in these three countries at present, it will become clear which concepts are lacking or are different within Japan's ICC education.

In this paper, we will focus on the comparison and analysis of professors' conceptions of *communication, culture and intercultural* in their teaching.

2   LITERATURE REVIEW

Although literature on ICC is prevalent in all three countries discussed here, this does not give us an account of the way professors actually use these terms in their teaching of ICC. Nevertheless, we will present some of the theories which can commonly be found in publications within the three countries.

Many authors who are well-known in the U.S. are also known in Germany and Japan, and in fact, many theories integrate culture and communication. E.T. Hall (1959), who coined the term *intercultural communication*, divides cultures into high-context and low-context ones. He also equates culture with communication. Geertz (1973) sees culture as a system of symbols interacting, which again relates culture with communication. The German author Bolten (2007), similar to Hall, emphasizes the creation of culture via interaction/communication. Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1997) also advocate a strong connection between culture and communication.

A number of authors write about culture and communication separately. Many of them offer to define culture as shared values, beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, which are generated and transmitted, such as Brislin (1981), Triandis (1995) in the U.S. and Ishii, Kume, Tohyama, Hirai, Matsumoto & Midooka (1997), Yashiro, Machi, Koike & Isogai (1998) or Ikeda & Kramer (2008) in Japan. Other authors see culture

simply as the rules for living and functioning in society (Yamada, 1997, Gudykunst, 2004). Hofstede's (1980) definition of culture as 'software of the mind' is also widely known.

In Germany, the sociologist Beck (1999), by proclaiming that cultures are not closed boxes, stressed that culture does not stop at national borders. Thomas (2003-2005), a psychologist, developed *Kulturstandards*, (translated as 'cultural personality structures' in Brück, 2002, p.17) for trainings in order to explain different national cultures more concisely. Assmann, a historian and sociologist, (2002) defines culture as collective memory; the meaning of its content being constantly made and remade. Dülfer (1999) developed a model of the continuously interacting components of culture, such as natural environment, level of technology, construction of meaning (e.g.religion), social relations, juridical system, and the acting individual.

Japanese authors like Sueda and Fukuda (2003) present various definitions of culture, from Edward Tylor to Clyde Kluckhohn and Gary Ferraro. They also explain various perspectives of culture, such as the mechanistic, the psychological, the interactionist as well as the systems theory perspective. Ikeda et al. (2007), however, refrain from presenting definitions of culture, communication and intercultural. Instead, they identify the problems of and question the common notion of the terms to cultivate learners' critical thinking ability.

Regarding communication, Applegate and Sypher (1988) see it as means to construe reality. Griffin (2005), cited in Samovar et al. (2006, 2009, p.8), proposes the following definition: "communication is the management of messages with the objective of creating meaning." This is similar to Ikeda & Kramer (2008), who present several definitions of communication focusing on meaning and interpretation as well as introducing CMM theory. It is also close to Ishii et al. (1997), who define communication as a process in which humans interact/influence one another by giving and receiving of messages in a certain context. Watzlawick et al. (1969/2003) stress the impossibility of not communicating (p.50). Luhmann (1992) views communication under aspects of systems theory, where communication engenders communication and so forth. In Japan, Sueda & Fukuda (2003) present views from the mechanistic, the psychological, the interactionist as well as the systems theory perspective. Schulz von Thun (1998/2007), on the other hand, proposes the 4-ears-4-mouths-model of communication, which gives a more tangible as well as practically useful explanation of the different facets within interactional communication. Linguists, such as Müller-Jacquier (2005), see communication mainly under the heading of intercultural discourse analysis. Ikeda et al. (2007) again attempt to question the transactional model that excludes the communicators'

roles in the creation and the transformation of meanings.

In the U.S., as well as in Japan, definitions of *intercultural* are usually given in conjunction with *communication*. M. Bennett (1998, p.2) defines the term as "communication between people of different cultures with different values" and Samovar, Porter & McDaniel (2007, p.10) see intercultural communication as "…interaction between people whose cultural perceptions and symbols systems are distinct enough to alter the communication event". In all cases the distillation is that *intercultural* is seen as between, exchange or interaction of cultures. Ishii et al. (1997) are close to the above when stating that *intercultural communication* is a process in which humans who have different cultural backgrounds interact/influence one another by giving and receiving messages. On the other hand, Ikeda et al. (2007) stress that a notion of *intercultural communication* as a catch-ball of messages overly emphasizes the practical and effective aspects of communication and that it ignores and discourages individuals' proactive involvement in the creation of culture.

In Germany, the original Latin meaning of the word intercultural (between cultures) is usually stressed and treated as such. For example, Bolten (2007) sees the term *intercultural* as describing something new and in-between, which is neither of the two or more cultures interacting, and Lüsebrink (2005) interprets *intercultural* as all phenomena, which are results of the contact between different cultures.

We have searched for comparative research projects as well as for studies, which deal with the conceptualization of basic concepts in ICC teaching. In Japan, we found Abe et al.'s study/survey (2002) about teaching methods and materials used in ICC. However, there has been no study found investigating concepts of the terms *culture*, *communication* and *intercultural* held by university professors in other countries. In Japan, some articles, which state the importance of investigating the terms used in the field of ICC (Takai, 2003), have been published; however, there has not been any further research into this area.

Although there are a large number of articles which include the definitions of the terms *culture, communication,* and *intercultural*, there has been no study found investigating concepts held by university professors nor by college/university students within a number of different country.

3   METHODS

10-15 educational institutions from each of the three countries (Germany, Japan and the U.S.) were selected at random and a total of 36 professors teaching ICC at those institutions were interviewed, regarding their definitions of the terms *communication*, *culture* and *intercultural* as used in their ICC-courses. The

interviews took place at their respective institutions. In interviews it is possible to probe (Burns, 2000, p. 582) and its narrative-conversational style allows obtaining more detailed and nuanced answers (Brück, 2002). Beside the interview, the professors were given questionnaires asking for more detailed background information. Syllabi were gathered and most professors consented to give a one-page questionnaire to their students at the end of the course. This data will be dealt with in a future paper.

Next, the interviews of the 36 professors (12 from each country) were searched for their conceptualizations and interpretations of the terms *communication*, *culture*, and *intercultural*. These were then sorted and analyzed by using the KJ-method of Jiro Kawakita (1986). Kawakita claims that identifying categories before the sorting of information leads to the exclusion of important data, whereas the KJ method lets all the data "speak" for itself through sorting the data into related themes first. His holistic approach is suited to our research which investigates professors' nuanced and, in some cases, complex conceptions of abstract terms.

In using the KJ method, all professors' explanations of each term were written in a different font or color on stripes of paper, cut up and put on a big table or on the floor. Expressions which were related were gradually grouped and by and by similarities and differences between the groups emerged.

4   RESULTS OF THE THREE CONCEPTS BY PROFESSORS AND COUNTRIES

Before discussing the overall findings, we would like to give some details found in the answers of the professors' questionnaires. Most of the interviewed U.S. professors have a background in communication or communication studies. In Germany the professors' backgrounds are too various to be classified, ranging from sinology, sociology, anthropology, Romance languages, linguistics to communication and/or cultural studies. Again, in Japan, the professors' fields of expertise are mainly communication and linguistics/language education. 80% of the Japanese and American professors have between ten and twenty years or more (American) of teaching experience, whereas the majority of German professors have been teaching ICC for less than ten years. Class sizes in Germany and the U.S. usually range from 25-35 students. However, in Japan, many classes of more than 50 students, some with up to a hundred and above, could be found.

4. 1   Communication
4. 1. 1   How American Professors see communication

Most professors saw communication from either the perspective of symbolic theory, transactional theory or

from both theories. Two professors who adhered to either one of these theories commented that communication is not static because it changes according to the context in which it takes place. They mentioned the following: "symbolic activity that has potential to maintain or change or perpetuate or challenge different identities, personal realities and collective realities." [Male professor, communication studies] "….an activity through which meaning is generated or created between and among people." [Male professor, speech communication].

For the transactional/interpretive and/or information version the following quotes: "transactional process between one or more people when they are communicating both verbal and non- verbally.… A transactional process – something that takes place simultaneously. While I'm communicating, you're communicating at the same time." (Male professor, communication studies). "An exchange of information between people that may or may not be intentional. It involves the exchange process." [Female professor, communication studies]. Communication is perceived as not static: "It shifts, it changes, it depends on the situation and the context that we find ourselves in, and the roles that we are playing throughout a given day, and so forth." [Male professor, communication studies].

Another professor introduced into the course along with the transactional theory, the attribution theory as well as one of the theories about media. Two professors preferred to see communication from the standpoint of other theories such as coordinated management of meaning theory and semiotic theory:

> (CMM is) a very powerful framework that gives me all the theories, all the concepts, all the ideas and all the vocabulary that I can kind of package in a way to show students how to understand the study of communication. …Communication to me is an ongoing process; it's a process of creating meaning and coordinating action, so that's kind of my working definition. Or: All the entire notions of the construction of signifiers and signified, and the social meaning associated with these particular practices. I see communication as a practice, a transactional practice. The focus in my work is a balance between interpretations. Therefore semiotic interpretation. [Female professor, communication studies].

Another two professors focused more on the ethnography of communication in which several theories were used to look at communication. They also mentioned perspectives that fall into symbolic and/or transactional theories.

4. 1. 2   How German professors see communication

10 of these professors saw communication as interactive, nine of them stressed the sender-receiver or face-to-face-model with verbal, non-verbal and extra-verbal influences on communication. The reason for this might be that most of these professors are also involved in trainings for companies and or public institutions. Except one, none of them used the terms symbolic or transactional explicitly but some used terms such as constructive or creating meaning together, which can be seen in the following results: Five of the professors stressed that communication is co-produced, however, another five saw it more as a process. Four of the professors quoted Watzlawick (1969, 2003) expressively, stressing that communication focuses on the HOW not on the WHAT, and the impossibility of non-communication. Three of the professors furthermore stressed that media is also communication, may it be written (ads, posters, flyers, articles) visual (TV-ads etc.) or audible (radio etc.) with less or no interaction.

Two of them used the active listening technique as well as the method 4-ears-4-mouths developed by Schulz von Thun (1998/2007) as an example of interactive communication.

Three of a total of 12 professors, however, had different ideas of what communication is. One professor mentioned that the general idea of most people is that communication is an uncomplicated process and that things will somehow be conveyed. However, his opinion was that most communication is precarious. This can start on a very familiar level, at home. He gave the following example: "Child: May I have an ice-cream? Mother: I am cooking right now. Child: Oh, always…" (own translation) [Male professor, sociolinguistics].

On a similar level another professor stressed that he sees no necessity to streamline theories. Communication is interpersonal communication, it is co-construed, co-present. He does not deal with the pre-conditions of communication nor its consequences or results, but with the phenomenon of co-construction. His approach is a more linguistic one, concentrating on intercultural discourse-analysis.

Another professor stressed solely the HOW in communication and gives no importance, either to the WHAT or to the WHY.

4. 1. 3   How Japanese professors see communication

Some professors see communication from the viewpoint of information theory. Three professors focused on the function of communication. WHY humans communicate, not HOW. Their focus was on what makes a society, therefore their approach was more sociological. One professor viewed communication from the relational communication perspective which focuses on formation, development and management of a relationship and another professor saw communication as a biological instinct and as an information activity.

Most professors, however, preferred to see

communication from the point of view of symbolic interaction theory. In teaching communication most of these professors introduced both, information as well as the symbolic interaction theory. Although the theories and concepts of communication used by the professors were diverse, their points of focus were in fact only split into two: 1. Process of communication between individuals and 2. Function: Communication as a base for society/ a group of humans sharing.

Most professors mentioned communication between individuals and its process. Their main points can be summarized as follows: a) Sharing a meaning between both sides, b) Communication is an act of creating a meaning and of interpretation [imizuke in Japanese], c) It is the founding of a relationship through interaction, and d) Context influences how humans communicate.

This indicates that they saw communication between individuals and focused on the process of communication. Three of the professors, however, focused on the function of communication and saw it as the basis for everything. For them, communication was like returning to biological origins.

> It (Communication) is more like humans spending time together with other humans. Communication is the basis for everything as a whole. "Communicare (Latin)" means to share. At the beginning, the individual DID NOT exist, there were rather sharing humans. And then something occurs that makes someone an individual. What are the shared experiences among humans, and the creation of common experiences? If we don't explain this from the biological perspective then communication cannot be explained at all. (own translation) [Male professor, language education, ICC]

4. 2 Culture
4. 2. 1 How American professors see culture
Among the 12 American professors interviewed, 11 perceived culture through a commonly used concept in ICC text books, mentioning terms such as a learned, shared, transmitted, structured, interpreted, constructed set of values, beliefs, behaviors, rules, symbols, meanings, ways of thinking, education systems, communication styles, expectations, and others. Some of these professors also mentioned big C and small c concept, as well as the iceberg-model. Two of them preferred to see culture from several paradigms such as social scientific, critical as well as the interpretative:

> Culture is seen as a politicized category – political construct. I don't see culture as maybe aesthetic or humanist. I see it in a larger field of interacting disciplines, in which culture itself in society has been politicized. …a critical perspective, which really introduces the notion of inequality, justice, power difference. [Female professor,

communication studies].

Some of the eleven as well as the remaining professor saw culture from the perspective of critical theory, seeing culture as political and a system of power. Two other professors mentioned that they focus on how a culture develops as well as how different factors such as historical, environmental and others influence the development of a culture: "This is very broad: it's from things like climate to everything – the environmental factors, the historical factors, the ecological factors and all that stuff. We talk about how those things influence the way culture develops." [Female professor, communication studies].

Three professors associate culture with macro- and micro-cultural groups such as individuals, families, organizations, and nations. Many of the professors seemed to associate culture with social groups or categories such as, gender, class, sexuality, ethnicities and nations, and find that a person has multiple cultures and identities.

Those professors who adhered to critical theory, as well as a few other professors, see culture as non-static, it changes. The majority of the professors felt that individuals are influenced by culture or by cultural dimensions. One professor felt that individuals may be influenced by culture according to context.

4. 2. 2 How German professors see culture
Most of the professors opted for an open or broader concept of culture. Sociologist Beck's *Cultures are not closed boxes* (1999) was directly quoted by two professors.

10 of the12 professors mentioned Hall (1959) and Hofstede (1980). Two mentioned Hofstede's *software of the mind* approach as a definition for culture and five used his onion model. Some of the professors introduced his model not as a theory, but rather as a tool for the students to find out in which direction they are drawn.

However, when further explaining their ideas of culture, the following words or phrases were often used: Culture is dynamic, but passes on values / an anthropological concept of culture with a set of values / culture is a system of symbols, rituals and points of identification. Or: Culture is an orientation system, which helps to master daily life and at the same time construes culture via communication. It is a network of reciprocities which is realized in different ways. Reciprocity is passed on historically. Culture is characterized by plausibility, normality, it makes routine-behavior possible, and it develops historically.

Two of the professors mentioned Geertz (1987) as theoretical ground. Another professor uses Thomas' (2003/2005) *Kulturstandards* (translated as 'cultural personality structure' in Brück, 2002, p.17) as orientation and Geertz (1987) as theory.

> Not one fixed concept of culture is of interest, but far more by what methods do people

introduce cultural factors into their verbal intercultural communication. …Remarks such as: 'Please no unnecessary Japanese modesty'. What is of interest are the phenomena of how co-acting participants in an intercultural communication 'culturalize' (kulturalisieren) for themselves what they experience during this communication process. (own translation) [Male professor, intercultural linguistics].

One professor, influenced by diversity management, explicitly advocated that age, gender, position etc are all cultures and not only sub-cultures.

Again three professors voiced opinions a little differently to the others. One used the French interculturalist Demorgon (2002), giving the reason that not many authors include a biological perspective in their explanation of culture. Another professor, anthropologist, explained that people constantly change their 'we'-groups, defining themselves through the relevant others. "Culture is the WHY which is explanation for each and everyone of the HOW. One form of HOW might be face-to-face communication. When communicating with someone, one interprets this communication." (own translation) [Female professor, anthropology].

4. 2. 3   How Japanese professors see culture

Many Japanese professors mentioned the following: Culture is something which is shared within a group or shared among people. It is about behavioral/thought patterns; it is learned; handed down from generation to generation; it is about beliefs and values. Objective as well as subjective culture was also mentioned, or the visible and invisible parts of culture were pointed out.

One professor mentioned that culture is information. The sum of shared memories and /or information is culture. Information creates culture. Another professor saw culture as accumulated practices and actions. The focus is on observable characteristics in actual interaction or communication people engage in.

When we asked for their examples of culture, some mentioned national cultures such as Japanese culture, Korean culture and other countries' cultures. One professor summed it up by saying: "Students are interested in national cultures and tend to believe culture is national culture. Although culture is not only national culture, it is easy to fall into the pitfall of discussing national culture. It is my dilemma" (own translation) [Female professor, communication studies.] This dilemma was mentioned by several professors. Many professors pointed out that their students come into class with an idea that culture differs between nations, and that students expect to learn about national cultures as part of that course.

Most professors mentioned that many things or categories can be seen as culture: nation, family, region, as well as gender, generation, experience, organization, club, and society. Among those who saw culture as

diversity, two professors described subcultures – which are within a main culture – as similar to the layers of an onion.

Although they saw culture in similar ways, their opinions on the relationship between culture and self can mainly be divided into two: One is that culture influences/shapes humans, and the other is that humans shape and create culture. More than half of the professors mentioned that culture *shapes* or *influences* one's thoughts and behavior. However, four professors mentioned the opposite viewpoint that *people shape culture,* and they stress the importance of this view. "I try not to have students think that an individual within a group or a culture is strongly influenced by culture. Otherwise I might convey the idea that there is a cultural gap that cannot be bridged."[Female professor, English language education].

4. 3   Intercultural
4. 3. 1   How American professors see intercultural

About eight of the 12 interviewed professors saw intercultural as between and among different cultures/identities. One of them also mentioned that it is moving from one culture to another culture. Two of the eight mentioned that they saw 'differences' as a continuum of similarities and differences. Another commented that intercultural emerges as differences are highlighted.

Another professor took a similar point of view, saying intercultural means people communicating based upon culture. Still another professor mentioned that all communications are intercultural.

The other two as well as some of the eight professors above saw intercultural somehow from the perspective of critical theories by using the terms political and power. One professor especially took a critical perspective commenting that:

> The entire notion of interculturalism is intruded by twin concepts – essentialism and otherization – or if you want, orientalism, too. … intercultural was seen as this transaction between individuals who were often in a business partnership together. So typically, the field emerged because there was seen to be a need to get along with another party, but for the purpose of business. [Female professor, communication studies].

Many other professors tended to cover a great deal of or focus on discrimination, privileged/unprivileged, and social justice issues. Five professors, who saw intercultural as between/among or who looked at it critically, commented that intercultural is associated with conflict or confrontation between/among different cultures and how to resolve this. One professor stated: "intercultural means to me effectiveness." [Male professor, communication].

4. 3. 2   How German professors see intercultural

Most of the 12 professors saw this term as the result of two cultures (via people) meeting, or the incorporation of different cultural horizons. Many professors saw intercultural also as an intersection or cut-set of at least two different cultures, which can again be defined as national, regional or cultural areas. Some mentioned that intercultural might be the experience of different cultures within one person. Others stressed that all cultures are intercultural although they do not see themselves as such.

Four professors mentioned that intercultural would be to communicate in such a way that one's own intentions are acknowledged and one is able to acknowledge the intentions of the other.

In a similar way, three professors would use the term intercultural whenever a limit is reached, where something is no longer perceived as normal. To be intercultural-sensitive then means, to be able to accept this situation, deal with it and not to override it.

Most professors thought that via the above mentioned exchange something new / third can develop. It might be a hybrid, not constant but ephemeral until it disappears or is incorporated in one or both of the original cultures, something third or a new culture altogether. Some professors stressed the importance of this third, and its significance in negotiations, team-work, and management etc. "Intercultural communication is the reciprocal adaptation and creation of something new. That is why it is inter = between. It is neither one nor the other, but is always a conventionalized mixture." (own translation) [Male professor, linguistics].

Intercultural is seen as an exchange, as a process of change, or development of identity; whereas multicultural means no exchange, simply being in the same place, wherever this is. The term transcultural was rather seen as a denial of cultural differences.

However, some differing definitions of intercultural also arose. One professor explained:

> Intercultural means: with which group do I feel strange? With which group of people do I share the feeling of strangeness or of being different? … People ascribe, attribute roles to themselves as well as to other people. If they would really mean only themselves as individuals it would not be the task of intercultural communication to deal with it, but the task of a psychologist, because culture is always more than only one person. (own translation) [Female professor, anthropology].

4. 3. 3   How Japanese professors see intercultural

In the interviews, as they were done in Japanese, we asked the professors what their view on *ibunka* (as *intercultural* is translated in Japanese) is. We found two opposite perspectives. One is that *ibunka* is static. The other is that *ibunka* is generated and volatile.

Some professors mentioned that *ibunka* are groups other than the groups to which one belongs. Others see *ibunka* as all individuals other than oneself. Thus intercultural or ibunka communication equals interpersonal communication, because one person belongs to many cultural groups: gender, age, school, work, region etc. These professors saw *ibunka* as static. However, some professors pointed out that *ibunka* is generated when one finds a difference between oneself and another. Thus *ibunka* is not static, it is volatile. When we asked their perspectives on *ibunka*, diverse opinions concerning the term *ibunka* emerged.

The 異 [i] of *ibunka* has a negative meaning, like something strange in the connotative meaning of this Chinese character. "異文化, as *ibunka* is written in Japanese, is perceived as discriminative." (own translation) [Male professor, linguistics]. Others were of the opinion that "異 simply means different from one's self, and has no negative meaning. 異 is positive and beneficial." (own translation) [Female professor, bilingual/multicultural education]. To quote another professor: "異文化 is used as an idiom nowadays, so I use it. I prefer to add 間 [kan] to express the meaning of 'inter' and mutual respect"(own translation) [Female professor, English language education].. The term 'trans-cultural' is seen as a unique way to express the concept of inter-cultural because it means to transcend one's own culture.

Another professor saw intercultural from the perspective of critical theory, mentioning that intention or the motivation for drawing a line between cultures is important to look into. He stressed the necessity to look at the real intention for drawing a line

> A line is drawn when one says a culture is from here to here. That is not natural. It is done based upon a certain intention or interest. When drawing a line, there is always a motivation. I have students think about where does the motivation come from, what is the background, and what advantages and disadvantages of doing that (drawing a line) are there (own translation) [Male professor, foreign language education and ICC].

5   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Communication as process could be found in all three countries, with an emphasis put upon context in Japan. Most of the American professors saw communication explicitly from either the symbolic or the transactional theory. ICC seems to be often taught in communication departments. Several of the German professors stressed the interactive and meaning-creating part of communication and the impossibility to not communicate (not only as a person). However, communication as function could be only found among the Japanese professors.

Although in all three countries most of the

professors saw culture as something learned, transmitted, and construed, with a set of beliefs and values, different focuses could be found particularly in Japan and the U.S. Many of the U.S. professors associate culture with social groups. Their focuses are on gender, class, ethnicities, and sometimes nations. Some of the professors see culture as a system of power and concentrate on the issues of privileged and unprivileged within a culture. In contrast, many Japanese professors mention that their students expect to learn about national cultures as part of the ICC courses. More than half of the Japanese professors are concerned about the pitfall of discussing national cultures, albeit knowing that culture is not only national.

The largest differences were found concerning the term *intercultural*. Most of the German professors focus on the new, third or hybrid aspect of intercultural and its usefulness in business-encounters. The U.S. professors' focus is placed upon conflicts within society; the social aspect being stronger. Contrary to that, half of the Japanese professors saw the term as static and referring to other cultures. Many Japanese professors are aware of the problem of the term *ibunka*, and quite a number were also dissatisfied with it.

This problem is probably not confined to ICC courses but rather one of the usage of the term *ibunka* as a whole, as a Google count shows (Google search engine, 2,350,00 entries for *ibunka (different cultures)*; 983,000 for *ibunkakan (between different cultures)*; and no entry for *bunkakan (between cultures)* as a single term; May 21st, 2009). The everyday connotation of the term *ibunka*, which stresses the distinct otherness, sometimes mingled with strangeness, of different cultures, as it was even pointed out by some of the professors, might be too strong as to be used in the title of an ICC course. However, three forth of the courses had the term *ibunka* in their title.

Although our sample may not be representative, it shows that some of the points, which have been criticized, are valid. For example, it did not become clear, what focus the Japanese ICC courses have. In the U.S. samples the focus is mainly on the (power) relationship between different groups within a society, whereas in the German samples the focus is mostly on business-encounters. In the Japanese samples a clear focus could not be detected, except for an overall comparison between Japan and other cultures, which again links to the problem mentioned above. It will be interesting to see, how the results found so far will match or not with the perceptions of the students of these three terms. Once their questionnaires are analyzed, we hope to be able to give a more concise picture in a future paper.

However, to clarify if the results of this random sample mirror the situation found in most ICC courses in Japan, a larger study would have to be undertaken.

REFERENCES

Abe, J., Nebashi, R. & Sasaki, Y. (2002). *Research on the teaching methods and materials to realize intercultural education in Japanese university education* (in Japanese) Research report no. 12610289. Tokyo: Diet National Library.

Applegate, J. & Sypher, H. (1988). A constructivist theory of communication and culture. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories of intercultural communication* (pp. 41-65). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Asante, M.K.& Gudykunst, W.B. (1989). *Handbook of international and intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.

Assmann, J. (2002). *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis [Cultural memory]*. München: Verlag C. H. Beck.

Beck, U. (1999). *Schöne neue Arbeitswelt – Vision: Weltbürgergesellschaft. [Nice new working world – Vision of a world citizen society]*. Frankfurt/Main: Campus-Verlag.

Bennett, M. (1998). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

Bolten, J. (2007). *Interkulturelle Kompetenz [Intercultural competency]*. Erfurt: Landeszentrale für politische Bildung.

Brislin, R. W. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction to research methods*. [s.l.]: Longman.

Brück, F. (2002). *Interkulturelles Management*. Frankfurt/Main: IKO – Verlag fuer Interkulturelle Kommunikation

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1987). *Dichte Beschreibung [Thick Description]*. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Gibson, R. (2002). *Intercultural business communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Demorgon, J. (2002). *L'histoire interculturelle des societes[Intercultural history of sociétiés]*. Paris: Anthropos.

Dülfer, E. (1999). *Organisationskultur. Phänomen – Philosophie – Technologie [Culture of organisations. Phenomena – philosophy – technology]*. Stuttgart: Schäffer-Poeschel Verlag.

Google search engine (June 2009). *http://www.google.jp/*

Griffin, E. (2005). *A first look at communication theory* (6th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W. B. (2004). *Bridging differences* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guest, M. (2006, September). Culture research in foreign language teaching: dichotomizing, stereotyping and

exoticizing cultural realities? In *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht (ZIF) [Journal for intercultural language teaching], 11, 3*. Retrieved October 10, 2006, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~german/ejournal/Guest1.htm

Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Hall, E.T. (1966). *The silent language*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Nan'un-do Publishing.

Hatakeyama, H. (2001). A Critical Review of the Current Intercultural Communication Education in Japan: From the Multicultural Perspective. (in Japanese) In *Junshin Bulletin of British-American Studies* , 17, pp.83-99 (in Japanese)

Hofstede, G. (1980).*Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ikeda, R. and Kramer, E. M. (2000). *Introduction to Intercultural Communication*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

Ikeda, R., Nada, Y., Imai, C., Yoshitake, M., Kramer, E. M., Yamada, M., Iwakuma, M., Isa, M. and Maruyama, M. (2007). *Multicultural Society and Intercultural Communication*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Sanshusha.

Ishii, S., Kume, T., Tohyama, J., Hirai, K., Matsumoto, S. and Midooka, K. (Eds.) (1997). *Intercultural Communication Handbook*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

Ishii, S., Kume, T. & Tohyama, J. (2001). *Theories in Intercultural Communication*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Yuhikaku.

Kawakita, J. (1986). *KJ-method*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Chuokoronsha.

Luhmann, N. (2002). *Einführung in die Systemtheorie [Introduction to system theory]*. Heidelberg: Carl-Auer-Systeme-Verlag.

Lüsebrink, H-J. (2005). *Interkulturelle Kommunikation.* Stuttgart: Verlag J.B. Metzler.

Müller-Jacquier, B. & Thije, J. (2005). Interkulturelle Kommunikation: interkulturelles Training und Mediation. In Busch, D. & Schröder, H. (Eds). *Perspektiven interkultureller Mediation*. Frankfurt/M./Berlin: Lang, 363-377

Rogers, E.M., Hart W. B. & Miike, Y. (2002). Edward T. Hall and the history of intercultural communication: The United States and Japan. In *Keio Communication Review 24*, 3-26

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E. & McDaniel E.R.(Eds.). (2009,2006). *Intercultural communication: a reader* (12th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E. & McDaniel E.R.(Eds.). (2007). *Communication between cultures*. (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Schulz von Thun, F. (1998/2007). *Miteinander Reden 3 [Talking with each other 3]*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag

Sueda, K. (1999). To learn about intercultural communication (in Japanese) In *Aguli (Aoyama Gakuin Library Information) 48*. Retrieved September, 2006, from http://www.agulin.aoyama.ac.jp/kanpou/aguli/agulitext/aguli48/aguli48-8.html

Sueda, K. & Fukuda, H. (2003). *Communication studies – Its prospects and perspectives*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Shohhakusha.

Takai, J. (2003). Current trends of intercultural communication research in Japan. *The Annual Report of Educational Psychology in Japan, 42*, 240-254

Thomas, A.(2003/2005). *Handbuch Interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kooperation [Handbook of intercultural communication and cooperation]*. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.l

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., Jackson, D. D. (1969/2003). *Menschliche Kommunikation. [Human communication]*. Bern: Verlag Hans Huber.

Yamada, H. (1997). *Different games, different rules. Why Americans and Japanese misunderstand each other*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yashiro, K., Machi, E., Koike, H. & Isogai, T. (1998). *Intercultural Training – Living the Borderless Society*. (in Japanese) Tokyo: Sanshusha.

Yoshida, T., Yashiro, K. & Suzuki, Y. (2009). Intercultural Communication Skills: What Japanese Businesses Today Need. *International Journal for Intercultural Research* (in print).

三カ国間(ドイツ・日本・アメリカ)における異文化コミュニケーションの授業の
基本概念の違いと類似点の比較

クラウゼ=小野 マルギット*、石川 園代**

ドイツ、日本およびアメリカの３か国の教育における異文化コミュニケーションの概念を調査した。それぞれの国でランダムに選出した総勢 36 名の教員にインタビューを行い、彼らの学生にアンケートを依頼

した。その内容を文字に起こし、**KJ** 法で分析した結果、以下の内容が明らかとなった。アメリカでは文化を社会集団と見ているのに対し、日本では国家と捉えている。また、ドイツでは、「intercultural」（異文化）を第三のものとして見ているが、アメリカではやりとりや不一致として見なしている。日本の半数が、自分が参加している以外のグループもしくは単に異国としてみており、異文化という概念に不満を持っている。

キーワード: 基本概念、異文化、文化、コミュニケーション、日本

*　室蘭工業大学 ひと文化系領域
** 札幌学院大学