

The Critical Turn in Intercultural Communication: Critiquing Culture as Nation

異文化コミュニケーションに対する批判的変転 —国家としての文化を論評する—

William S. BRADLEY

Abstract

This paper describes the critical turn in Intercultural Communication. I first outline a brief history of the field, including its reception and development in Japan and then introduce several critiques that have been made of the field in the past decade, subsumed under the name of critical intercultural communication. Finally I raise the question of connection to nationalism in nation-state focused approaches to culture in normative intercultural communication.

Keywords : Intercultural Communication, Critical Intercultural Communication, National Culture

概 要

本論文は、異文化コミュニケーションに対する批判的変容について考察する。

まず、簡単に異文化コミュニケーションが日本でどのように受容され、啓発されたかなどに焦点をあて、その歴史を概説する。

次に、異文化コミュニケーション批判と称するものを包摂して、過去10年のいくつかの異文化コミュニケーション分野に対する批評を紹介し、最後に規範的異文化コミュニケーションとナショナリズムの関連性の問題を取り上げる。

キーワード：異文化コミュニケーション、異文化コミュニケーション批判、国家の文化

Introduction

Intercultural Communication is a wide and disparate field of overlapping fields and studies that grew up following Edward Hall's seminal work in the 1950s and 1960s, with the publication of several important books in the 1970s, and formation of societies and journals in the 1980s. In this paper I attempt to trace some of the history of the field (focusing on Edward Hall) as well as offer critiques of some of the early formulations of Intercultural Communication (for which I will use the acronym IC when I refer to

the discipline or field of study; where I refer to the action of communicating “across cultures,” I use intercultural communication without capitals), critiques which are even more relevant in contemporary time. This is partly the result of a more sustained global critique of what might be termed “normative” IC, provided by a sub-field of the discipline, Critical Intercultural Communication (for which I will use the acronym CIC), which has developed since roughly the start of the 2000s. I will outline some of the points that have been made by scholars working within this paradigm. I conclude by looking at the problem of nationalism, suggesting that there exists a collusion between normative or mainstream (also cf. Moon, 2010, who uses “traditional”) approaches to IC and nationalism, in so far as it is focused on nation-state based conceptions of culture.

History of the Origin of Intercultural Communication

If it is possible at all to generalize about the value or necessity of intercultural communication, then most observers agree that its defining force depends on the essential contribution to consciousness of increased numbers of the human species to overcome the barriers that have caused world wars, environmental destruction, and global problems resulting from failures in dialogue and mutual accommodation of different values, whether they are termed philosophical, ethnic, religious, or cultural. One well-known IC textbook reader begins with a framework of explication of globalization through improvements in transportation and communication technologies, growth of economic exchanges, and increased immigration. “Contact among cultures ... and the emergence of multicultural organizations and work forces require that we develop communication skills and abilities appropriate to a multicultural society and to life in a global village” (Samovar and Porter, 1994, p. 1).¹ In further expanding the rationale for IC studies, they write “concern with the difficulties cultural diversity poses for effective communication [has led] to the recognition of intercultural communication as a field of study” (Samovar and Porter, 1994, p. 7).

While much of the ethical and intellectual framing of the need for intercultural communication rests on an optimistic proposal that humans in the late 20th and early 21st centuries need to find a common ground on which to work together for peace, human rights, protection of the ecosphere and a concomitant growth in conscious modes of communication for tolerance of difference and understanding of diversity, such a focus can lead to a presentist bias. In other words, it is only in the last 30 to 40 years that concerns for the future of humanity appear to be powerful enough to concentrate energy into a field of study, which we now can subsume under the term intercultural communication. Whether or not the optimal approach to IC to be considered should be mainstream or critical is a question that I raise in this paper, but to illustrate the shared assumption of most IC scholars, consider for example the idea of a wager as outlined by one critical scholar in the mid-1990s. Here the notion of intercultural communication rests on a backdrop of nothing less than the survival of humans into the 21st century in the face of the various problems mentioned above that threaten a common existence as a world community (Young, 1996). “The development of human powers to affect each other and the planet we share has been so rapid and so great that we threaten our own survival...Only effective intercultural communication can enable us to achieve cooperation and understanding on a global scale” (Young, 1996, p. 1). He later critiques some of the standard approaches to IC, in an argument that anticipates some of what I outline below, in that behavioural and positivist ideas of culture “as a fixed background for individual psychological change ... legislates for the political passivity of immigrants and the incapacity of the host culture to learn from them” (Young, 1996, p. 61).

What interlocking areas of study comprise IC is subject to different interpretations. For example,

Gudykunst has listed intercultural communication, cross-cultural communication, international communication, and comparative mass communication (Gudykunst, 1987) using a two-by-two grid to propose that each contains two dimensions, interpersonal (intercultural and cross-cultural), mediated (international and comparative mass), comparative (cross-cultural and comparative mass) and interactive (intercultural and international). Other scholars have separated approaches according to research paradigms (functional, interpretive, critical humanist, and critical structuralist) to sketch differences between the mainstream field of IC and a growing critique of many of their assumptions and models. Overcoming the fissure between the various paradigms can be accomplished by borrowing, collaboration, or dialectic engagement with binaries such as culture/individual, difference/similarity and others (Martin and Nakayama, 1999).

Transcending the focus on the present in thinking about some of the issues related to how IC is framed is crucial for advancing beyond recurring, even potentially intractable, inheritances from the founding studies of IC in the post-WWII generation. In this respect, the history of IC as a field of academic study has been extended back in time to pioneering approaches of, among others, George Simmel and his work on relations with strangers, Franz Boas, theory of cultural relativism, and Sigmund Freud's emphasis on unconscious communication (for Simmel, see Rogers, 1999; for Boas and Freud's influence on Edward Hall in particular, considered by many as the primary founder of IC, see Rogers, Hart and Milke, 2002). In brief, Simmel's idea of living in a world of strangers and the resultant struggle to achieve communication became the source of one of the first well-known texts on IC (Gudykunst and Kim, 2002, originally 1984). Meanwhile, Boasian anthropology was responsible for many of the ideas of cultural contact and cross-cultural understanding that were developed later by Hall, after studying anthropology with Boas and Ruth Benedict at Columbia University in the 1940s and after WWII while doing post-doctoral study (Rogers, et al., 2002, pp. 3-4). According to Piller (2011, pp. 28-9, citing the Oxford English Dictionary and other sources), early usages of "intercultural" and "cross-cultural" date from the 1930s and quotes from well-known anthropologists Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead (another Boasian) in the 1940s explain the value of cross-cultural research and understanding.

More specifically with regard to communication and language, another of Boas' students, Edward Sapir, who along with Boas, helped to found the Linguistic Society of America in 1925, trained a younger generation of linguistic anthropologists to not only study grammar and philology, but to learn to speak the languages that they were researching (Monaghan, 2012, p. 20). This emphasis on using language in cross-cultural context was picked up by Hall through work with a collaborator, George Trager, who had studied with both Sapir and his star student, Benjamin Whorf (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Rogers, et al., 2002, pp. 5-6). This occurred in 1951, while they were both working for the US Department of State's Foreign Service Institute (FSI), training staff who were to be sent abroad at the height of the Cold War. Monaghan (2012, p. 21) notes how it was a main branch of linguistic anthropology that provided much of the impetus for Hall's ideas of the interconnections of language and culture, while at the same time the ethnography of speaking, a discourse and descriptive approach to language research that was being developed at the same time was largely neglected. This is one area of IC that has been consistently challenged by CIC in recent years, as I note below.

Hall's (1959; 1976) written work is considered by most to be influential and inspirational to the field of IC, growing out of his practical work in training FSI members. In a commonly recounted telling of his development of a new approach to IC, Hall discovered that teaching anthropological theory to FSI staff had little effect on their understanding. They would only "tolerate a few theoretical statements, although they

paid attention to concrete details of real occurrences” and “wanted concrete, immediately useful details provided to them before they left the US” (Hall, cited in Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990). Hall turned to micro-cultural details and descriptions of time and space, paralanguage, and body movement to describe intercultural communication. In an early article, entitled “The Anthropology of Manners,” published in *Scientific American* in 1955 before his first book (1959), he described the variations of spatial distancing in face-to-face conversations. In what is referred to as the most cited section of the article, he describes the exact distances that vary between speakers in the U.S., and Latin American and Middle Eastern countries. In the latter, “distances which are almost sexual in connotation are the only ones at which people can talk comfortably” (Hall, cited in Rogers, et al., 2002, p. 11-12).

While the applied nature of Hall’s work is obvious given the context and demands of training government officials, his emphasis on nonverbal communication is less apparent and deserves more than the cursory treatment I can give to it here. This was an outgrowth of his own anthropological training among Hopis and Navajos in the American southwest in the 1930s as well as work with development programs in the South Pacific island of Truk in 1946. According to Rogers et al. (2002, p. 12), at least 20% of *The Silent Language* (1959) was devoted to nonverbal communication and the book was a runaway bestseller, translated into six languages, including Japanese in 1966.

In his later work (1976), he made a well-cited distinction between high and low-context communication systems; in the former, messages are often communicated conveyed as much in the forms that transport the messages as in the actual information that is conveyed. In contrast, in low-context communication systems, much more importance is placed on the information in the communication. Japan and China (but also England and France) orient to the high-context culture while Germany, Scandinavia, and the U.S. orient to the low-context culture. “In high-context communication the listener is already ‘contexted’ and does not need to be given much background information” (Hall, cited in Chen and Starosta, 1998, p. 50). This distinction became the source of much subsequent research, including by Gudykunst who argued that nonverbal cues were more important in high-context cultures and later (with a co-author) “confirmed Hall’s prediction that Japanese (high-context culture) show a lower level of self-disclosure and interrogation than Americans” (Gudykunst and Nishida, 1984, cited in Chen and Starosta, 1998, p. 130). I detail more of the acceptance of Hall’s work and IC more generally in Japan below, but first I turn to a crucial issue that has arisen in discussion of revisionist histories of IC.

The contribution of anthropological conceptions of culture to an incipient IC through Hall’s association with Boasians at Columbia led him to modify his conception of the use of culture in the 1950s, without positing the need for a field such as IC.² He wrote in a co-authored article in 1960 that previously anthropologists had been mostly interested in “the internal pattern of a given culture” and in addition they had “examined the impact of one culture upon another. [However] very little attention has been given to the actual communication between representatives of different cultures” (Hall and Whyte, 1960, cited in Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990).

In a more recent piece of research, Leeds-Hurwitz (2010) explores the connection between “culture at a distance” studies championed by Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, and a number of other anthropologists in the pre-WWII period as forerunners for intercultural study and descriptions that Hall was to put forward later. In particular, she cites applied research that was done under the auspices of the Institute for Intercultural Studies that was organized by this group, headed by Margaret Mead and her husband, British anthropologist Gregory Bateson. While there is no explicit critique of anthropology’s current relation to the study of intercultural communication (other than a mention that most anthropologists, like IC scholars,

know little of this history), the assumption is given that cultural concepts that have long been abandoned by many anthropologists continue to predominate in IC. I return to this problem below.

While Hall may be considered a founder of sorts, there are numerous other authors who have contributed to the nation-state culturalist basis of IC. Foremost among them is Geert Hofstede, whose work surveying 88,000 IBM employees in 40 countries (there are more than 50 countries, but the number is reduced if 50 responses each is considered a standard) led him to posit four cultural polar dimensions (individualism/collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity/femininity; Hofstede, 1980). In later revisions he (and other collaborators) also included what they termed “Confucian dynamism,” a variable to describe long-term orientation vs. short-term orientation. Rogers and Tan (2008) identified Hofstede (along with Hall) as one of the five key scholars of IC research, using the Social Science Citation Index which showed him to have more than twice as many citations as Hall or any other IC researchers.

Compared with Hall and the other four that they selected, they argue that Hofstede is the most identifiably national-oriented (on a continuum from universal/national/organizational/interpersonal/intrapersonal). His interest in the “collective mind” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 21, cited in Rogers and Tan, 2008, p. 4) is focused on national characteristics. Most research utilizing Hofstede has been focused on the first of Hofstede’s variables, individualism vs. collectivism, with some IC scholars, including Hofstede, labeling Japanese as group-oriented. Jandt (2001, p. 203), however, points out that Japan is “popularly stereotyped as a group-oriented culture,” whereas in the index of countries, in this scale at least, Japan ranked in the middle of the scale (23rd out of 53 countries and regions). In recent years, Hofstede’s model has come under sustained criticism from multiple scholars. Fang (2003), for example, took Hofstede to task for the fifth dimension which included China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan and South Korea in the top five slots (but followed by Brazil and India). He summarizes his argument as “for decades the field of cross-cultural research has been predominated by a functionalist paradigm of national culture, which analyzes culture in terms of *bipolarized* (italics in original) cultural dimensions” referring not only to Hofstede by also Hall’s high and low context societies (see McSweeney, 2001, for a critique of Hofstede; on “disrupt[ing] binary opposites” such as individualism and collectivism see Scollon et al., 2012, p. 237; also Ono, 2010, p. 90).

One further scholar worth mention, because of his connection with Japan (see below) is William Gudykunst, who utilized frameworks from both Hall and Hofstede in his work on anxiety management in IC (Gudykunst, 1987). Gudykunst can be credited with an impressive range of publications starting in the 1980s in which he proposed more rigorous research to test variables of intercultural communication, while at the same time leading to the stridently positivist approach that framed culture in national categories and simultaneously marginalized it as a domain of continuous contestation, a conception that in contrast has been advanced by CIC scholars more recently (Yoshitake, 2002).

Another aspect of interest to scholars in Japan is the fact that many of the early scholars had lived in Japan at one point or had done some study on Japanese aspects of intercultural communication (which I elaborate on below). Piller (2011) has called attention to the drivers in this relation between the U.S. and Japan, namely the necessity for exchanges in military/diplomacy and business (as well as missionary/religious studies) among early approaches to the study of IC. In other words, the study of IC developed in its early history as primarily an applied field (as already noted above with the discussion of Hall), an aspect that further led to its compartmentalization of culture as overlapping with nation-states, which has been also critiqued by CIC scholars.

Focus on Japan in the Early History of Intercultural Communication

According to one research done on Japanese intercultural communication, there exist more studies of the communication between Japanese and Americans than other groups (Ito, 1992, cited in Rogers, et al., 2002, p. 15). What accounts for the robust development of this particular study of IC? Certainly Edward Hall's work was influential in fuelling interest in the style of Japanese communication, not only the high-context vs. low-context comparison, but also analysis of indigenous concepts such as *amae*, *wa*, *ma*, and *nemawashi*, all mentioned by Hall in later works. He also pointed to the role of silence in Japanese communication (Rogers, et al., 2002, p. 17).

As I noted in the first section, in addition to Hall's interest in Japan, a surprising number of early intercultural communication scholars either spent considerable time in Japan or carried out research on communication between Japanese and others. John Condon, who co-authored what is considered one of the first textbooks on IC (Condon and Yousef, 1975) worked for a number of years as a professor at International Christian University in Tokyo and helped organize numerous conferences and workshops while there in the 1970s. In one co-edited publication with Saito Mitsuko (whose career trajectory is outlined below), he brought together IC researchers such as Clifford Clarke (who founded one of the first IC training institutes for businesses in Tokyo in 1980; Kawakami, 2009) and Milton Bennett, founder of the Intercultural Communication Institute (based in Portland, Oregon) in 1986 (Condon and Saito, 1974).³

In addition, Japanese participants included Doi Takeo, known for introducing the concept of *amae* to describe social relations in Japan and Nakane Chie, who described Japanese society using "vertical" relations of *sempai* and *kohai*. Here also we can see one of the problems of the field of IC relying on rather static concepts that are inherited from previous generations, as Doi, for example, relates how he developed the concepts of *amae* and *amaeru* in 1955. Whether or not one agrees that *amae* (or dependency) can be posited as the fundamental building block for relationships among Japanese, and hence Japanese society, the reliance on traditional cultural analyses is apparent in some of the early attempts at theory building of IC in Japan.

Gudykunst had worked at a U.S. Navy base in Japan as an intercultural relations specialist before entering academia (Pillar, 2011, p. 30). Dean Barnlund, a leading IC specialist and mentor to many students at San Francisco State University (also having visited Japan and given seminars and talks many times) wrote an entire book on the relevance of IC to the analysis of differences between Americans and Japanese, claiming that "their cultural distinctiveness is most apparent in their communication styles" (Barnlund 1989, p. xvii). Barnlund's book accepts that culture is a construction (a critique that many of the CIC studies I describe below follow), or to be exact cultures are "constructs not concretes" (Barnlund, 1989, p. xvi). He nevertheless uses culture as the active principle in determining what can be termed a functionalist-oriented style, "each style appears consistent with their distinctive views of communication" (Barnlund, 1989, p. 42), Japan's being primarily focused on harmony.⁴

Discussion of IC in Japan needs to address the question of work in Japanese beginning with the translation of IC into Japanese. In our faculty at Ryukoku University, we have used the term *Kokusai Bunka* and Intercultural Communication jointly but it is important to point out here that the terms *Kokusai Bunka* and IC have some slightly different meanings. First there is a problem of translation. Some translations of the term IC have used *Ibunka Komyunikeishon* (異文化コミュニケーション). For example, this is the preferred term of organizations like Sietar (Society for Intercultural, Training and Research) Japan.

Kawakami (2009) outlines the history of evolution of this term, crediting Gyo Furuta as the originator in the 1980s. Pioneering work was also done by Saito Mitsuko, a professor at International Christian University, after being one of the first Japanese women to receive a Ph.D abroad (majoring in Speech in the late 1950s at Northwestern University, where Dean Barnlund also studied) and returning to teach in Japan (Kawakami, 2009, p. 167). Saito served as a link for many of the originators of IC to come to Japan, including Barnlund, Condon, and invited numerous others through her academic connections in the U.S.

Kawakami (2009) nowhere mentions *Kokusai Bunka* in her more than 500 page unpublished dissertation, preferring *Ibunka Communication*, which is the name of a department and PhD graduate program (since 2004) at Rikkyo University in Tokyo. In contrast, *Kokusai Bunka* has been adopted by more than 10 universities in Japan (including Ryukoku, Kobe, Hosei, Yamaguchi Kenritsu, Poole Gakuin and others). It is however notable that the first case of the Japanese Ministry of Education accepting a katakana name (*Ibunka Communication*) for a university faculty came with Kanda University of International Studies (KUIS) in the early 1990s.

While I must truncate this discussion here for the sake of focusing on the main thread of intercultural communication (rather than its translation and acceptance in Japan *per se*), it is further instructive to note that the issues of translation of concepts have their own distinct histories.⁵

The term *Kokusai Bunka* (国際文化祭) is much older than *Ibunka Communication* as it was associated with a cultural institute that was the forerunner of the Japan Foundation (*Kokusai Koryu Kikin*). Shibasaki (2014) details the origin of *Kokusai Bunka Shinko Kai* (Center for International Cultural Relations) from 1934 to 1972, which then became the Japan Foundation. *Kokusai Bunka*, naturally, shares some of the problems that I have outlined above, in that it often takes communication between cultures (and citizens of different nations, *de facto*, as their representatives) as a starting point (I have discussed this in Bradley, 2007). For example, in one exemplary textbook, Koizumi and Murata (2004, pp. 54-5) represent cultural distance between C1 (culture 1) and C2 (culture 2) as overlapping circles.

In understanding why Hall's work was so influential in Japan, Kawakami's explanation of networks around ICU, and in particular Saito Mitsuko, helps, but so does her statement that Hall "tended to concentrate on differences rather than similarities... Intercultural Communication provided a way to learn the differences between cultures and how best to maneuver among them. And Japanese tending to believe that Japanese culture was unique, believed that they were different from other people" (Kawakami, 2009, p. 161). While this explanation also partially explicates the attraction of the uniformity of culture aspects of IC that has appeal to some (including some IC scholars in Japan), it also reflects another kind of essentialized understanding, namely about Japanese.

Rogers et al. (2002) have identified three important gaps that the influence of Hall on IC among Japanese scholars can be said to have contributed to. First, there was little attention paid to intercultural communication with or between domestic non-Japanese (resident Koreans and Chinese first and foremost in terms of numbers). Second, the comparative framework around differences between Japanese and English-speaking peoples exaggerated the role of differences (more than if other neighboring Asian countries had been taken into focus to a greater extent). Finally, most studies neglected power and privilege and re-inscribed the vertical senses of intercultural communication and relations that implicate hegemony to/from Europeans (particularly northern and western Europe) and North Americans (Rogers, et al. 2002, p. 18).

Critical Intercultural Communication

Critical Intercultural Communication (CIC) has developed primarily over the last decade, although there were some earlier works. A relatively early example of this branch of study was a paper published in 1999 by Martin and Nakayama, cited above. More recently, Martin and Nakayama (2010), in reviewing their earlier work, rearticulate their argument that various paradigms of IC lead to different outcomes. They begin with a central idea that motivates most of the work in CIC, that the concept intercultural “tends to presume interaction between discrete and different cultures” and that by highlighting similarity (vis-à-vis difference) the “heterogeneous character of all cultures” becomes more visible (Martin and Nakayama, 2010, p. 59). Put in another way, CIC approaches challenge the “predominant essentialism [that] makes intercultural communication studies an exception in the social sciences, where social constructionist approaches have become the preferred framework in studies of identity” (Piller, 2012, p. 3). A challenge in integrating CIC and IC approaches is to articulate the links between macro and micro-level communication (Asante, et al., 2014, p. 2).

Other earlier critical studies of IC have been mentioned above (Young, 1996, who uses a philosophical approach based on critiques of rational communication by Habermas and Foucault), but other sources for this turn to criticality draw on Stuart Hall’s work in cultural studies in the 1980s and notions of culture as ideological struggle (Halualani and Nakayama, 2010, p. 6). Such research in CIC pays attention to questions of power in relationships, coded in identities of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality, regional and socioeconomic variability, generational and other kinds of difference. “Inter” in the term intercultural then becomes less about “culturally different ‘dialogue partners’” and more about “the intersecting layers of cultural, discursive, and signifying practices that constitute power relations within and around groups” (Halualani and Nakayama, 2010, p. 8).

Moon’s (2010) survey of recent published work in IC, examined 68 articles that had been published between 1997 and 2007 which had referenced intercultural communication. Of these, 29% followed the functional perspective (Moon uses the term “variable analytic”), defining culture in terms of nationality or Hofstede’s individualism/collectivism variable. However, a number of what he terms “critical impulses” did become apparent, of which 1) historicizing the field 2) deconstructing culture 3) and critique of dominant ideology are delineated (Moon, 2010, pp. 36-37).

As mentioned in the first section of this paper, the orientation to actual data collection and focus on language in interaction has not been a strong focus of some of the mainstream approaches to IC. However as Scollon, et al. (2012, originally 1995) have advocated, a discourse-based approach to IC moves research away from singular foci, such as national cultures. “All of us participate in multiple discourse systems, some of which we participate in more fully than others. All of these discourse systems form intersecting and cross-cutting waves of communication style and form and values which lead us to argue ... that culture is mostly too large a concept to really capture the complexity of interdiscourse communication” (Scollon, et al., 2012, p. 10). The emphasis in this approach is on social interaction and the communication that is generated, used, and co-constructed, and not “abstract or independently conceived differences between members of different groups” (Scollon, et al., 2012, p. 17).

A third concern of some CIC scholars is a turn away from hegemonic models of knowledge that are identified with Europe and North America. One example of this is Miike’s (2014) call for an Asiacentric turn in IC theorizing, following earlier calls for Afrocentric IC.

Critiques of Nation-State Orientations in Intercultural Communication

While culture is certainly often viewed within nationalist containers (what is increasingly referred to in social science as methodological nationalism), as I have shown with much IC research above, this presages a final critique, that of IC's tendency to lay the groundwork for, if not openly veer towards, perpetuating nationalism. Ono (2010, p. 88-89) writes, "the degree to which nations have become naturalized is indeed troubling and renders their use for the purposes of cultural comparison problematic ... it is this habitual referencing or citation – its *citationality* – that renders a nation a seemingly uncontestable, indisputable part of reality" (italics in original). CIC he maintains, and I would agree, attempts to put such normalized conceptions under question. That raising such questions goes against ingrained ways of thinking may seem obvious but it is important to relate such challenges to the problems of national identity and belonging which "have been around for a considerable period and are powerfully supported by a range of state, media, and other institutional practices" (Piller, 2012, p. 6).

While there is little space here to expand on the problem of nationalism in relation to intercultural communication, it is also a given that the borders of states and boundaries of nations correspond in few places in the world (Smith, 2001, p. 17). Of course this begs the question of what constitutes national 'identity,' which Smith summarizes as "the continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories, myths, and traditions, that compose the distinctive heritage of nations, and the identifications of individuals with that pattern and heritage and with its *cultural elements*" (Smith, 2001, p. 18, italics added). Such a definition gives room both for hope as well as ammunition for critique. For in allowing for continuous reinterpretation, IC scholars (as CIC researchers are already doing) can aid in challenging singular one-directional analyses of identity in contemporary nation-states, something that would help people view their identities as less fixed and more able to accommodate difference either domestically through improved relations with immigrants or in cross-cultural exchanges and contacts. On the other hand, this also can be taken as indictment of the failure of mainstream IC in not going far enough to challenge the bracketing of communication styles by terms such as Japanese, American, or other national labels.

It is here that this all too brief excursus on the history of IC and the challenges that it now faces comes to a conclusion. I argue that the legacy of IC's borrowed cultural concepts in the early works of IC remains to be overcome, a challenge that is increasingly being met by a new generation of CIC scholars. At the same time, though, as noted by Moon (2012) in his survey of recent IC literature, the mainstream still dominates the field and tends to marginalize critical approaches. In this respect then, the majority of IC can be said to be complicit with rising nationalist sentiments that are apparent in many parts of the world.

In lieu of a more sustained critique of culture from anthropologists which is then taken up and extrapolated on by IC scholars, there is a tendency to reinforce cultural nationalism, what some have referred to as "culturalism" (Vertovec, 2011), whether or not it derives from "cultural anxiety" (Grillo, 2003), which leads to its being further entrenched. Clearly much work remains to be done to fulfill the conditions for making the wager of intercultural communication a likelier bet with more than just utopian dreams of positive outcomes. In this sense, then, Hall was probably on the right track in thinking of IC as having a compelling rationale as an applied field, one that can and should be taught to non-academic specialists. Avoiding the simplistic narratives of us-and-them distinctions, especially based on the fixing (or fiction) of national cultures must, however, be a prerequisite to a critical discourse-based intercultural communication

field of study.

Notes

- 1) This book was recently published in a 40th anniversary edition (14th edition, but I am citing from the 7th edition published in 1994).
- 2) The field is generally considered to have congealed around the mid-1970s with publications like Condon and Yousef (1975) or even as late as the 1980s with Gudykunst's work.
- 3) This paper follows Japanese convention for names with surnames first followed by given names.
- 4) Barnlund also cites at various junctures both Kurt Singer's *Mirror, Sword and Jewel* (1973, but written based on his experiences in the 1930s in Japan) and Edwin Reischauer's *The Japanese* (1981, but the product of his serving as U.S. ambassador to Japan in the 1960s) both of which rely on sketches of psychologized culture to describe Japanese reliance on harmony in communication (p. 42 and p. 186).
- 5) Some examples are how Furuta decided to use *Ibunka Communication* and not *Ibunka-kan Communication*, or terms that have been proposed by Japanese IC scholars for communication among Japanese, such as *sasshi*, *enryo* and others (Kawakami, 2009, pp. 236-9 and p. 372).

References

- Asante, M.K., Miike, Y., and Yin, J. (2014). "Introduction: New directions for intercultural research." Pp. 1-14. In M.K. Asante, Y. Miike, and J. Yin, (Eds.), *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader, 2nd Ed.* New York: Routledge.
- Barnlund, D.C. (1989). *Communicative Styles of Japanese and Americans: Images and realities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Bradley, W. (2007). "Kokusai Bunka – Towards a Definition." *Journal of the Socio-Cultural Research Institute*, 9: 245-247.
- Chen, G.-M. and Starosta, W.J. (1998). *Foundations of Intercultural Communication*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Condon, J.C. and Saito, M. (Eds.). (1974). *Intercultural Encounters with Japan: Communication-contact and conflict*. Tokyo: Simul Press.
- Condon, J.C. and Yousef, F.S. (1975). *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Fang, T. (2003). "A Critique of Hofstede's Fifth National Culture Dimension." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3(3): 347-368.
- Grillo, R.D. (2003). "Cultural Essentialism and Cultural Anxiety." *Anthropological Theory*, 3(2): 157-173.
- Gudykunst, W.B. (1987). "Cross-Cultural Comparisons." Pp. 847-889. In C.R. Berger, and S.H. Chaffee, (Eds.), *Handbook of Communication Science*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W.B. and Kim Y.Y. (2002, orig. 1984). *Communicating with Strangers: An approach to intercultural communication, 4th Ed.* New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hall, E.T. (1959). *The Silent Language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Halualani, R.T. and Nakayama, T.K. (2010). "Critical Intercultural Communication Studies: At a Crossroads." Pp. 1-16. In T.K. Nakayama and R.T. Halualani, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills. CA: Sage.
- Jandt, F.E. (2001, orig. 1995). *Intercultural Communication: An introduction, 3rd Ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Kawakami, H.S. (2009). *A History and Development of the Intercultural Communication Field in Japan (1950 – Present)*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Koizumi, T. and Murata, S. (2004). *Kokusai Bunka Gaku Josetsu*. Tokyo: Taga Shuppan.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1990). "Notes in the History of Intercultural Communication: The Foreign Service Institute and the mandate for intercultural training." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76(3): 262-281.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2010). "Writing the Intellectual History of Intercultural Communication." Pp. 21-33. In T.K. Nakayama and R.T. Halualani, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Martin, J.N., and Nakayama, T.K. (1999). "Thinking Dialectically about Culture and Communication." *Communication*

Theory, 9: 1-25.

- Martin, J.N., and Nakayama, T.K. (2010). "Intercultural Communication and Dialectics Revisited." Pp. 59-83. In T.K. Nakayama and R.T. Halualani, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and Their Consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1):89-118.
- Miike, Y. (2014). "The Asiacentric Turn in Asian Communication Studies: Shifting paradigms and changing perspectives." Pp. 111-133. In M.K Asante, Y. Miike, and J. Yin, (Eds.), *The Global Intercultural Communication Reader, 2nd Ed.* New York: Routledge.
- Monaghan, L. (2012). "Perspectives on Intercultural Discourse and Communication." Pp. 19-36. In C.B. Paulston, S.F. Kiesling, and E.S. Rangel, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Intercultural Discourse and Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Moon, D.G. (2010). "Critical Reflections on Culture and Critical Intercultural Communication." Pp. 34-52. In T.K. Nakayama and R.T. Halualani, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ono, K.A. (2010). "Reflections on 'Problematising 'Nation' in Intercultural Communication Research." Pp. 84-97. In T.K. Nakayama and R.T. Halualani, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural Communication: A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Piller, I. (2012). "Intercultural Communication: An Overview." Pp. 3-18. In C.B. Paulston, S.F. Kiesling, and E.S. Rangel, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Intercultural Discourse and Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rogers, E.M. (1999). "George Simmel's Concept of the Stranger and Intercultural Communication Research." *Communication Theory*, 9(1): 58-74.
- Rogers, E. M., Hart, W.B. and Miike, Y. (2002). "Edward Hall and the History of Intercultural Communication: The United States and Japan." *Keio Communication Review*, 24: 3-26.
- Rogers, P. and Tan, J.-S. (2008). "Fifty Years of Intercultural Study: A continuum of perspectives for research and teaching." *University of Michigan Ross School of Business Working Paper, No. 1104*.
- Samovar, L.A. and Porter, R.E. (Eds.). (1994). *Intercultural Communication: A reader, 7th Ed.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Scollon, R. Scollon, S.W., and Jones, R.H. (2012). *Intercultural Communication: A discourse approach, 3rd Ed.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Shibasaki, A. (2014). "Activities and Discourses on International Cultural Relations in Modern Japan: The making of KBS (Kokusai Bunka Shinko Kai), 1934-1953." Pp. 53-72. In M. Herren (Ed.), *Networking the International System; Global histories of international organizations*. Basel: Springer.
- Smith, A.D. (2001). *Nationalism: Theory, ideology, history*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2011). "The Cultural Politics of Nation and Migration." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40: 241-256.
- Yoshitake, M. (2002). "Anxiety/Uncertainty Management (AUM) Theory: A critical examination of an intercultural communication theory." *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 11(2): 177-194.
- Young, R. (1996). *Intercultural Communication: Pragmatics, genealogy, deconstruction*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.