

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A PHENOMENOLOGY OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

JIRO SAKAI
Norman Oklahoma
1997

UMI Number: 9721059

UMI Microform 9721059
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

A PHENOMENOLOGY OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

BY

1 David L. ...

c Copyright by JIRO SAKAI 1997
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation may not exist without numerous helps from others. First of all, I would like to express special thanks to my academic advisor, Dr. Eric Kramer. Without his academic advice, this dissertation was impossible to complete. Even though this is the dissertation I wrote, many of the ideas are those I learned from him. In this sense, I simply owe him a lot. Having an opportunity to learn phenomenology and phenomenological attitude from him was one of the biggest lucks in my life. I learned how ignorant I was before through the process of completing dissertation. I am still ignorant, but I am beginning to see my blind ignorance reflectively. He literally directed me. Thank you Dr. Kramer.

Along with Dr. Kramer, my four committee members always helped me particularly emotionally. There was a time I did not meet each of them more than a year. Nevertheless, they patiently understood my situation and supported me emotionally. I am truly grateful for that. Sometimes, I lost my motivation and perspective. Dr. Friedrich helped me a lot to re-focus on my dissertation. Without his kindness and suggestions, I don't know whether I could complete my dissertation. I always admire his integrity as a person. Dr. Chen also helped me tremendously. She always listened to me carefully without judging anything when I was facing difficulties. Dr. Lujan, on the other hand, was another help for me. Every time I met him, his relaxed mood soothed my stressed feeling. I would like to also express my gratitude to my outsider member, Dr. Harold Grasmick. Similar to my other committee members, he always listened me patiently and understood me. It is no doubt his presence made a difference in terms of completing my dissertation.

While Dr. Kramer and my committee members helped me in various ways, many other people encouraged me to complete my dissertation. First of all and most importantly, I just have to express my special thanks to my lifetime best friend, Chikage Imai. Simply, I could not finish my dissertation without her presence. There is no word to express my thankful feeling for her. Having a relationship with her definitely made a crucial difference in my life in many respects. One thing for sure is she is the one who helped me the most emotionally. Again, without her emotional support and persistent belief in me, I just couldn't finish this dissertation.

I also have to express my special gratitude to my parents, Hideo Sakai and Keiko Sakai. They supported me emotionally and financially. They allowed me to pursue my Ph. D. I just simply feel thankful for them. Without their existence, I just could not receive this Ph. D. degree. Their unconditional and persistent emotional supports gave me extra energy to continue my graduate program. Thank you my father and my mother.

Other than Chikage and my parents, I feel like I owe a lot to my friends. They are my colleagues and friends at the same time. Ezah Tamam helped me in my initial stage of my graduate life. I and Ezah discussed a lot about many things. Although he already graduated, I feel like he's been always with me. I have never forgotten his kindness. I also express my gratitude to Lonnie Johnson. Academic discussions with Lonnie always stimulated my thinking. Moreover, he helped me emotionally by listening to me patiently when I was down. I also would like to thank for my Japanese friends, Masazumi Maruyama, Masako Isa, Miho Iwakuma, Michiko Yamada, Noriko Takagi, and Emiko Kobayashi. We socialized and talked about many things. I feel luck to have a relationship with each of them.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Sandra Ragan and Dr. Young Kim. Although Dr. Ragan was not my committee member, she encouraged me and supported me emotionally whenever I stopped by her office. Thank you Sandy. I also want to express my gratitude to Dr. Young Kim. In fact, she helped me to get a teaching assistantship when I came to OU. Without her help at that time, I might have encountered a financial difficulty. I express my gratitude to her for that reason. Finally, I would also like to thank for Dr. William B. Gudykunst, Dr. Stella Ting-Toomey and Dr. Tsukasa Nishida. They were my ex-advisor when I attended different schools. I established my academic foundation through interacting with them. I owe them a great deal for that matter.

As it became obvious, I could not complete my graduate program without having various kinds of human relationships. Although the process of completing my dissertation was inefficient, I feel grateful about the fact I had many meaning relationships. One more time, I would like to thank for each relationship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Introduction.....	1
	Purpose of the Present Study.....	2
	Research Questions.....	6
	Outline of the Study.....	6
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
	A Brief History of Intercultural Communication.....	11
	The Major Topics in the Area of Intercultural Communication.....	14
	Ontological Dimension of Intercultural Communication.....	22
	Methodological Dimension of Intercultural Communication.....	33
	Theoretical Dimension of Intercultural Communication.....	39
	Summary: Intercultural Communication as an Ideology.....	48
III.	METHOD.....	50
	Phenomenology.....	51
	Phenomenology as a Presuppositionless Inquiry.....	51
	Phenomenology as a Method.....	53
	Archaeology.....	56
	General Characteristics.....	56
	Procedures.....	60
	Demarcation.....	67
	Eidetic Analysis.....	69
	General Characteristics.....	69
	Procedures.....	71
	Demarcation.....	80
IV.	THEORETICAL BASIS.....	81
	Theoretical Basis for This Study.....	81
	Gebser's Project.....	84
	A Theory of Plus-Mutation.....	86
	Three Structures of Human Consciousness.....	88
V.	AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION.....	98
	Unveiling the Origin of Intercultural Communication.....	101
	Identifying the Original Historical Context.....	102
	Clarifying the Meaning of the Post-War Historical Context.....	106
	Clarifying the Specific Process.....	112
	Interpreting the Meaning of Intercultural Communication.....	125
	Unveiling the Fundamental Presuppositions.....	127
	Summary.....	144

Clarifying the Meaning-Transformation of Intercultural Communication.....	146
Identifying the Shift of the Historical Context.....	147
Clarifying the Meaning of Intercultural Communication.....	148
Unveiling the Implications of the Meaning-Transformation.....	151
Deciphering Uncanny Consequences: Crisis of Culture Differences.....	155
A Question to the Two Values and Cartesian Anxiety.....	155
Ultimate Consequence of Conformity.....	157
Ultimate Consequence of Pursuing Efficiency.....	158
Ultimate Consequence of Cartesian Anxiety.....	162
Ultimate Problem Taking Place in the Late-Modern Deficient Perspectival World.....	164
Limitations.....	165
VI. AN EIDETIC ANALYSIS OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION.....	169
Phenomenological Suspension of Metaphysical Prejudices.....	170
Phenomenological Description.....	176
Apprehending Necessary Conditions Through Comparison.....	182
Challenging the Investigator's Prejudices.....	198
Interpreting Concealed Meanings.....	200
Limitations.....	202
VII. LATENCY OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION.....	203
A Latent Presupposition in Intercultural Communication.....	204
A Latent Potentiality in Studying Intercultural Communication.....	211
A Latent Meaning of Intercultural Communication.....	217
REFERENCES.....	219
APPENDIX.....	234

A PHENOMENOLOGY OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Abstract

The present dissertation has two major purposes. The first is to examine the origin of intercultural communication as an independent academic field cultivated in the US. In order to carry out this task, this study employs Edmund Husserl's archaeology as a method. In short, this study unveils intercultural communication has developed as a manifestation of Western ideologies (e.g., individualism, pragmatism, etc.). The second objective, on the other hand, is to examine the necessary conditions which constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication we experience in reality. Eidetic analysis is employed as an appropriate method for accomplishing this objective. The present eidetic analysis elucidates that differences in logics and styles are two necessary conditions which constitute a phenomenon of intercultural communication. This study suggests intercultural communication is not a pre-determined fixed phenomenon, but a unique place where different logics and different styles meet together. It is a manifestation of basic human similarities and meaningful human diversity. This dissertation also indicates latency (i.e., latent presuppositions, latent topics, latent methods, and latent theory, etc.) in the field of intercultural communication in the end.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In the (our) current modernity, there is an academic area of inquiry named "intercultural communication." It investigates various phenomena of interactive human communication among people from different cultures, various forms of cross-cultural phenomena, and unique intracultural phenomena. Many people have contributed valuable insights for a deeper understanding of intercultural phenomena.

While intercultural cultural communication is maturing as an area of communication studies, this does not mean we (as people who are interested in the field) should not reevaluate the area of intercultural communication in terms of its presuppositions, which are reflected in topic selection, chosen methods, and theories. Such reevaluations are necessary because we investigate intercultural phenomena presuming a prior literature of intercultural communication. The prior literature influences what and how we study intercultural communication (e.g., topic selection, method choice, theory construction). Put differently, the history¹ of intercultural communication always influences us whether we are conscious of this or not. The past is not gone. Rather, the past is always here as a living tradition, so is the history of intercultural communication. In order to know what we are and what we presume as we study the field, it is necessary to understand and evaluate the

¹ It is important to notice "history" in this sense is different from the conventional meaning of history. While the conventional meaning treats history as a past and a recorded isolated event, history, here, means a living tradition which we always already presume and is renewed by us and shifting over time. Just like Jean Gebser (1949/1985) paradoxically indicates the nature of origin as ever-present origin, history in this study is ever-present history.

history in a critical manner. Such effort, ultimately, leads to self-understanding. We are essentially historical beings living in a certain space-time continuum.

While we (people in general) are the product of history, we are making history at the same time that we are re-interpreting each past event. We are not only a bearer of our history but also a co-bearer of our history. Likewise, each scholar in the field of intercultural communication is renewing the history through various forms of participation (e.g., publishing books and articles, presenting conference papers, teaching courses, et cetera). The history is presumed. We as historical beings are a product and producer simultaneously, as is history. This implies we who are interested in studying the field of intercultural communication have more responsibility than we realize. Whether we like or not, we are renewing the history of intercultural communication over time as co-makers of the field. The history shifts over time, presuming "ever-present origin," as Jean Gebser (1949/1985) paradoxically states. In order to fulfill such a responsibility, it is also necessary to re-evaluate the field of intercultural communication.

Purpose of the Study

While the history of the field is presumed as ever-present history, we tend to be ambiguous about the origin of the history and the relationship between the history and us (who live in now). Therefore, a sort of historical investigation², which attempts to clarify the origin and the relationship between the origin and the present, is necessary. Without understanding such issues, the investigator can not evaluate the area of intercultural communication in a critical and a self-

² This effort is similar to archaeology. The details will be explained in the method chapter.

reflective manner. On this point, metaphorically speaking, we do not know many things about who we are and who our parents are and the relationship between them and us. Only after revealing such ambiguities, can we evaluate what we are doing.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to understand the origin of intercultural communication as an academic field. Stated differently, the investigator attempts to understand the original motive which made this field possible. More specifically, the investigator attempts to understand the field situating it in a larger historical context. This process will unfold when, how, and by whom this area of an academic study came into existence. Such a venture also reveals how the origin of intercultural communication has been sedimented in the current studies of intercultural communication. History, again, as many philosophers (e.g., Dilthy, Gadamer, Husserl) also argue, is not just an objective dead past, but a living tradition that constitutes our present, and is constituting our future.

While the investigator must expose the certain historical context where intercultural communication emerges as a field for the first time, he necessarily must also examine the present historical context where we are renewing "intercultural communication" in order to understand the intimate relationship between the (ever-present) origin and the present. This attempt also might clarify how the field has been moving and shifting over time since the origin. Therefore, a second purpose is to clarify the transformational process of the field.

While archaeological historical investigation is the major purpose, this study has another purpose: to investigate the necessary conditions which

constitute a phenomenon of "intercultural communication" as experienced in life. This kind of basic effort has rarely been done. We in the field tend to presume what "intercultural communication" is and what it is not. While we tend to presume "intercultural communication" as a communication process between people from different cultures (Hall, 1959; Samovar & Porter, 1972, 1976; Sarbaugh, 1979; and many others), the conditions which necessarily constitute "intercultural communication" we experience in reality are virtually never critically examined. Therefore, examining such conditions is another purpose for this study.

This study also strengthens the prior studies of intercultural communication. Prior studies in some ways touched upon the essence of intercultural communication. However, since they (prior studies) did not delineate the essence (i.e., delineate "what are necessary conditions" and "what are not") of intercultural communication comprehensively and systematically, they could not have been aware of prejudices, which might preempt or distort their investigation. Prior studies of intercultural communication might have been presuming certain ideologies or metaphysics embedded in modernity (i.e., Western modernity). These historically embedded presumptions made all prior studies culturally prejudiced in certain way. The products (i.e., the prior studies of intercultural communication) are always partial and blindly ethnocentric in nature. Attempting to delineate the necessary conditions which constitute the ontic status of intercultural communication allows the investigator to challenge and risk his prejudices (which could be shared with the prejudices embedded in prior studies). This phenomenological attempt also allows the investigator to examine intercultural communication

phenomena by going back to these phenomena themselves in reality. Again, such a basic attempt has never been done in the area of intercultural communication.

Finally, this study is, in a sense, a culturally biased interpretation of the phenomenon of intercultural communication. Whenever one attempts to write about "culture" or "communication" or "intercultural communication," he or she necessarily must write it from his or her prejudices. Writing this dissertation is no exception. This present study is necessarily analytical and linear, following a specific order. The investigator writes this dissertation in a rational way, which reflects a certain cultural perspective. Moreover, since the investigator is situated in a certain historical epoch as a certain historical being, he can not escape from his (historically sedimented) prejudices. He can only do his best to enable his blind prejudices (usually derived from historically embedded presuppositions). Attempting to recognize his own prejudices is his minimum responsibility (even though this minimum responsibility itself is very a difficult task to accomplish) for this project. Without this attitude, the hidden structure and meaning of intercultural communication will remain in the dark.

In short, this present study has two major tasks. The first one is a sort of historical investigation of intercultural communication which has two parts. Part one is to unveil the origin of the field of intercultural communication, putting it in the original historical context where it originally appeared as such. Part two attempts to unveil the transformation of intercultural communication by placing it in a significantly shifted historical context. The second task, on the other hand, is an attempt to delineate, through a phenomenological method, the necessary conditions which constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication.

This task may unveil what "intercultural communication" as a phenomenon in reality is. The above three purposes (the first has two parts) lead to the corresponding research questions mentioned below.

Research Questions

1. What is the origin of the field "intercultural communication³ ?" More specifically, in what historical context, how, by whose efforts, and why did "intercultural communication" come into existence as an academic field?
2. How did the meaning of "intercultural communication" transform as the historical context shifted significantly ?
3. What are the necessary conditions for something to appear as a phenomenon of "intercultural communication" in life?

The above three are the research questions under investigation in this dissertation. Finally, the organization of this study is outlined in the following section.

Outline of the Study

The present study, including this introductory chapter, consists of seven chapters. The second chapter attempts to review the area of intercultural communication in terms of its general history, its major topics, its major definition, its major methodology, and its major theoretical approach. The purpose of this section is not to review the literature in terms of its content in an exhaustive manner, but to review the form of the literature's manifestation in terms of its history, its particular form of definition, its choice of the major methodology, its choice of major theoretical approach, and its corresponding

³ "Intercultural communication" here means an independent academic field which has been developed in the US specifically. The investigation delimits the domain more specifically in the method section.

major theory. This "semiotic" review might unveil the hidden nature of intercultural communication as a field.

After unmasking the hidden nature of intercultural communication as a field, the third chapter introduces two appropriate methods for this study. Archaeological historical investigation is one method, while eidetic analysis is the other. Since both are methods of phenomenology, the investigator first explains the general characteristic of phenomenology as a method. Then, he describes the general characteristics and the specific procedures regarding archaeological historical method. This is followed by a description of eidetic analysis in terms of its general characteristics and its methodological procedures. The investigator demarcates the domain of both methods as well.

After introducing two methods employed in this study, the investigator offers a theoretical framework. Gebser's theory of consciousness mutation helps us understand the original motive which created the field of intercultural communication in terms of a structure of human awareness (Chapter 5). It also helps in carrying out a phenomenology of intercultural communication (as a direct experience) by recognizing various ways people experience the phenomenon (Chapter 6). The theoretical basis must be introduced after the method chapter because Gebser's theory presumes phenomenology. Gebser's theory makes more sense after understanding the premise of phenomenology.

Chapter five attempts to trace the origin of intercultural communication as an independent academic field by situating it in the original historical context where the field originally appeared. More precisely it examines in what historical context, how and why and by whom (if it is possible) did the field of intercultural communication come into existence. Fundamental presuppositions

embedded in the original meaning of intercultural communication will be revealed also. Chapter five also examines the meaning-transformation of the field. When a historical context significantly shifts, the meaning of intercultural communication shifts along with it. The investigator examines this meaning shift by placing intercultural communication in the post Cold War historical context. Implications and consequences of the meaning shift of intercultural communication are also addressed in this chapter. Archaeological historical method is employed in order to clarify the original motive and the transformed meaning of intercultural communication.

While the previous chapters decipher the sedimented meaning of intercultural communication as a cultural artifact social scientists created, chapter six attempts to unveil the real appearance of intercultural communication as a phenomenon which is taking place in reality. In order to accomplish this task, the investigator attempts to clarify the necessary conditions for intercultural communication to take place as a phenomenon in reality by employing a phenomenological method named "eidetic analysis."

Finally, the concluding chapter attempts to unveil the latency of intercultural communication as a field. More specifically, the investigator deciphers a concealed presupposition, theoretical latency, potentially alternative methods, and potentially latent topics. The task of unveiling these latencies also correlates to the implications for the study of intercultural communication. In the end, the investigator interprets a latent meaning of "intercultural communication."

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

What is the major purpose of a literature review ? A common-sense answer would be that it is to rationalize the study (specifically to rationalize the study's hypotheses or research questions) by reviewing literature in a given field and by evaluating strengths and weaknesses of each study in the literature. Yet another answer is that the purpose of a literature review is to identify elements that prior studies have failed to examine. When the domain of a study is relatively specific and narrow, a review of literature is relatively easy, although it is not always factual, of course. On the other hand, when the domain of a study is relatively general and broad, a literature review is much more difficult. There are, thus, many alternative ways to review literature; it is almost impossible to review exhaustively any given field. This situation applies to the field of "intercultural communication." Intercultural communication is a general and broad field. It is not only a phenomenon in life but also a field of communication studies. It also involves numerous sub-fields which express various modes of awareness regarding intercultural communication. There is an abundant amount of literature in the field of intercultural communication, although the history of the intercultural communication study is short. Thus, the investigator needs to carefully consider the most adequate way of reviewing prior studies of intercultural communication.

Each prior study concerning the phenomenon of intercultural communication is a text which expresses the author's feelings, attitudes, forms of thought, et cetera. Put otherwise, each text is a cultural artifact and a concrete

manifestation of the author's consciousness. In this sense, each text in the field of intercultural communication is just like other cultural artifacts, such as music, architecture, literature, technology, et cetera. Each (cultural) text expresses, signifies and means something. While studies of intercultural communication might be different from one another in terms of topic selections, methods, theoretical foundations, et cetera, authors of the studies have a commonality in the sense that they are all historical beings located in a certain era (e.g., the current epoch). Therefore, studies of intercultural communication might have some similarities in terms of the form of their manifestations, rather than in terms of their contents. In short, a certain similarity that cuts across researchers of intercultural communication as historical beings may lead to a certain similarity in their work. Each author of the prior studies of intercultural communication is most likely a "social scientist." In other words, the "social scientific" form of thought might manifest in each text of intercultural communication. This speculation is worth investigating. Investigating the form of manifestation of each intercultural text unfolds each author's hidden consciousness that is making and defining a history of intercultural communication.

Therefore, this section examines the prior studies of intercultural communication in terms of their forms of manifestation as well as their contents. This task is a sort of semiotics¹ which examines signification and meaning of a text. In this sense, this particular review can be considered as a semiotic literature review of intercultural communication. The investigator, particularly in this section, attempts to do a semiotic review of intercultural communication as a field which includes a semiotic review of the general history, the major topics, the

¹Semiotics is a science of sign and meaning (Noth, 1995). It studies signification and meaning (of signs and texts).

major definition, the major methodology, and the major metatheoretical approach. Such a review of the study of intercultural communication is indispensable. As a consequence, the investigator might be able to unveil the hidden picture and nature of intercultural communication as an academic area.

Another important factor is that this review is selective in nature. The purpose of this particular (semiotic) review is not to review the contents of each prior intercultural communication study in an exhaustive way, but to review the form of manifestation prevailing in the field of intercultural communication in terms of topic selections, particular ways of definitions, method selections, and theory selections. The exhaustive review is neither possible nor necessary.

Finally, this review focuses on the literature of "intercultural communication²" rather than that of "cross-cultural communication" or "intracultural communication." Again, the major purpose of this section is to unveil the latent nature sedimented in the prior studies of intercultural communication.

A Brief History of Intercultural Communication

A phenomenon called "intercultural communication" has been studied in various ways by different kinds of people. In other words, there is a history of intercultural communication as an academic field of inquiry. There is a certain acknowledged origin and movement. The purpose of this section is to give the overall picture of the historical movement of intercultural communication as a field of study.

²Generally speaking, the academic area of intercultural communication has three sub-areas: (1) intercultural communication which investigates the interactive communication process among people from different cultures; (2) cross-cultural communication which studies various communicative phenomena in a comparative way to identify similarities and differences across cultures; (3) intra-cultural communication which aims to describe a culture (usually in an anthropological manner).

After Edward T. Hall published his book "Silent Language," many scholars acknowledged that his book stimulated the birth of intercultural communication as a specific academic study. Many scholars (Gudykunst, 1985; Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Samovar & Porter, 1972, 1976; to name a few) seem to acknowledge this book as the first academic book specifically focusing on "intercultural communication." This book has made many contributions. The book has enhanced the awareness of intercultural communication and made people recognize intercultural communication as an academic field of study worthy of investigation. In a way, therefore, Edward Hall is the first person who problematized the human interaction between different cultures as "intercultural communication," and called it as such. To use different words, Hall is virtually the first person who explored the potentially new field of study.

While Hall termed the potentially new field of study as "intercultural communication" during the late 1950s, intercultural related topics had been studied before that period. For instance, the studies of intercultural acculturation had started during the 1930s (e.g., Redfield, Ralph, & Herskovis, 1936) under the area of cultural anthropology. Sociologists (Marden & Meyer, 1968; Shibutani & Kwan, 1965; Zimmer, 1955) had dealt with the various topics on intergroup relations as well. Many other intercultural related topics (e.g., acculturation, prejudices, ethnocentrism, racial and ethnic relations, stranger relations, et cetera) had been studied under various disciplines, such as anthropology (especially cultural anthropology), sociology, social psychology (especially cross-cultural psychology), education, political science, international relations, linguistics, et cetera. Although various intercultural related topics had been studied in various disciplines, intercultural communication as a whole did not

become an independent field of study until the 1970s. In other words, the awareness of "intercultural communication" as such was not strong enough to make a new field of academic study before the 1970s.

Asante and Gudykunst (1989), likewise, points out, that "intercultural communication" took on a significant development as a field of study during the 1970s. Many scholars (Asante, Newmark, & Blake, 1979; Casmir, 1978; Samovar & Porter, 1972; Sarbaugh, 1979) began to publish books focusing on intercultural communication during 1970s. This was significant because the books were published under the field of communication studies.

"Communication" scholars began to problematize intercultural communication as an area of communication. As Leeds-Hurwitz (1990) suggests, intercultural communication became a stepchild and began growing up under the name of "communication."

As some communication scholars (Asante & Gudykunst, 1989; Gudykunst, 1983; Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Nwanko, 1979) pointed out, the early studies on intercultural communication had been predominantly descriptive in nature rather than exploratory. Stated differently, it was the 1980s when intercultural communication began to mature as a field of communication studies. Gudykunst (1983), for instance, changed an editorial policy on the International and Intercultural Communication Annual. Until he changed the policy, the Annual had been just like any yearly journal, derived from the collected articles on various topics in the field. Essentially, intercultural communication prior to the 1980s had not been studied systematically. Rather, each study problematized intercultural communication in its own way. As a consequence, intercultural communication as an integral field of study could not mature. Gudykunst (1983) therefore

changed the Annual to a thematic volume for the purpose of maturing intercultural communication as an area of communication. He was particularly concerned with the lack of theoretical development in studying intercultural communication. His decision contributed to the growth of intercultural communication's status as a field of communication studies.

The Major Topics in the Area of Intercultural Communication

Reviewing the prior literature in the area of intercultural communication leads to discussion of several points. First of all, there are three sub-fields in the area of intercultural communication: intracultural communication, cross-cultural communication, and intercultural communication. Intracultural communication attempts to study a single culture, while cross-cultural communication deals with comparative cultural studies among at least two cultures. As Kim (1984) contends, intracultural communication is deeply rooted in cultural anthropology, whereas cross-cultural communication is strongly influenced by cross-cultural psychology. Finally, the third field deals with studying human interaction among people from different cultures, which is intercultural communication itself.

Although both intracultural studies and cross-cultural studies are indispensable to understanding intercultural communication, the focus here is on the sub-field of intercultural communication. This includes a review of intercultural communication as a phenomenon.

Reviewing the topics chosen in the area of intercultural communication is important not only because it provides a clue to the overall picture of intercultural communication phenomena, but also because reviewing the chosen topics tells us something about intercultural communication. The topics people choose to study are, in a way, reflections of their interests and values.

Reviewing the studied topics in the area of intercultural communication sheds light on two major tendencies³ which are interrelated. First, the study of intercultural communication tends to focus on the identification of various "problems" presumed to be derived from intercultural communication. For instance, such problems include intercultural misunderstandings, intercultural conflicts, intercultural adaptation, culture shock, and immigrants' acculturation. Intercultural adaptation is a particularly dominant topic that focuses on problems of intercultural interaction.

The second tendency, which is closely associated with the first one, is that the study of intercultural communication concerns various solutions to the problems arising due to culture differences. For instance, such solutions include intercultural communication effectiveness or competence, intercultural training (both cultural-specific or culture-general), and various forms of intercultural identity.

With the above patterns or tendencies in mind, the investigator must ask, "Are these patterns of research telling us something?" While it is true that diverse topics are chosen to cover various phenomena of intercultural communication, many studies are devoted to investigation of problems and their solutions. Thus, intercultural communication as a study has been articulating the problems and providing solutions. A more important point is that this dominant pattern of perception (problem-solution) is rooted in certain prevailing values in the modern age (i.e., conformity and efficiency). This becomes obvious when one looks at the two major topics in the area of intercultural communication: various forms of intercultural adaptation (i.e., a major problem of intercultural

³The investigator reviewed all articles and books about "intercultural communication" published after 1970s. These two tendencies are the results of the research. although people studied various phenomena of intercultural communication in various ways.

communication) and intercultural communication competence/effectiveness (i.e., a major solution of intercultural communication). The relationship between these two topics (intercultural adaptation and intercultural communication competence/effectiveness) is illustrated in the following section.

Intercultural adaptation and two modern values. People in general do move around and change their residences for various reasons. When people change their place to live, they must adjust to a new environment. Some can adjust easily, while others need more time to adjust to the new environment. The same is true in intercultural adaptation. However, since intercultural adaptation usually requires more radical change (e.g., change of language, change of habit and custom, change of food, et cetera) of environment, the process of intercultural adaptation is considered more complex and more problematic. Therefore, one predominant area of interest in the field of intercultural communication has been cultural strangers' adaptation to a host environment. Social scientists are interested in examining cultural strangers' reactions to new environments (e.g., sojourners' "cultural shock" experiences, immigrants' identity crisis experiences), adaptation stages sojourners generally follow⁴ (Adler, 1975, 1987; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Oberg, 1960), theories to explain sojourners' intercultural adaptation (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988) as well as immigrants' adaptation (Kim, 1988; Kim & Ruben, 1988). Although each scholar views the phenomenon of intercultural adaptation differently and employs different research methods to examine the phenomenon, every one of them agrees on (presumes

⁴Adler (1975) proposed cultural strangers go through five progressive phases through learning from culture shock: (1) a contact phase. (2) a disintegration. (3) a reintegration phase. (4) an autonomy stage, and (5) an independent stage. While Oberg (1960) proposed U curve model of cultural strangers' (mainly sojourners') adjustment in a host environment though four different stages: (1) a honeymoon stage. (2) a hostility stage. (3) a recovery stage. (4) a final stage (in which adjustment is about to complete). Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) extended Oberg's U curb model to propose W curb trying to integrate re-entry shock (i.e., the second U curb).

without questioning) the importance of cultural strangers' successful adaptation to a host environment, believing in a guideline embedded in by an ancient adage, "When in Rome, do as the Romans do." In spite of its apparent practical value, the phenomenon of adaptation presupposes several things which should manifest the predominant values and norms in the field of intercultural communication existing in modernity. Regarding these presuppositions, Kramer (1992) claims adaptation is, first, a linear prejudice, second, involves power inequality, and third, values homogeneity and conformity without recognizing the nihilistic tendencies manifested in such values. His claims clarify the predominant values and norms in our society as well as in the researchers who have been examining the phenomenon of intercultural adaptation. Intercultural researchers assume the necessity of cultural strangers' linear adaptation (degree of the adaptation varies depending on conditions) to their host environments, and indigenous dwellers' (i.e., people living in their own country) legitimate right of maintaining power over intercultural "strangers." Such theories consequently rationalize the appropriateness of strangers' conformity to their host environments in order to maintain order in the host environments through homogeneity. This rationalization must have been accomplished for the sake of another predominant modern social value: that of efficiency. That is, adaptation should be successful, effective, efficient, and convenient in order to keep order in a host environment and to keep the value of efficiency vital. Therefore, the phenomenon of adaptation has been examined clearly based on the values of preserving order through homogeneity and of achieving efficiency. Similarly, the topic of intercultural communication competence/effectiveness presumes the two values.

Intercultural communication competence and the presupposed values. The area of (intercultural and intracultural) communication competence has been one of the most crucial issues in the area of communication in general. Although no one has asked the reasons (people may simply presume the reasons), communication competence receives significant attention from researchers probably because being competent is more or less equated with being successful in modernity. Becoming more competent means to facilitate more efficient success (i.e., success within a minimal time frame). Becoming more competent is always a desirable state in modernity, which values efficiency and convenience a great deal. In modernity, possessing various kinds of competence is a minimum and necessary condition to be able to reach a goal of one's own. Oftentimes, being judged as less competent or incompetent means to become a loser. For instance, a slow learner is usually labeled as incompetent or less competent compared to a fast learner. Therefore, it is evident that modern people are obsessed with the value of efficiency in an attempt to become a winner. This partly explains why the area of competence in communication (i.e., communication competence) is a very popular area in which many scholars and practitioners have been interested. Interesting enough, Spitzberg and Cupach (1984), in one of the most influential and theoretically powerful books, "Interpersonal Communication Competence", contend that the criteria and the critical dimensions of competence are effectiveness and appropriateness. "Effectiveness" is described as the social judgment of the degree of goal achievement, while "appropriateness" refers to the social judgment of the degree of conformity to social norms in a situation. In other words, effectiveness refers to the degree of efficiency, whereas appropriateness indicates the degree of

homogeneity (or of conformity). In short, surprisingly, both criteria of communication competence already presuppose the values of efficiency and homogeneity. A more important issue to realize is that these are values that are unquestioningly presumed according to a combination of utilitarian and hedonistic world views within the intercultural literature.

The same values (i.e., efficiency and conformity) are presumed in the area of intercultural communication competence or effectiveness. However, because communication becomes more problematic due to the existence of culture differences, achieving efficient and appropriate communication also becomes much more difficult. Communication is, more or less, viewed as "abnormal" in any intercultural interaction, compared to that in any intracultural communication. Therefore, the primary role of intercultural communication competence is to recover "normality" in communication mainly by means of restraining, minimizing, or even canceling the existence of culture differences. Possession of intercultural communication competence should enable the communication participants to make "abnormal" communication more like intracultural communication, which is the appropriate communication process. Here, the abnormal communication process should be replaced with a more normal communication process, since "abnormality" is against the social values of efficiency and homogeneity. Therefore, the phenomenon of intercultural communication competence (and intercultural communication effectiveness) has received strong attention as a solution to the problem of cultural differences, and as the best and the most efficient means to conquer the abnormality of communication by overcoming or even destroying the existence of cultural differences, which are presumed to be major sources of the abnormality. While incompetent and abnormal behavior still

communicates something, its messages are evaluated as "inefficient and (therefore) bad" according to the criteria of efficient and smooth communication process. Although many scholars view intercultural communication competence differently, most of them agree upon one thing. They agree that the possession of intercultural communication competence will facilitate the process of communication with strangers and help overcome various challenges (e.g., intercultural posture, misunderstanding, psychological stress and so on) derived from cultural differences; consequently, intercultural communication competence facilitates achieving communication participants' goals (Gudykunst, 1991, 1993; Hammer, 1989; Hawes & Kealey, 1981; Kim, 1991; Martin, 1987, 1993; Ruben, 1976; Ruben & Kealey, 1979). Interestingly, Kim (1991) contends that adaptability, or in other words, self-altering capacity, is "the heart of intercultural communication competence as metacompetence" (p. 268). She explains adaptability as follows:

In intercultural encounters, therefore, adaptability means the individual's capacity to suspend or modify some of the old cultural ways, to learn and accommodate some of the new cultural ways, and to creatively find ways to manage the dynamics of cultural difference/unfamiliarity, intergroup posture, and the accompanying stress. (p. 268)

Here, Kim clearly presumes that possessing intercultural communication competence (as adaptability) helps solve and overcome challenges (problems) due to cultural differences. She also appears to presume that communication participants actively conform to the host environment's intersubjective world⁵ by restraining the influence of their competing different intersubjective world (i.e.,

⁵ Central or "core values" are established and presumed to be somehow "attached to" a geographical local. So if you are here (e.g., Rome), you must act this way.

competing social realities) when they are interculturally competent. Moreover, recently, Kim (1993) contends that one of the most important factors in the behavioral dimension of intercultural communication competence is "synchronization," which also obviously values homogeneity in successful communication. Gudykunst (1991), similarly, claims that a competent communicator can manage to avoid various pitfalls of communication (e.g., minimize misunderstanding) by overcoming and bridging cultural differences in his book "Bridging Differences: Effective Intergroup Communication." Here, again, consciously minimizing the effect of a stranger's competing reality is presumed as a solution to overcome cultural differences and is viewed as an important condition of interculturally competent communication. As Murphy and Min Choi (1992) point out, prudent persons (i.e., prudent interculturally competent communicators) try to adjust to a predominant social reality rather than resisting it. Prudent persons are the persons who are willing to follow orders in a host environment. Following orders is presumed to be an appropriate means to achieve maximal convenience. In short, interculturally competent individuals are people who can achieve their goals efficiently and conveniently while they can avoid violating the norms in a host environment (i.e., they can interact and communicate normally in a host environment) so that they can keep the orders by trying to cancel the abnormality (i.e., the existence of culture differences). The conceptualization of intercultural communication competence itself seems to be deeply rooted in the two major modern values. In short, major topic selections in the field of intercultural communication are reflections of the modern values of conformity and efficiency.

Ontological Dimension of Intercultural Communication

Intercultural communication has been appearing as a field for about at least forty years. Since the term "intercultural communication" appeared in Edward T. Hall's "Silent Language" (1959), the phenomenon has been interpreted in different ways, yet with certain similarities. This section reviews prior interpretations of the existential status of the phenomenon of intercultural communication. Stated differently, this section reviews the definitional issue and its referential reality. First, two major interpretations about the phenomenon are reviewed; then the similarities among the definitions of intercultural communication are explored.

Initially, there are two major interpretations about the phenomenon of intercultural communication. First of all, intercultural communication is interpreted as a unique phenomenon which is different from other communication phenomena (e.g., cross-cultural communication, intracultural communication, interracial communication, interethnic communication). Second, and by contrast, intercultural communication is interpreted as a phenomenon which involves a process similar to that of other communication phenomena. The subsequent section discusses these two differing interpretations.

When intercultural communication is interpreted as a unique phenomenon, it tends to be defined as a communication between people from different cultures (i.e., countries). This definition presumes that a boundary between cultures is equated with a political boundary between countries or nations. Culture is frequently presumed to be a national culture. As Samovar and Porter (1976) point out, intercultural communication is treated as an international event where participants come from widely diverse geographic areas which are separated and

isolated. Therefore, this form of communication should be unique and different from other communication phenomena, especially compared to any form of communication which takes place within the intracultural sphere. Stated differently, the referential reality that intercultural communication signifies is presupposed to be unique and different from the referential realities that other types of communication phenomena signify.

Many early scholars (e.g., scholars during 1960s and 1970s) who studied intercultural communication tended to interpret intercultural communication's existential status in the above manner. Hall, for instance, clearly defines intercultural communication based on the first interpretation. Hall and Whyte (1960) defined the phenomenon as "the actual communication process between representatives of different cultures" (p. 12). For them, especially for Hall, intercultural communication is a special area which requires special attention and treatment that other communication phenomena do not require. This is explained by the fact that Hall was an officer of the Foreign Service Institute of the United States at that time (1951--1955). He needed to develop the area of intercultural communication to train foreign service officers so that they could effectively execute their assignments in assigned foreign countries⁶. Intercultural communication, thus, represents communication between representatives of different countries, as Hall defined it. Ellingworth (1977), likewise, interpreted the phenomenon as did Hall. Ellingworth (1977), for instance, contends that "intercultural communication is a unique dimension of communication which

⁶ While Hall was in the Foreign Service Institute, Chuck Berger was in military intelligence in Korea. Gudykunst, on the other hand, was in Japan for his Navy assignment. These conditions might force them to presume that communication is not for its own sake but that it is an instrument to be used to achieve some ulterior goal. Like Popper's (the logical positivist) conception of language as merely an arbitrary tool (1968), intercultural communication is presumed to have instrumental value. Something exists (has value) only insofar as it serves utility.

requires special labeling, attention, methodology, and instruction" (p. 101). In sum, this type of interpretation dominated the study of intercultural communication until the late 1970s.

There seemed to be several reasons why the ontic status of intercultural communication had been interpreted as a unique phenomenon and as different from other communication phenomena. First, after Edward Hall identified the phenomenon of intercultural communication as an academic field, the most noticeable and visible form of intercultural communication was communication between people from different countries. After World War II, for the first time, various forms of intercultural interactions began to penetrate into people's daily lives around the world. Intercultural communication was also needed to improve international relations. While many people gradually grew aware of the phenomenon and its necessity, not many people existed as experts or specialists of intercultural communication. The historical context at that time required somebody to examine the special form of intercultural communication, which was perceived to be the most unnatural and the most problematic.

The second probable reason intercultural communication was treated as a special area was its premature status as an academic field of inquiry. As a subfield of communication, intercultural communication has just forty years of history. Therefore, during its early stage (during 60s and 70s), the best efforts tried to describe the structure of the newly named phenomenon rather than to explain the phenomenon. Intercultural communication was still an ambiguous phenomenon for many people at that time. Therefore, describing the phenomenon, as some (Asante, Newmark, & Blake, 1979; Stewart, 1978) argued, was the first priority in the early stage of the history of intercultural

communication study. As a result, the phenomenon was necessarily treated and studied as an independent and a unique phenomenon which is perceived to be different from other communication phenomena. Intercultural communication, as a unique phenomenon, had to be described thoroughly before explaining the relationship between the phenomenon and other communication phenomena.

Nwanko (1979) summed up the nature of the early stage of intercultural studies:

This variety of definitions (about intercultural communication and other related phenomena) indicates that the field is still groping for an adequate description of its central focus and that intercultural communication analysis has been more descriptive than explanatory: its emphasis has been more on structure than on process. (p. 326)

Although such interpretation was unavoidable to some extent, the intercultural-communication-as-unique-phenomenon interpretation led to several serious problems. The first problem was that because intercultural communication was considered unique and thus was studied in an isolated manner, the relationship between the phenomenon and other related communication phenomena (e.g., cross-cultural communication, international communication) was ambiguous. The way each scholar distinguished intercultural communication and other related phenomena was inconsistent. For instance, while some equated intercultural communication with cross-cultural communication (Samovar & Porter, 1972), others contended communication became cross-cultural when it was effective (Martin, 1976). In order to understand "what" intercultural communication is, clarifying the differences and similarities between intercultural communication and related communication phenomena in a systematic way was necessary. However, such a systematic attempt had never been done. Therefore, people continued to define intercultural

communication and other phenomena descriptively rather than explanatorily without clarifying its referential reality. Consequently, as Saral (1977) suggested, "the newness of the field has attracted scholars from varying disciplines, who, while enriching and broadening the area, have also rendered the field so diverse and discursive that it defies definition." (p. 389)

The early intercultural studies' descriptive tendency leads to the second problem. Since scholars of intercultural communication tended to study the phenomenon in an isolated manner (based on intercultural communication-as-unique interpretation), intercultural communication did not have any clear future directions and consequently did not develop as a field of academic inquiry. Moreover, the descriptive tendency of many intercultural studies discouraged exploratory efforts of intercultural communication, which could have lead to theoretical developments. There was virtually no attempt to theorize intercultural communication at that time. Consequently, intercultural communication as a field of communication studies did not develop. While the issue of whether theorizing about intercultural communication is desirable or not was a crucial debate during late 1970s, the absence of theorizing in intercultural communication (which was based on intercultural communication-as-unique interpretation) clearly became a problem when intercultural communication attempted to gain a higher academic status as a field of communication. As Gudykunst and Nishida (1981) argue, "it is our contention that if the study of intercultural communication is to develop further, it needs to move ---toward a consistent theoretical framework for the analysis of communication between people from different cultures." (p. 88)

While such an interpretation had been predominating for a while, Sarbaugh seems to be the first person (with several solid reasons) to depart from

the first interpretation. Sarbaugh (1979) claimed intercultural communication is not different in kind from other forms of communication. The phenomenon is interpreted as involving processes shared by other communication phenomena. This, intercultural communication as a general communication phenomenon, is the second interpretation. In this view, the referential reality of intercultural communication is presumed to be overlapping with other communication phenomena's referential realities. This shift of this interpretation had some significance.

First, since intercultural communication was interpreted as a general communication phenomenon, the relationship between intercultural communication and other communication phenomena was gradually clarified. Specifically, as many (Gudykunst, 1983; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1981; Kim, 1988; Sarbaugh, 1979) claimed, all communication was perceived to be intercultural to an extent. Sarbaugh (1979) argued: "we would not expect to find two persons who were different on every characteristic; nor would we expect to find two persons who were alike on every characteristic." (p. 7)

This statement is based on an assumption that every individual is similar to and different from others to some extent. Every one of us is similar at least as a human being to an extent, yet is different to some extent as an individual. When the communication between two people from different countries is compared to the communication between people from the same country, the former tends to be more heterogeneous than the latter form of communication. It is just a matter of the degree of similarities and differences. Therefore, as Sarbaugh and others proposed, all communication is intercultural to an extent, which indicates that all communication is heterogeneous to an extent. The

degree of heterogeneity is the main difference among different forms of communication. For instance, intercultural communication and intracultural communication are distinguished in terms of the degree of heterogeneity. Intercultural communication is more heterogeneous than intracultural communication is.

Sarbaugh here contended that while the degree of heterogeneity between communication participants is different, all communication phenomena involve similar processes, such as encoding and decoding, feedback and so on. In other words, through the introduction of the concept of heterogeneity, Sarbaugh started to focus on the process rather than the structure of intercultural communication. Of particular significance is the fact that focusing on the process aspect of intercultural communication allowed scholars of intercultural communication to explore theoretical explanations. By that time, intercultural communication had lacked theoretical dimensionality as a field of communication studies. The intercultural communication-as-a-general-communication view allowed scholars of intercultural communication to apply other pre-existing communication theories to explain the phenomenon. Since intercultural communication is a general communication phenomenon, logically speaking, the theories of communication can be applied to explain **intercultural communication as well**.

The intercultural-communication-as-a-general-communication-phenomenon-view has yet another significance. People are beginning to recognize similar communication phenomena taking place in an intracultural context. For instance, race and ethnic relations, especially in the United States, are similar to the process of intercultural communication. Moreover, numerous co-cultures or subcultures have been emerging and voicing their opinions against

dominant groups. As this movement has become more noticeable, the scope of intercultural communication has widened. People are recently more aware of numerous intercultural contacts within their home boundary (i.e., within the intracultural environment). Treating intercultural communication as a general phenomenon was convenient for the inclusion of intercultural communication taking place intraculturally. Even though the participants are from the same national culture, the interaction can be very intercultural ("heterogeneous" in Sarbaugh's term).

While the intercultural-communication-as-a-general-communication view has several strengths, it also has several weaknesses. First, the view might have difficulty explaining a truly unique process "intercultural communication" involves. Some claim one of the unique processes of intercultural communication is "third culture⁷" building (Broome, 1991; Casmir, 1978, 1993; Casmir & Asuncion-Lande, 1989; Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977; Useem, Useem, & Donoghue, 1963). Since the view treats intercultural communication as a general phenomenon of human communication, it has a difficulty describing as well as explaining a unique phenomenon like "third-culture" building.

The second problem is the view can not clearly distinguish between intracultural communication and intercultural communication. Since all communication is intercultural to some extent, all kinds of communication taking place intraculturally are intercultural communication in a sense. There was no clear boundary between intracultural communication and intercultural communication based on this view. Gudykunst (1986) and Gudykunst & Kim

⁷When individuals from a culture A and a culture B interact, a new culture (i.e., the third culture) which is neither culture A nor B, is build through the communicative process. In general, the third culture is interpreted as the creation derived from a dialogue among intercultural communicators. As a result, a new third culture which both interactants can belong to is build (Broome, 1991; Casmir, 1978, 1993; and others).

(1983, 1992), realizing this definitional problems of intercultural communication, contended "intergroup communication" (Gudykunst, 1986) or "communication with strangers" (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, 1992) might be more appropriate terms than "intercultural communication." They tended to use the alternative term after that recognition.

Presuppositions About the Definitions of Intercultural Communication.

Regardless of the perceived definitional problem of intercultural communication, there seem to have been several shared agreements about "what is" intercultural communication. In other words, "what is" intercultural communication has been presumed as a kind of commonsense. Some of the major definitions of intercultural communication are the following:

Hall & Whyte (1960)	the actual communication process between representatives of different cultures (p. 12)
Samovar & Porter (1972)	the form of interaction that takes place when speaker and listener come from different cultures (p. 1)
Jain, Prosser, & Miller (1974)	communication between groups with different value structures (p. 33)
Stewart (1974)	Intercultural communication is communication under conditions of cultural differences. (p. 23)
Maletzke (1976)	an exchange of meaning between cultures (p. 410)
Prosser (1978)	interpersonal communication on the individual level between members of distinctly different cultural groups (p. xi)
Howell (1979)	interaction with representatives of many cultures (p. 40)

Collier & Thomas (1988)	contact between persons who identify themselves as distinct from one another in cultural terms (p. 100)
Gudykunst (1988)	the specific case of intergroup communication when participants come from different cultures (p.125)
Kim (1988)	direct, face-to-face communication encounters between or among individuals with different cultural backgrounds (p. 12)
Kincaid (1988)	communication between members of relatively diverse cultural groups (p. 288)

As the above definitions of intercultural communication indicate, a shared (and maybe a commonsense) definition of the phenomenon is communication between individuals from different cultures. Although the perceived relationship with other related areas of communication is different, intercultural communication has been perceived as a phenomenon which appears whenever at least two individuals from two distinct cultures communicate with each other. Of course, the secondary issue, at this point, is the definition of both "culture" and "communication." Many have seemed to agree on this common definition including this secondary definitional issue.

Specifically, there seem to be three agreements at least regarding the requirements which constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication. The first agreement is that the channel of Intercultural communication is interpersonal. The communication requires at least two individuals. In other words, communication in "intercultural communication" is considered "human" communication (i.e., human to human) which is interactive in nature. Intercultural communication as an academic area, in this sense, presumes humanism. The

second agreement is that the communication requires significant cultural differences. Each participant in the communication event is culturally heterogeneous from the others. The third agreement is that animated beings (i.e., human beings) are presumed to be "the" manifestation of a "culture." In other words, each participant in intercultural communication has been presupposed to be the manifestation as well as the representation of each culture. This agreement leads to the requirement of two individuals' (or more than two) existence, which is the same requirement as the first agreement needed.

The crucial point is these three agreements were presumed and have never been critically examined. While the phenomenon each scholar was referring to is intercultural (i.e., a phenomenon where two individuals from different cultures interact), it is still premature to decide whether those three requirements are necessary conditions of "intercultural communication" without critical examination. In other words, there might be a possibility that the three presumed agreements are not necessarily required conditions for intercultural communication. Put otherwise, while the three presuppositions constitute certain referential reality (i.e., communication between people from different cultures) of intercultural communication, there might be certain other referential realities of "intercultural communication" which the three conditions do not constitute. The three conditions might be just metaphysical prejudices which could predetermine the nature of reality (i.e., the certain kind of reality intercultural communication refers to). A strong argument can be made for the need to examine the necessary conditions which essentially constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication. Such an attempt is so basic that its importance must not be

underestimated. Without such attempts, the foundation of intercultural communication remains weaker than it could be. Therefore, this study examines the necessary conditions for a phenomenon to appear to be "intercultural communication" as such. This attempt becomes necessarily a phenomenological one; thus, phenomenology is the primary method for this investigation.

Methodological Dimension of Intercultural Communication

The next dimension of the review of the studies of intercultural communication is methodological. How have prior studies problematized the phenomenon in order to gain knowledge about it? This section reviews the methodological approach(es) to the study of intercultural communication. Although intercultural communication has been studied in various ways and in various traditions, there seems to be a predominant approach to problematizing the phenomenon. This section, therefore, shows a predominant methodological approach to the study of the intercultural communication.

In the beginning, the predominant methodological approach to intercultural communication has been the "analytical-reductionistic-quantitative" approach, as Kim (1984) suggested. This approach, in a broad sense, can be equated with the variable-analytical approach. Gudykunst and Nishida (1989), likewise equated this approach with either an objective approach, or a nomothetic approach. In other words, traditional scientific methods, as Di Mare (1994) indicated, have dominated the study of intercultural communication.

Whatever the name of this approach, this tradition tries to "abstract the reality under study by isolating and detaching separate elements and then somehow bringing them together." (Kim, 1984, p. 24) In essence, the researchers who took this approach believed intercultural communication had an

objective reality and its corresponding universally applicable laws and rules, which they (the researchers) could discover as objective scientists in scientific manner.

In the same manner, a subject, which is the very source of information⁸, becomes an impersonal object rather than a subjective unique being. Scientists believe that, as disinterested observers, they can objectify (i.e., analyze, measure, and quantify) the subject in a reductionistic and scientific way. Any personal elements and any subjective factors (e.g., the subject's personal opinion) were bound to be eliminated in the name of rigorous objective science. A subject should be a purified impersonal object, while a researcher is to be a disinterested observer. This very way of "observing" accomplishes a valued desire (i.e., to objectify and make all things equal, which is a reductionism).

Moreover, this scientific approach usually does not examine intercultural communication as a whole. Instead, the researchers in this approach frequently isolate variables (e.g., perception, attitude, stereotype, empathy, second language competence, behavioral flexibility, et cetera), which relate to the process or the outcome of intercultural communication, in a very reductionistic manner. Then, they (i.e., intercultural researchers) attempt to examine the relationship among the variables for the purpose of discovering the potential causal laws among the variables.

Therefore, the intercultural studies in this scientific approach choose systematic scientific methods to examine the relationship among the variables.

⁸. Intercultural communication has been problematized by using individuals' intercultural experiences as the sources of information. Since intercultural communication is not like any substances which can exist by themselves, the individuals who have experienced intercultural communication were bound to be the very source of problematizing intercultural communication. Here, it is important to notice intercultural communication is equated with intercultural interactions among people.

Actually, for instance, more than half of the articles published in the journal International Journal of Intercultural Relations (1981-1995), have attempted to find out the relationship among several variables employing the scientific-analytical-reductionistic-quantitative⁹ approach.

The major method in this tradition, as a result, is a quantitative one, which is a method to value the quantity of the information. Therefore, survey, including either questionnaire survey or interview survey, is one major method, while statistics is a major tool for the analysis of the "quantity."

Indication of the predominance of scientific methodology to study intercultural communication. The predominance of the variable-analytical-quantitative-objective-nomothetic-scientific methodological approach to intercultural communication is not only a trend, but it signifies something. The predominance of the use of this methodological approach indicates the predominant intercultural researchers' belief in objectivity and the supremacy of nomothetic science. They (i.e., intercultural scholars who believe in objectivity and nomothetic science) blindly believe there is an objective reality and universally applicable (i.e., eternal or permanent) laws and rules "out there" which they can discover. Moreover, they believe the superior way to discover the laws of intercultural communication should be rigorous "scientific" methods. The predominant use of the objective-scientific-quantitative methodology clearly signifies the value placed on the certainty of knowledge, objectivity over

⁹ The other end of this approach is holistic-subjective-qualitative-ethnographic approach. This approach, which is famous for ethnomethodology and conversational analysis, attempts to accomplish a thick description of social reality. While the goal for this approach is different from that of the traditional scientific approach, this "qualitative" approach also presumes the existence of the reality and its corresponding rules and patterns the researcher can discover through the process of thick description (i.e., realism). While particular methods are different from each other, both "quantitative" and "qualitative" approaches try to be scientific presuming certain metaphysics.

subjectivity, rationality over irrationality, and efficiency/convenience over inefficiency/inconvenience. It also means these values are shared values which are prevalent among many intercultural scholars¹⁰.

Limitations of traditional scientific methodology. While such values are prevalent among many intercultural scholars, the important point to notice is such belief in objectivity and the supremacy of nomothetic science are nothing more than metaphysical speculations, which are objectivism and scientism in particular. The tendency to study intercultural communication by isolating variables is based on yet another metaphysical speculation, namely, "reductionism." Without arguing whether the use of such methodology is right or wrong, it is instructive to consider limitations inherent in the use of this methodological approach. In other words, the objective scientific methodology, which presumes metaphysics (i.e., speculations about what is real) can easily preempt, narrow down, and sometimes distort the investigation of intercultural communication. Any metaphysical speculations force people to see a phenomenon in certain ways, presuming what is real and what is not without recognizing the presumption. They form a "community" of scholars. Consequently, they (i.e., people who investigate a phenomenon presuming metaphysics) automatically limit the source of information before even beginning their investigation. The traditional scientific methodology (presuming objectivism and scientism, for instance,) automatically eliminates subjective factors and personal elements as a source of investigation. Di Mare (1994) similarly contended as follows:

¹⁰ In a sense, this is not surprising. They (many intercultural scholars) have been trained in the same Western academic tradition (culture). Thus, they tend to see or share the same "reality."

My criticism of this method (and one that has been leveled by a plethora of interdisciplinary scholars) is that it evolved from a model of mathematical reasoning that attempted to provide a model of clarity, certainty, and orderly deduction in regard to human behavior, thus the term "human sciences:" A method that is the right method and one which eliminates the personal element and subjective factors so that a body of propositions, the truth of which is assured, is built up. (p. 6)

Such elimination¹¹ of personal factors and subjective elements has been perceived as indispensable for another reason. It was indispensable for the purpose of developing a scientific theory of intercultural communication which is presumed to be derived from systematic scientific research based on rigorous scientific methods.

While the presumed elimination of subjective factors has been done for the sake of scientific development¹², the act of attempting to eliminate any subjective elements itself is very uncanny. Fundamentally, the very source of problematizing intercultural communication used by objective scientists is the individual's direct personal intercultural experiences. Even though they (scientists) problematize their subjects (i.e., people who have intercultural experiences) as the objects of human knowledge in a systematic scientific manner to make research more objective, the very nature of the "data" they collect remains in essence subjective. Therefore, the fact the very source of objective science and scientific methodology is essentially subjective is ironic. Moreover, the way the researchers problematize and measure the phenomenon of intercultural communication is based purely on their subjective decisions even though they follow a systematic procedure. The choice of subjects, the choice of measurements, and the choice of statistical analysis and procedures are all

¹¹. Logically speaking, this elimination of subjective factors leads to a strange consequence. When we eliminate the subject (e.g., any subjective element), we eliminate culture. Only people (i.e., subjects) have "culture" which differs from each other.

¹². It is important to notice this scientific approach is based on values too.

based on the researchers' subjective judgments and capabilities (i.e., subjective limitations) which are their prejudices. Traditional scientific methodology employed in the study of intercultural communication and human communication is very subjective. What scientists measure tells about the researchers rather than the objects of their interest.

In any case, in this study, the investigator tries not to limit the region of investigation derived from the metaphysical speculations traditional scientific methodology presumes. Therefore, this study will stand in a phenomenological tradition and use its corresponding phenomenological method which questiones and challenges the traditional scientific approach and its corresponding metaphysics.

Summary. The predominant methods for studying intercultural communication presuppose that certain rules or laws regulate the phenomenon of intercultural communication. Although some argue the importance of multi-method approaches (i.e., triangulation), very few studies attempt to incorporate a historical perspective into the method of studying intercultural communication. Leeds-Hurwitz's (1990) historical account of intercultural communication is one exception. She attempts to unfold the origin of intercultural communication by putting it in historical context. As Williams (1967) contends, considering a historical dimension seems to be necessary in any cultural studies. This study, therefore, necessarily involves a historical approach to examining the phenomenon of intercultural communication. While this study follows in some ways Leeds-Hurwitz's study, it also attempts to unfold how the current study of intercultural communication has been dependent upon the origin, and how the

current intercultural communication scholarship has been transforming its appearance as a historical context has been transforming.

Theoretical Dimension of Intercultural Communication¹³

The final area of the review of prior studies of intercultural communication involves its theoretical dimensions. How have prior studies made sense of the phenomenon of intercultural communication¹⁴? Examining the basis of each explanation may reveal some hidden sedimentation they added to the phenomenon of intercultural communication. Again, the investigator can not review all kinds of theories to explain intercultural communication phenomena. Rather he attempts to review and clarify the predominant manner of explaining intercultural communication that has been predominantly shared by the prior theorists in explaining intercultural communication.

After a review of the predominant metatheoretical approaches to intercultural communication, some of the major theories used to explain intercultural communication phenomena are discussed.

The major theories used to explain various phenomena of intercultural communication are grounded on a shared metatheoretical approach labeled "traditional approach" Hall (1992) argued. Hall positioned the traditional perspective as one of the three prominent metatheoretical perspectives (i.e.,

¹³. It is important to remember that the selected theories in this section have contributed to the area of intercultural communication in many respects. The reader should be aware that the selected theories have use-values.

¹⁴. Intercultural communication presumes to involve at least two individuals from different cultures. This presumption implies any intercultural communication involves cultural differences. Therefore, cross-cultural theories (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 1980, 1983) had been attempting to explain such cultural differences/variability prior to explaining the process of actual interaction among different people who are presumed to be a manifestation of each different culture. Put otherwise, there are many theories of cross-cultural communication which attempt to explain culture differences. Despite their significance, the investigator does not review them in this dissertation. Again, the purpose of this section is not to review the various theories from various viewpoints in an exhaustive way, but to review the major metatheoretical approach and its corresponding major theories to unveil the hidden nature of intercultural communication.

traditional, coordinated management of meaning, and ethnographic perspective) in terms of the fundamental issues of culture, communication, and intercultural communication. He, then, described the term "traditional" as follows:

The term traditional was chosen for the first perspective because, although this perspective does not have one consensually accepted label, it is generally consistent and is the perspective reflected in the greatest number of scholarly publications, including textbooks. The traditional perspective is largely modeled after work in the natural sciences, is basically neopositivist in nature, and is concerned with causal relationships among variables. (p. 50)

Although Hall (1992) contends that the traditional perspective is one of the three prominent metatheoretical approaches, the investigator argues that theories based on this traditional perspective are particularly predominant in explanations of the very process of intercultural communication. Intercultural communication phenomena have been presumed to be problematic in essence; therefore, the researchers had to be concerned with practical ways to handle the various problems (e.g., intercultural misunderstandings, intercultural conflicts, culture shocks) derived from culture differences. Therefore, the ultimate theoretical goal was to domesticate and manage the chaos and the wilderness (i.e., to effectively control the problems derived from the process of intercultural communication) effectively through prediction, just like natural scientists had been attempting to do to nature. That is why, in a sense, it was natural that the theories grounded on the traditional approach, with the major goal of prediction and control, became predominant.

The crucial problem of this approach is that any theories under the influence of this traditional perspective attempt to explain the intercultural communication phenomena presuming what is desirable in the process. Since this desirability is grounded on the predominant value(s) of the current modernity,

the theories are deeply embedded in the modern value(s). The theories under the influence of traditional scientific perspective are not explaining intercultural communication objectively in a value-free manner. Rather, they are explaining intercultural communication phenomena rather ideologically¹⁵ presupposing certain values¹⁶ (e.g., effectiveness, conformity). Let's look at some of the major theories of intercultural communication which belong to the traditional (i.e., "objective") perspective.

The major intercultural communication theories under the traditional perspective. There are many theories under the traditional perspective which attempted to explain intercultural communication phenomena. Nevertheless, not many theories have been developed based on systematic lines of research. This section examines the two major theories of intercultural communication which have been developed in a systematic manner. Particular attention is given to the manners in which each theory explains intercultural communication. One is a theory of anxiety/uncertainty management that Gudykunst developed through a series of systematic studies (1988, 1993, 1995). The other is a theory of intercultural adaptation Young Kim (1988) developed along a separate line of systematic research.

First, one of the most influential theories of intercultural communication phenomena (e.g., communication with strangers, intergroup communication) is anxiety/uncertainty management theory (Gudykunst, 1988, 1993, 1995). Gudykunst (1988, 1993, 1996) extended Berger and Calabrese's uncertainty reduction theory (originally this theory was generated to explain intracultural

¹⁵. Therefore, intercultural communication ought to be explained in a value-laden way.

¹⁶. Stressing and hyper-valuing efficiency and homogeneity seems to be due to two major and essentially imperialistic reasons: (1) trade, and (2) diplomacy, including war.

human communication in 1975) in order to explain intergroup communication (i.e., communication with strangers). He argued that cultural strangers need to reduce uncertainty and anxiety in (especially in initial interaction) interacting with people from a host environment in order to communicate effectively (efficiently and conveniently) since the strangers encounter a series of crises¹⁷ in a host environment. This theory, first of all, rationalizes the necessity of uncertainty and anxiety reduction for the sake of more effective communication. It is so because cultural strangers usually can not be engaged in natural communication of their native culture, mainly due to the existence of relatively high uncertainty and anxiety derived from culture differences. Second, this theory clearly presumes the value of maintaining a social reality in a host environment by minimizing cultural strangers' social realities (through uncertainty and anxiety reduction). He also presupposed that similarities (especially cultural similarities) reduce uncertainty and anxiety and consequently lead to the strangers' intercultural adaptation and effective communication. As a rationale to value cultural similarities over cultural dissimilarities (to maintain order), he offered Levine's (1979) assumption that hosts (people interacting with strangers in their own country) feel anxiety, or and at least latent antagonism,¹⁸ as an initial response to the stranger (or to the stranger's strangeness). Another rationale is derived from

¹⁷Gudykunst often employed Schuetz's (1944) description of the strangers' general lack of intersubjective understanding in a host environment to rationalize this point. Gudykunst and Hammer (1988), likewise, contended "Because strangers lack "intersubjective understanding," or an understanding of the social world inhabited by the members of the host culture, their interactions in the host culture are experienced as a series of crises (pp. 107-108).

¹⁸ This does not always happen. Not all cultural encounters are painful or antagonistic. Many are simply filled with curiosity and wonder. Sometimes uncertainty leads to curiosity and wonderment. Antagonism is common to colonizing aggression. Often in the past, explorers and anthropologists have been received with great excitement and ecstatic activity--not anxiety. Anxiety happens only if one fears the unknown, presuming it could be harmful. Anxiety also presumes a fear of losing what one has as private property. Private property is not known to all cultures.

Stephen and Stephen's (1985) study. Stephen and Stephen claim perceived cultural dissimilarity increases communication participants' anxiety in intercultural contact. Since Gudykunst (1988, 1991, 1993, 1995) consistently argues the reduction of strangers' anxiety leads to effective communication, cultural dissimilarity (i.e., culture differences) must also be reduced.

Therefore, Gudykunst seems to view the cultural differences as the source of distraction, at least to some extent, to maintain order in a host environment, assuming an indigenous person becomes annoyed by the cultural differences that cultural strangers possess. He also presumes two outcomes of communication with strangers: intercultural adaptation and effective communication, which evidently presume the value of homogeneity and that of efficiency. Particularly regarding communication effectiveness, he equates effective communication with minimizing misunderstanding (Gudykunst, 1991; Gudykunst & Kim, 1992). Gudykunst (1991) argued:

Whether or not a specific instance of communication is effective or not depends on the degree to which the participants attach similar meanings to the messages exchanged. Stated differently, communication is effective to the extent that we are able to minimize misunderstanding (p.24).

He clearly encourages strangers to think similarly in their intergroup communication for the sake of accomplishing a predominant social value of efficiency by trying to avoid and minimize misunderstanding (i.e., minimize the effect of cultural differences). It seems that maintaining communication homogeneity through uncertainty/anxiety reduction has been considered the best means to satisfy the value of efficiency. In other words, it is fair to say that Gudykunst's uncertainty and anxiety reduction theory presupposes both values of homogeneity and efficiency. Actually, Gudykunst (1993) proposes a theory of

effective (i.e., efficient and convenient) interpersonal and intergroup communication through anxiety and uncertainty management as a chapter in the book entitled, "Intercultural Communication Competence" (Wiseman & Koester, 1993). Gudykunst, here, again clearly connects the theory of uncertainty and anxiety with the value of efficiency (i.e., competence).

Another influential and powerful theory, along with Gudykunst's A.U.M. (Anxiety/Uncertainty Management) theory, to explain intercultural communication phenomena is Kim's intercultural adaptation theory (1988). This theory has been developed in order to explain immigrants' adaptation in their new environment. She applies General Systems Theory as a theoretical basis to explain strangers' (especially immigrants') intercultural adaptation. Unlike other scholars who had viewed intercultural communication as a problematic phenomenon, Kim considered intercultural communication as a learning experience or a challenge to facilitate an individual's internal growth (For a similar view see Adler, 1987). According to her, such internal growth often leads one to generate his or her intercultural identity as an outcome. She also contends that a stress experience derived from cultural unfamiliarity is indispensable to the individual's internal growth. In other words, she assumes that overcoming cultural differences and the accompanying stress is important and feasible for most human beings, since most of us are open systems and have internal homeostatic drive to maintain the human system.

On this point, Kim presumes adaptation is the only way to maintain order (or various levels of systems; individual systems as well as various levels of group systems). Kim assumes cultural differences disturb the equilibrium of an

individual system. The individual regains the internal balance by adapting¹⁹ to the stronger system through personal growth accompanying the process of deculturation. Deculturation was necessary since promoting the existence of culture differences is presupposed to involve a sort of risk to disturb the efficient and effective function of various systems of a host environment as well as disturb the order there. It is fair to say, modernity more or less presupposes the values of homogeneity and efficiency over the importance of preserving the unique cultural heritage strangers bring into a host environment. For that reason, Kim rationalizes the necessity of partial loss (i.e., unlearning) of original cultural identity as a part of indispensable intercultural adaptation process.

Kim's (1988) argument seems to be based on an assumption, based on systems theory, which states, "To regain internal equilibrium and reduce stress, a person adapts by altering his or her internal conditions" (assumption 4, p. 50). This assumption presumes that the only solution to overcome challenges of culture differences (i.e., internal disequilibrium and stress) is to adapt into a changed environment actively by altering cultural strangers' internal conditions. This implies the necessity of deculturation. Cultural strangers' efficient adaptation, including deculturation, is presupposed to be necessary for the sake of preserving order in a host environment to keep the bigger system (i.e., a host society) functioning smoothly, efficiently, and normally. In short, Kim's systems theory, on one hand, views culture differences as challenges to facilitate cultural strangers' internal growth and, on the other hand, it still views culture differences to be solved, overcome, and at least restrained presupposing the values of conformity and efficiency.

¹⁹. It is important to notice Kim equated learning and growth with adaptation.

The above two theories explain intercultural communication phenomena presupposing certain values (e.g., effectiveness, conformity). Therefore, these theories are not explaining intercultural communication as it is. Instead, they are explaining the phenomenon while making certain value judgments and aiming for certain goal achievements (i.e., effective and conforming communication in AUM theory; effective adaptation and attaining intercultural identity in Kim's terminology) without recognizing it. Kincaid's (1988) convergence theory, likewise, explains the process of intercultural communication searching for the conditions which can accomplish the goal of greater cultural conformity/convergence. Obviously, the theories which claim to be "value free" are heavily value-laden.

Therefore, these theories do not comprehensively explain the intercultural communication phenomena that are taking place in the real world. The various intercultural communication phenomena that take place in the real world are much more complex than the theories²⁰ acknowledge. Actually, in reality, usually

²⁰ Although the investigator did not review the theories of cross-cultural communication, they have problems explaining culture differences. The problems are complicated and can not be easily explained. However, one of the crucial problems in cross-cultural theory is its simplistic and rational explanation presuming linearity and two-valued dichotomy. Many of the dimensions of cultural variability (e.g., Hall's Low- High context, 1976; Hofstede's four dimensions: individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, power distance, 1980, 1983; Okabe's East-West assumptions, 1983; Parson's pattern variables, 1951) represent this problem. These frameworks also manifested two-valued logics (e.g., high vs low context, collectivism vs individualism, East vs West, et cetera) which presume Cartesian dualism. Regardless of the content of the dimensions of cultural variability, each dimension is a continuum which presumes each culture locates on somewhere between the extremes. For instance, Japan is more collectivistic than the United States is, while Japan is less collectivistic than Korea is. Although these cultural variability dimensions are indications of general tendency, such dimensions exclude the potentiality that some cultures might be highly collectivistic as well as highly individualistic at the same time. Such potentiality is presumed to be irrational; therefore, it is excluded from consideration. However, such a decision itself is based on a certain cultural perspective which is a Western, linear and rational mode of awareness.

One of the principal characteristics of intercultural communication is the multiplicity of cultural differences. Western, linear, and rational explanations can only deal with Western rational cultures. Recently, many people have questioned the validity of the cultural variability dimension. Kumon and Hamaguchi (1983), for instance, argued Japanese culture can not be understood appropriately by the collectivism-individualism dimension. Nadamitsu (1996).

intercultural communication phenomena are not taking place in the ways the theories explain and predict. In other words, the theories are only explaining the phenomenon of intercultural communication partially. Intercultural communication is a very complex phenomenon which takes place rationally as well as irrationally and even pre-rationally. Whenever we experience intercultural communication, not only do we rationally attempt to reduce anxiety and uncertainty and adapt to the situation, but also we irrationally avoid intercultural communication despite our curiosity. We even pre-rationally experience intercultural communication by hating or rejecting others without any rationality.

People experience intercultural communication very differently.

Intercultural communication is a much more complex phenomenon than we think, just like the complex nature of human reality. While there are many theories to explain intercultural communication phenomena under various perspectives, there are not any theories which can explain the complexity of intercultural communication comprehensively. Therefore, in this study, the investigator attempts to explain this complex nature of intercultural communication by employing Jean Gebser's theory of consciousness mutation presuming Husserl's presuppositionless phenomenology. This theory allows an explanation of the complex process of intercultural communication in terms of communication participants' structures of consciousness. This theory can explain the diverse ways people experience intercultural communication without presuming any metaphysics or ideologies.

likewise, demonstrated the inadequacy of individualism-collectivism dimension empirically. It seems, for instance, non-Western cultures or the cultures of non-linear thinking can not be easily understood from the cultural variability dimensions which are the manifestation of the Western rational linear logic. Although there have been many attempts to create an etic-derived theory to explain cultural differences among different nations, such effort seems to be still inadequate. In other words, the effort to establish a cross-cultural communication theory to transcend one mode of cultural logic has not yet been done critically.

Summary: Intercultural Communication as an Ideology.

In general, the area of intercultural communication has been developing as a field of communication presupposing several things. First of all, the existential status of intercultural communication has never been critically examined. The fundamental ontological status of intercultural communication has been adopted and accepted uncritically and blindly as-a-common-sense-phenomenon. As a result, the definition of intercultural communication became very ambiguous and was and has been based on metaphysical speculations. In this sense, a critical investigation of the ontic status of intercultural communication is necessary.

Next, the major topic selection, the major methodology, the major metatheoretical approach, and its corresponding major theories that signified intercultural communication as a field have been highly ideological as well as metaphysical. For instance, the choice of intercultural communication competence/effectiveness and intercultural adaptation as the two major topic areas in intercultural communication seem to manifest the predominant modern value of efficiency and conformity in the topic selection. The major methodological choice of variable-analytical-objective-reductionistic approach, on the other hand, signifies several metaphysics (e.g., reductionism, scientism, objectivism and empiricism) already presumed in the methodology. Investigating a phenomenon of intercultural communication, therefore, might be preempted or distorted even before its investigation. Phenomenology, which attempts to suspend metaphysical speculations, is the appropriate method for this study.

In terms of the major choice of metatheoretical approach and its corresponding theories to explain intercultural communication, they signified value-laden nature rather than value-free. The traditional scientific approach

presupposes prediction and control as the two major goals. These two goals are the manifestation of the value of efficiency. The corresponding theories under this approach also are transforming a subtle form of ideology by presuming effective communication as the desirable goal of intercultural communication.

In summary, the field of intercultural communication has been presuming certain metaphysics and ideologies without recognizing and without questioning. It is not known why this process of ideological formation took place.

Nonetheless, it is indispensable to search for the origin that constituted this metaphysical and ideological nature of intercultural communication as a discipline. In other words, a sort of historical investigation to unfold the origin of intercultural communication should be done. At the same time, intercultural communication is taking place in life. We are experiencing "intercultural communication" in our own lives. However, the true appearance of intercultural communication has never been critically examined. Therefore, this study attempts to examine the existential status of intercultural communication. In order to accomplish this task, the investigator necessarily engages in an eidetic analysis, which elucidates the necessary conditions that constitute a phenomenon of intercultural communication. The next chapter describes two methods appropriate for this study.

CHAPTER THREE

Method

In this section, several ways to examine the above research questions are explained. It is inappropriate to employ any traditional scientific methods (e.g., survey, experiment) to answer these research questions. Such traditional scientific methods can not escape from their inherent metaphysical presuppositions (e.g., objectivism, reductionism, empiricism, scientism) which prevent them from answering the investigator's research questions. Therefore, this analysis employs phenomenology, which challenges scientific presuppositions. The investigator applies Edmund Husserl's archeology as a way to unfold the origin of intercultural communication as an academic area established in the US. He also employs Husserl's eidetic analysis as a primary method to decipher the necessary conditions that constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication we (as historical beings in this present historical epoch) experience "as such." Both archeology and eidetic analysis are parts of phenomenology.

This chapter first describes the general characteristics of phenomenology as an approach. Since phenomenology is not only an approach but also a method of investigation, the chapter next explains the general characteristics of phenomenology as a method. Then, this chapter describes two specific methods of phenomenology (i.e., archaeology and eidetic analysis) in terms of the general characteristics and the specific procedures involved in each method. The chapter also demarcates the domain in each method.

Phenomenology

Phenomenology is the first requirement for this study. It is indispensable because what this study attempts to accomplish is in essence a phenomenology of intercultural communication. A phenomenology of something is only accomplished through phenomenology as a method. Therefore, phenomenology should be the first methodological concern for this study. This section describes phenomenology as a method, and applies Edmund Husserl's archeology and eidetic reduction to investigate a phenomenon of intercultural communication. A brief explanation of the origin of the term and an overview of three different attitudes serve as an introduction of the method.

Phenomenology as a Presuppositionless Inquiry.

Phenomenology is derived from two Greek words: phenomenon and logos. Phenomenon means appearance which is anything of which one is conscious. Logos, as Stewart and Mickunas (1974) contend, means " 'reason' or 'word,' hence a 'reasoned inquiry' " (p. 3). Phenomenology is a reasoned inquiry of anything of which one is conscious. As long as one is conscious of something, it becomes a legitimate area of investigation for phenomenology. This statement is very important to remember. Phenomenology does not presuppose what real is. Stated differently, phenomenology tries to avoid any metaphysical speculations (i.e., any speculations of the nature of reality). When a study is based on a metaphysical speculation, the nature of reality is necessarily limited. For instance, the nature of reality in empiricism is limited to anything which can be verified through sense perceptions (e.g., seeing through eye, hearing, touching). In this case, the experience of dreaming is excluded from the area of investigation, since a dream is not empirically experienced. However, the

experience of dreaming is as real as the experience of any empirical thing. The reason a dream is excluded from the area of investigation is purely based on a metaphysical prejudgment (i.e., empiricism). Empiricism, for instance, like all philosophical schools of metaphysics, is bracketed by the phenomenological method. Phenomenology, therefore, can widen the area of its investigation by avoiding any metaphysical speculations. As was mentioned before, anything of which one is aware can become a legitimate area of investigation for phenomenology, regardless of whether it is a dream, a memory, an empirical thing, a past history, et cetera. In other words, phenomenology attempts to investigate a phenomenon without any prevaluations (i.e., without any metaphysical presuppositions). This becomes a crucial issue when the investigator attempts to do a phenomenology of intercultural communication. What is intercultural communication (the nature of intercultural communication) is obviously based on several metaphysical speculations pointed out in the literature review section. Intercultural communication has been investigated as a presupposed phenomenon; therefore, it has been viewed in certain ways, examined presuming several metaphysical (or ideological) requirements which may be unjustified. So called, "intercultural communication" is a phenomenon which involves a certain origin and certain historical sedimentation. Nonetheless, very few studies have attempted to unfold the origin of intercultural communication. Moreover, there is no study which tries to unveil the essence of intercultural communication without presupposing metaphysical speculations. Although it is controversial whether a presuppositionless investigation is truly possible, phenomenology is the only method designed as a presuppositionless inquiry.

For this study, therefore, the investigator employs Edmund Husserl's archeology and eidetic reduction as the two specific methods to do a phenomenology of intercultural communication. The two methods have different roles and require different procedures. Preceding an explanation of the specific procedures, however, the next section describes the general characteristics of phenomenology as a method.

Phenomenology as a Method

When we wake up in the morning and wash our faces, brush our teeth, are we thinking about what we are doing? Probably we are not. When we are living in our world, we just accept everything existing in our world rather than questioning each existence. Our house, our teeth, our book, our friend, our school, everything surrounding us is a part of our daily lives. As long as something is a part of our world, we never question it. We just simply and naturally accept the existence in our world as it is. Edmund Husserl called such an attitude the "natural attitude." Husserl describes "natural attitude" in his book, "Ideas" (1913/1962) as follows:

I am aware of a world, spread out in space endlessly, and in time becoming and become, without end. I am aware of it, that means, first of all, I discover it immediately, intuitively, I experience it. Through sight, touch, hearing, etc., in the different ways of sensory perception corporeal things somehow spatially distributed are *for me simply there*, in verbal or figurative sense "present," whether or not I pay them special attention by busying myself with them, considering, thinking, feeling, willing. (p. 91)

The natural standpoint, nonetheless, "constitutes the most basic web of all human relationships to the world and to other persons" (Stewart & Mikunas, 1974/1990, p. 24). While the natural attitude is the most basic human attitude, we are presupposing many things under its influence. For instance, we are presupposing everything that surrounds us is real. For instance, a woman is

walking down the street. We just presume the person is a woman. However, in principle, we actually do not know whether the person is she or he. We just presume the person is she, because the person appears like a woman. Although this might be a natural observation, this belief is a mere metaphysical speculation. The person might be a transvestite. We never know. This example illustrates that there might be many presuppositions as we speculate about the nature of reality without recognizing and questioning. We just blindly believe and accept everything surrounding us as belonging to our natural world as it is.

Husserl, on the other hand, argued that such natural attitude might distort and sometimes preempt our investigation of a phenomenon if we wish to understand it rigorously. The natural attitude does not force us to question the blindly accepted presuppositions. We call such blindly believed presuppositions "commonsense." While such commonsense might be true, it might be wrong. At least, it can be questioned until more firm evidence is available. Husserl, therefore, argued the importance and the necessity to shift attitude if we wish to investigate a phenomenon decently and seriously.

Phenomenological Reduction as the Shift from the Natural Attitude to the Philosophical Attitude. Such a changed attitude is basically the one which asks a philosophical question without presupposing anything. Philosophy developed when men began to question the world around them and to search for rational explanations about it. Such an attitude, therefore, is called the "philosophical attitude." It is the attitude to question the reason why about everything rather than presuming many things. It is an unnatural attitude in a sense, since the attitude asks questions which are presumed to be commonsense. Yet, Husserl contended the shift from the natural attitude to the philosophical one was

indispensable if we wish to know a phenomenon seriously. It is indispensable, because the philosophical attitude allows one to open up the region of investigation by bracketing one's natural attitude and consequently by questioning all presuppositions about the world. Someone investigating a phenomenon without the philosophical attitude, in other words, might automatically see the phenomenon in a certain way, presuming something even before the investigation¹. Husserl, therefore, argued in favor of this operation as the indispensable first methodological concern for any phenomenological investigation. He specifically called this attitudinal shift, which involves a questioning of all one's presuppositions about the world, "phenomenological reduction." According to Stewart and Mikunas (1974/1990), the phenomenological reduction "involves a narrowing of attention to what is essential in the problem while disregarding or ignoring the superfluous and accidental" (p. 26). In order to accomplish this task, disconnecting one from his or her naturalistic assumptions is necessary. Suspension of all kinds of naturalistic assumptions/presuppositions is an operation called "epoche" originally employed by the Greek skeptics to refer to abstention (i.e., suspension of judgment). Husserl also used a mathematical metaphor, "bracketing," to explain phenomenological reduction. By bracketing a mathematical equation, mathematicians merely place it out of question for a while until the larger context of the equation is fully investigated. Likewise, by bracketing (i.e., parenthesizing) naturalistic assumptions embedded in one's natural world, a phenomenologist merely places his or her naturalistic prejudices out of question (i.e., disregard or ignore accidental and superfluous) for a while until the phenomenon of interest is

¹. Husserl labeled a scientist's reductionistic attitude as the "scientific attitude."

more critically investigated. In any case, Stewart and Mickunas (1974/1990) contend that phenomenological reduction, epoche, and bracketing are synonymous terms which can be employed interchangeably.

According to Husserl, investigating the essence of a phenomenon (i.e., the second step of phenomenology as a method, specifically called "eidetic analysis") is possible after epoche is completed. The more important issue is to identify a concrete way to accomplish "epoche", which is the first phenomenological operation.

Proceeding from epoche (i.e., suspending judgment about all kinds of presuppositions about life-world) is an extremely difficult task. It is extremely difficult, since we are not aware of what we are presuming. Therefore, the historical investigation Husserl proposed is a concrete method of unfolding deeply sedimented presuppositions. In other words, the historical investigation Husserl called "archaeology" is a process of critically reflecting on the historical horizon of the phenomenon, and is a form of epoche. In the next section, the general characteristics of an archaeological historical investigation are outlined.

Archaeology

General Characteristics

Something appears as a phenomenon in a certain historical context with certain motive. Likewise, intercultural communication showed itself as an independent academic field in a certain historical context with certain motives. In other words, intercultural communication has its origin and its history. The prior studies (i.e., texts) of intercultural communication have certain shared presuppositions (e.g., certain metaphysics). Stated differently, the way each prior

study of intercultural communication manifested itself was very similar, regardless of the obvious differences in its content. This became so because each prior study (of intercultural communication) is a product of historical sedimentation. The origin and the history of intercultural communication have been always already presupposed in each text of intercultural communication as historical sedimentation. Therefore, unfolding the history and the origin of intercultural communication is indispensable not only to understand the meaning of intercultural communication and its potential transformations, but also to clarify how the metaphysical speculations about intercultural communication have been established.

Such historical investigation is necessarily an archaeological one. Archaeology is a search for the origin as Stewart and Mikunas suggest. It is a form of historical investigation. Edmund Husserl engaged in this archaeological historical investigation in his work, The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology (1954/1970). He clearly indicated that this form of historical investigation is "not that of a historical investigation in the usual sense" (p. 70). **A traditional historical investigation**, for Husserl, is one which examines history "from the outside, from facts, as if the temporal becoming in which we ourselves have evolved were merely an external causal series." (p. 71) History, in this view, is treated as a mere recorded past which is already gone in a physical sense. Conventional history tends to presume a line connecting different historical events. Conventional history categorizes and isolates historical events chronologically, much like isolating variables in hypothesis testing. Any investigator who engages in historical investigation in a traditional

sense examines history as a disinterested observer detached from "the past history."

On the other hand, Husserl's historical investigation is an **archaeological** one. The investigation treats history as a living tradition which has been accumulating as historical sedimentation like archaeological layers. In this archaeological investigation, "we are heirs and cobearers" (p. 71) of history. It indicates we are a product and a producer of history at the same time. History is essentially our history which is an archaeologically accumulated sedimentation rather than a bunch of mere recorded factual past. History is like a sedimentation of multiple layers which has been archaeologically accumulated as well as accumulating. History is a product as well as a process simultaneously. History always already has a unity which integrates past, present, and future. Therefore, in this archaeology, as Husserl (1954/1970) argued, "we are attempting to elicit and understand the unity running through all the [philosophical] projects of history that oppose one another and work together in their changing forms" (p. 70). In other words, the archaeological historical investigation attempts to decipher the relationship between the past and present which encompasses the future. History is, for Husserl, a transcendental and synthetic phenomenon which transcends time.

In another important role, archaeology leads to self-understanding. The most difficult task on the way to achieving epoche (i.e., suspending judgments) is to clarify and understand our own prejudices. Whenever we are living in our natural world with our natural standpoint, we never realize what we really presuppose. The presuppositions embedded in our natural attitude are part of our life and can not see themselves. Therefore, as Gadamer (1960/1989)

pointed out, these are blind prejudices (i.e., presuppositions) which are historically sedimented. Similarly, Husserl argued that "all the things he takes for granted are prejudices, that all prejudices are obscurities arising out of a sedimentation of tradition" (p. 72). In order to bracket these historically sedimented blind prejudices, the investigator must unveil and see these blind prejudices. Otherwise, he can not bracket his prejudices. In order to bracket something, it is necessary to know what that something is. We can not bracket something without knowing it. Therefore, it is necessary to enable blind prejudices, since any blind prejudices are "unknown" prejudices which can not be bracketed.

While such blind prejudices necessarily are clarified, these kinds of prejudices are ambiguities that are so deeply sedimented in ourselves (in our historical traditions) that we can not easily reflect and see what they really are. Therefore, the investigator must engage in the archaeological historical investigation Edmund Husserl proposed. As Husserl contended, the archaeological historical investigation is "actually the deepest kind of self-reflection aimed at a self-understanding in terms of what we are truly seeking as the historical beings we are" (p. 72). Put otherwise, through historical self-reflection, the archaeology gives us an opportunity to see our historically sedimented blind prejudices for what they really are; consequently, we can suspend those prejudices by bracketing them. The archaeological historical investigation, therefore, is a form of epoche. However, it is also important to remember epoche is a dialectic and a continuous never-ending process. The archaeological historical investigation gives the investigator just such an opportunity to reflect upon his historically sedimented prejudices and to see what

he really is as a historical being through a historically reflected dialogue. Nonetheless, this does not guarantee he can successfully accomplish this task. All he can do is to critically and sincerely try to challenge and question his deeply blinded prejudices.

Procedures

Basically, there is no pre-determined procedure to carry out the archaeological historical investigation. While Edmund Husserl made some comments and suggestions about the method of his archaeological-teleological historical investigation in his The Crisis of European Sciences², he did not describe the method in a specific step-by-step way. Therefore, the investigator must describe the procedure of this historical analysis considering Husserl's suggestions. It is important to notice, however, the proposed procedure is a preliminary one and far from complete. Others might also do the archaeology in a different way. The procedure the investigator proposes is merely a version of his own which is designed to investigate the origin of intercultural communication. The only thing the investigator can do is to try his best to reflect Husserl's fundamental attitude embedded in his archaeology on the procedure the investigator proposes.

Another important point to remember is his historical analysis is not only archaeological, but also hermeneutic³. A hermeneutic principle of the text-context relationship suggests that in order to understand the meaning of a text (i.e., a phenomenon), it is indispensable to know the meaning of the context in which the text is situated. Therefore, the investigator follows his investigation by

². "The Crisis" is an archaeology or genealogy as are Foucault's work (e.g., *The Order of Things*, 1966/1970; *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 1971/1972).

³. The Crisis had a great impact on subsequent hermeneutics like Gadamer, Habermas, and Ricoeur. So, Husserl is in a sense setting the phenomenological basis for a new hermeneutic.

following this principle. Particularly, in order to understand the original meaning of a phenomenon (i.e., a text) of intercultural communication, he attempts to identify the original context where the phenomenon took place originally through necessary means. Then, he tries to unveil the meaning of the original context in which the phenomenon is originally situated. Third, he attempts to interpret the original meaning of intercultural communication by situating it in the original context. Finally, he deciphers the presuppositions embedded in the original meaning of the phenomenon.

In a similar manner, carrying out the task of unveiling the transformation of the meaning of intercultural communication is the second part of archaeology. The section first identifies the shift of context, followed by clarifying the meaning of the shift of the context. Then, the investigator interprets the meaning of intercultural communication by situating it in the shifted context. Fourth, he unveils the implications of the transformations of the text (i.e., intercultural communication). Then, the study reveals the uncanny nature of the foundation of intercultural communication. Limitations of the present attempt of archaeology are suggested in the end. The general procedures of this version of hermeneutic archaeology are outlined below.

1. Searching For the Origin

- A. Identifying the original context where the text originally appeared;
- B. Clarifying the meaning of the context;
- C. Interpreting the original meaning of the text situated in the context;
- D. Deciphering the presuppositions embedded in the original meaning of the text;

2. Clarifying the transformation of intercultural communication

- A. Identifying the shift of the context;

- B. Clarifying the meaning of the shifted context;
- C. Interpreting the meaning of the text by situating it in the shifted context;
- D. Unveiling the implications of the transformation:

Each step is described below.

(A-1) Identifying the original context where a phenomenon (i.e., a text) originally appears. Phenomenologically speaking, something appears as a phenomenon when one is conscious of it in a certain historical context with certain motives. In order to understand the original meaning of a phenomenon (i.e., a text), identifying and understanding the meaning of the original context is necessary. There is an intimate relationship between the birth of a phenomenon and (the teleology of) the original context. In fact, a text (i.e., a phenomenon) can not exist by itself. When there is a text, there is always a context where the text is situated. This version of archaeological historical investigation attempts to understand the original historical context where a text is situated. Clarifying the meaning of the original historical context will lead to the original historical meaning of the text (i.e., a phenomenon). Therefore, clarifying the historical epoch which brought something into existence for the first time as a phenomenon is the first task the investigator engages in. In order to understand the meaning of the text (i.e., a phenomenon), unfolding the context which is the background of the text is necessary.

There are several ways to identify the original historical context where a phenomenon originally took place. The use of the historical documents about a phenomenon is one way. It is important to use multiple documents and find out the correlation among different documents in this stage. In any case, a hasty decision should be avoided. Another way to identify the original historical context

is the use of dictionary. Some dictionaries indicate the original historical epoch where the word (i.e., the word which refers to the phenomenon) originally appeared (e.g., Random House Dictionary of the English Language) or even the original reference or the way the word was originally employed (e.g., Oxford English Dictionary). An etymological dictionary might also help in identifying the original context by going back to the word origin, although the choice of the etymological dictionary requires great care. Again, a crucial point to remember is to use multiple methods and multiple resources and to find out the correlation among them in order to identify the original historical context. Through this careful process, we can identify the original historical context. More importantly, through this careful process, we can find a way and a path to dig in the origin of a phenomenon.

(A-2). Clarifying the meaning of the original historical context where the text originally was situated. The second step of this version of hermeneutic-archaeological historical investigation is to clarify the original historical meaning of the context where the phenomenon originally appeared. Unfolding the meaning and teleology of the original historical context is the second necessary task to interpret the original (historical) meaning of the phenomenon of investigation.

One of the useful ways to clarify the meaning of the original historical context and the teleology of the historical epoch is to examine the shift of the historical context. In other words, logically speaking, there should be a historical context where the phenomenon had not taken place. In other words, the context shifted between the original historical context and the prior historical context. Therefore, comparing the two historical context particularly in terms of the

historical teleology will clarify the meaning and the teleology of the original historical context.

For instance, there was a historical context in which intercultural communication had not been recognized as such⁴. People recognized something as intercultural communication as such after one historical context (i.e., pre-intercultural communication era) shifted to another historical context (i.e., intercultural communication historical era). Comparing the two historical contexts will clarify the uniqueness and the essential differences between the two historical contexts (in terms of the historical teleology), which leads to an unfolding of the sedimented original meaning of intercultural communication. Comparison is necessary to clarify the uniqueness and the meaning.

In this stage, of course, before interpreting the original meanings of a phenomenon, we can unfold the specific process of the birth of the phenomenon by clarifying the more specific context where the phenomenon originally took place. When we engage in this task, the process of the investigation is usually called a biographic investigation. Although this might be very useful, it should not be forgotten that it is necessary to pay attention to the relationship between the historical teleology hidden in the original historical context and the specific context where a phenomenon originally took place.

⁴. It is important to notice intercultural communication is not defined by apparent physical conditions. Some may argue intercultural communication has been taking place for more than a thousand years, since physical interaction between people from different cultures had taken place thousands of years ago. While this is true, it is unsure whether the people at that time recognized the interaction as "intercultural communication." The point, here, is that a phenomenon of intercultural communication is not defined by the apparent physical interaction, but defined by people's consciousness. In a way, intercultural communication (especially as a discipline) is a cultural creation just like other cultural artifacts such as music, painting, ways of thinking, etc. It is a manifestation of the creator's consciousness. Intercultural communication as such first assures communication as a reflectively identified phenomenon.

(A-3). Interpreting the original meaning of a text (i.e., a phenomenon) by situating it in the original historical context within which it appeared. In this stage, the investigator is finally able to interpret the original meaning of the phenomenon of interest by putting it in the original historical context. The hidden meaning of the phenomenon will be unveiled when the intimate and inseparable relationship between the phenomenon (i.e., a text) and the context where the phenomenon originally appeared is clarified based on the prior two procedures.

(A-4). Unveiling the presuppositions embedded in the original meaning of a text. When the original meaning of the text becomes obvious, the presuppositions which constituted the original meaning of the text will usually reveal themselves. Although these presuppositions could be revealed when we decipher the historical teleology embedded in the original historical context (A-2), the investigator finds it more appropriate to do this as the final procedure of the first part of hermeneutic-archaeological historical investigation. The presuppositions hidden in the original meaning of the text are the ones which keep the unity of the text or the phenomenon running throughout the history of it. In this stage, we might want to unfold the relationship between the presuppositions and the history of a phenomenon in order to clarify the historical sedimentation (i.e., to clarify the ever present origin of the phenomenon throughout the history).

Basically this procedure concludes the first part of the archaeological historical investigation. The second part, which unveils the transformation of a phenomenon, goes through similar procedures. Particularly, the first three procedures are almost identical. Nonetheless, brief descriptions of the four procedures follow.

(B-1). Identifying the shift of the context. Sometimes, the meaning of the text or the phenomenon transforms along with the shift of the context where the text is situated. The meaning of the text is always shifting slightly since the context is always shifting in one way or another. An important point is when the shift is too significant to be ignored, especially when the significant historical context shifts for some reason. In this case, investigating the meaning of the phenomenon is necessary because of the significant shift in the historical context. Although the original meaning of the text might be still present, another layer of new meaning is added. It is important to clarify the transformed meaning derived from the addition of the new layer. This applies to the phenomenon of intercultural communication. Although nobody has explicitly indicated so before, the meaning of intercultural communication transformed when the historical context shifted significantly (i.e., the end of Cold War). Therefore, the first procedure the investigator must engage in is to identify the shift of the historical context. It might be difficult to determine the shift. The investigator must attempt to identify the historically significant event which might change the nature of the text or the phenomenon of interest. Such historically significant events usually correlate with certain historical changes.

(B-2). Clarifying the meaning of the shift of the context. This procedure is similar to (A-2). The comparison between the two historical contexts is necessary to reveal the meaning of the shift by deciphering the meaning and the uniqueness of the new historical context in terms of the historical teleology.

(B-3). Interpreting the transformed meaning of the text by putting it in the shifted new context. In this stage, just like the (A-3) stage, the investigator may interpret the transformed meaning of the text by situating it in the shifted context.

(B-4). Unveiling the implications of the meaning of the transformed text.

The concluding procedure of the second part of the hermeneutic-archaeological historical investigation attempts to unveil the implications derived from the shifted meaning of the text (i.e., the phenomenon). Specifically, in this stage the investigator tries to indicate some of the consequences the transformation of the meaning of the text leads to. The consequences are either explicit or implicit. In either case, the investigator, as a co-bearer of our history, must decipher the consequences. It is important to notice we are co-bearer as well as bearer of our history. We are not only inheriting a history, but also creating our history. Therefore, deciphering the consequences which are derived from the meaning-transformation of the phenomenon (i.e., the text), in a critical manner, is our responsibility as co-bearers of our history.

Demarcation

Before the investigator moves to explain "eidetic analysis," it is important to delimit the domain of the present archaeological attempt. The domain of the investigation is "Intercultural communication" as an independent academic area which belongs to the field of communication. Intercultural communication as a conscious effort to understand other cultures might have been taking place since the dawn of human civilization as a form of diplomacy, missionary activities, trading, etc. While it is significant to understand the history of such "intercultural activities," such an attempt is obviously impossible to achieve in just one dissertation. The investigator, therefore, delimits the domain to the examination of "intercultural communication" as an independent academic area of communication studies, which was cultivated in the United States.

Limiting the scope of "intercultural communication"⁵ to a field of communication studies cultivated in the US is necessary because fields which are similar to "intercultural communication" might have taken place in different places outside the US and in different historical epochs. In this study, the investigator does not determine this issue. Sources of information are limited to documents that are available in the US and are written in English. Therefore, the investigator delimits the scope as "intercultural communication" cultivated in the US in this study.

Delimiting intercultural communication as an independent academic field cultivated in the US has another motive. The investigator is interested in evaluating the movement of the field of "intercultural communication" and its implications; the investigator has been studying intercultural communication in many respects (e.g., presenting papers on intercultural communication, reading "intercultural" related articles, teaching "intercultural communication," thinking about the future of the field, et cetera). As a member of the field and as a co-maker of its history, the investigator is motivated to understand why (in what motive), how, and in what (historical) context "intercultural communication" became an independent academic field in the US. Such an attempt leads to a clarification of what he is and what he presumes as a co-bearer of the history. As he contended in the introductory chapter, the history is ever-present history. Without understanding an original motive and its historical movement, he can not understand where he stands and what he is doing as a member who cares about the field (which has been cultivated in the US). In order to re-evaluate the field, he needs to do an archaeological investigation of the field; such an investigation

⁵. "Intercultural communication" may also mean the name of an academic curriculum (usually within university-level institutions).

motivated him to delimit the scope to "intercultural communication" as an independent academic field which has been cultivated in the US.

Up to this point, the general characteristics and the procedures involved in the hermeneutic-archaeological historical investigation have been described. The previous sections also demarcated the domain of the study. The next section explains the general characteristics and the specific procedures required in the next phenomenological method, "eidetic reduction." Then, delimiting the domain of eidetic analysis follows.

Eidetic Reduction

While an archaeological historical investigation is a critical way of exercising phenomenological epoche, eidetic reduction, Edmund Husserl proposed, attempts to decipher the necessary conditions for intercultural communication to take place as a phenomenon. In this section, the focus is on the general characteristics of eidetic reduction, the specific procedures of the method, and demarcation for analysis.

General Characteristics

"Eidetic" is the adjective of the noun, "eidos." "Eidos" is a Greek word for "idea." However, the "eidos" which Husserl meant was not the usual meaning of idea as a subjective mental process. Rather, *eidos* is, in a Husserlian phenomenological term, the essence of what a thing is. The next question is what "essence" is. In order to understand what essence is, let's take a simple example. Assume that there is a pen in front of you. Somebody asks you, "what is it?" You immediately answer, "it is a pen." The person continues to ask you, "how do you know what you are seeing is a pen?" You maybe simply answer like

this, "I know what I am seeing is a pen because I know what a pen is." A more sophisticated answer might be, "I know this is a pen based on my previous experiences." Or you respond, "I know this is a pen because I have been using it." Whatever the content of the response, the above dialogue illustrates several important points about eidos or essence.

First of all, in the above example, the moment you see the thing, you immediately know it as a pen before somebody asks you what it is. You just instantly know this is a pen without reflection. But again, critically speaking, how do you know exactly that this is a pen. One of the answers illustrated above gives an important clue. You said, "I know what I am seeing is a pen because I know what a pen is." This is a very important statement. You know this is a pen because you know the essence of what a pen is intuitively⁶. You have experienced the essence of pen, which might be called, "penness." Knowing "penness" through personal direct experiences means knowing the structures and the meaning of the phenomenon of pen. Any experiences are fundamentally eidetic experiences regardless of whether this is recognized or not. Whenever we experience something, we are experiencing the essence of what the thing is. Without knowing the essence of what a thing is, it is impossible to experience and comprehend it. The essence necessarily constitutes the structures and meanings which are manifested by the all worlds. Put otherwise, the essence is a necessary condition for something to manifest as a phenomenon of something as such. It may be an essentially empirical or an essentially fantastic thing or an essentially logical phenomenon.

⁶. Intuition, in this sense, is not mythical. It means one's direct awareness (i.e., experience) of something. Nothing is more obvious than intuition. According to Husserl, to intuit simply means to be aware.

Eidetic reduction, therefore, is a method by which we grasp the essence of a phenomenon. In other words, eidetic reduction is a method to grasp the necessary condition(s) for something to emerge as a phenomenon of something as such. In order to carry out this task, phenomenological reduction (i.e., epoche, which is a process of bracketing naturalistic assumptions by reflecting those) is a prerequisite. This study is an attempt to engage in the task of epoche through archaeology (i.e., archaeological historical investigation), which is a critical historical reflection (i.e., critical historical self-understandings). While an attempt to carry out an epoche is a most difficult task, Husserl contended that after epoche one is further able to systematically reduce consciousness to its essentials by eliminating accidental conditions which constitute a phenomenon. In the end, the essence or the necessary conditions which constitute the phenomenon are supposed to be grasped. Husserl called this particular process eidetic reduction. The next section describes the specific procedures of the method.

Procedures

Edmund Husserl explored the method of achieving the science of essence or eidetic reduction in his work, Experience and Judgment (1948/1973). Although he suggested a specific operation named "free imaginative variation" to carry out eidetic reduction, his explanation was not very specific. Spiegelberg (1982), therefore, proposed a phenomenological method which is composed of a seven-step procedure. His phenomenological method may be the only detailed description regarding phenomenology as a method. This study offers a five-step adaptation of Spiegelberg's procedures in the following order:

1. Suspending metaphysical speculations about the existential status of a phenomenon (suspension);
2. Describing a phenomenon (description);
3. Apprehending the necessary conditions for a phenomenon to take place (comparison);
4. Clarifying the investigator's prejudices about the ontic status of a phenomenon (another suspension);
5. Interpreting the meaning of a phenomenon (interpretation);

(1) Suspending metaphysical speculations about the existential status of a phenomenon. The first step of eidetic analysis is suspending metaphysical and ideological speculations about a phenomenon's existential status. Whenever we are conscious of something, we are aware of it within certain a socio-cultural context from certain a perspective as a historical being who belongs to certain a historical epoch. What it means here is that our consciousness of something is already always contaminated by the naturalistic assumptions about the ontic status of a phenomenon. Since those assumptions are historically embedded sedimentation, we usually can not even see them. As a result, it becomes very difficult to reflect them so that the assumptions can be bracketed until more solid evidence emerges. Nevertheless, suspending such metaphysical and ideological speculations about the ontic status of a phenomenon is indispensable. Retaining those speculations might distort or even preempt the investigation. Kramer and Mickunas (1992) point this out by using a phenomenon of voodoo as their example:

For instance, to appreciate voodoo as a different mode of being and awareness from some other cultural phenomenon, one must first be willing to accept it as it is and not immediately seek to explain it in terms of some other ontological basis, such as reducing it to brute physicalism (behavior patterns or neurophysiology). This is not to say that a physical description is invalid, but rather to make a commitment not to presume that a physical description is the only way to make valid statements about voodoo. To reject a priori---that is, to exclude any phenomenon (like spell-casting) from the field of investigation simply on the basis that it is deemed nonempirical---is to commit an unwarranted prejudice, based on a narrow metaphysical faith in materialism. (xiii-xiv)

Therefore, metaphysical and ideological speculations about the ontic status of a phenomenon should be unveiled through a series of critical self-reflections and temporarily suspended. In this study, both a semiotic literature review of prior studies of intercultural communication and archaeological historical analysis of intercultural communication should facilitate an elucidation of the metaphysics of the existential status of intercultural communication. Regardless of the effort, it is important to notice a complete epoche is impossible, as Merleau-Ponty (1962) contended. Rather, epoche is a continuous process. Epoche is, in essence, a process of self-understanding (i.e., understanding one's own prejudices) which is a never-ending hermeneutic process. What the investigator attempts to do here is to do his best to try to challenge and question the prejudices about the phenomenon's ontic status including his own prejudices, in a critical manner.

(2) Describing a phenomenon. The second step of the eidetic analysis in this study is phenomenological description. Phenomenological description is basically the procedure of classifying and naming a phenomenon of interest. The major purpose is to locate a phenomenon within a pre-existing classification system. Spiegelberg (1960/1982) contended this might be enough for familiar phenomena, while describing by negation, or through analogy or metaphor might

be more adequate in order to describe unfamiliar phenomena or new aspects of familiar phenomena. In any case, the main function of phenomenological description is, as Spiegelberg (1960/1982) mentioned, "to serve as a reliable guide to the listener's own actual or potential experience of the phenomena" (p. 694).

Another important issue to notice about phenomenological description is the very nature of the description. The description, in essence, is not descriptive, but interpretive. Any description is basically your description according to your consciousness. Your perception and your past experiences about the phenomenon you are trying to describe inevitably constitutes the very way you describe the phenomenon. Critically speaking, any attempt to describe something is always already interpretive and prejudiced in nature. Any description signifies the describer's prejudice in one way or another rather than purely describing a phenomenon of interest. An important point is that describing a phenomenon produces a prejudiced description among many potentially different descriptions. What we can do is to attempt to recognize our way (i.e., our prejudiced way) of describing a phenomenon. Moreover, the description essentially can not go deeper than the surface level and never truly penetrates to the essence of the phenomenon. Therefore, phenomenology does not stop at this point. It is not acceptable to be satisfied with your description and stop entering into the next step regardless of the thickness of the description⁷. Similar to the process of epoche, phenomenological description is also an on-going process.

⁷. No matter how thick the description is, it is the describer's version of description which is a reflection of his or her prejudice. Kramer and Mickunas (1992) argue regarding this matter as follows, "Description of surface behavior, no matter how 'thick,' is ontologically and phenomenologically different from that which is described." (p. xii)

(3) Apprehending necessary conditions for a phenomenon to take place⁸.

The third step of eidetic analysis is apprehending necessary conditions for a phenomenon to appear. Spiegelberg (1982) indicates this step as "apprehending essential relationships." This step is an essentially comparative one which is one of the most important steps in eidetic analysis. Comparison essentially elucidates necessary conditions for something to show itself as a phenomenon. For instance, compare a chair to a desk. We experientially know what a chair is and what a desk is. Stated differently, we know the meaning of both "a chair" and "a desk." More specifically, not only do we know the meaning of both phenomena, we already know how the two are similar and different from each other based on our direct experiences with them. When we know what "a chair" is, we already always presuppose the knowledge of numerous existences which are not a chair. Comparison already presupposes a process of elucidating similarities and differences among phenomena. Comparison clarifies identity. A chair can maintain its identity because there are numerous non-chair phenomena. If only a chair existed in our world, the chair could not be identified as a chair. A chair is only identifiable in relation to other existences which are not a chair. A chair can only be meaningful and unique because it is different from other phenomena. When we are living in our world with a natural attitude, we presume knowledge of numerous phenomena. We blindly accept each phenomenon in our world pre-reflectively. Stated differently, we merely experientially understand the essence of each phenomenon and essential relationships between each phenomenon pre-reflectively. Besides, without

⁸ There is a step called "apprehending general essences" in Spiegelberg's (1982) phenomenological method. This step attempts to illuminate the general essences which constitute a phenomenon by comparing several series of particular phenomena in a systematic manner. This process necessarily requires comparison; therefore, the investigator attempts to include this step as a part of comparison step.

recognizing it, we are comparing numerous phenomena; consequently, we can make sense of them pre-reflectively (or mindlessly). However, since this comparison takes place pre-reflectively, we usually can not clarify what the essence of each phenomenon is, although we know the essence experientially. In other words, in order to elucidate the essence of one phenomenon, conscious comparison is necessary. This conscious and systematic comparison is the task of this stage.

Particularly, Spiegelberg (1960/1982) suggests two kinds of comparison in order to elucidate necessary condition(s) for something to show itself as a phenomenon. The first is comparison within the same phenomenon, while the second is comparison between a phenomenon of interest and other different phenomena. The first comparison examines an "internal relations within one essence" (p. 699). For instance, comparing one chair to other different kinds of chairs applies to this process. By comparing numerous different kinds of chairs, the necessary components which constitute a chair regardless of the kind are clarified. Spiegelberg (1960/1982) explains this process illustrating "triangle" as an example as following:

Thus, in the case of the triangle we shall have to determine whether three sides, three angles, and certain shapes and sizes of these sides and angles are necessary to them or required by the essence "triangle," or whether they are merely compatible with it. Questions like the following would arise: Can a triangle without these elements still be a triangle rather than another figure? Or would a figure without them be an essential impossibility, since it would include incompatible ingredients? (p. 699-700)

In order to accomplish this task, Edmund Husserl suggested "free imaginative variation" (*freie Variation in der Phantasie*) as a specific operation. A process of free imaginative variation is, as Kramer and Mickunas (1992) contend, a thought experiment comparing imaginatively created numerous kinds of the

same phenomenon. Therefore, in essence, our past experiences of the phenomenon are actively employed as the source of information. A systematic procedure is indispensable for this task. The major goal is to clarify the nexus among components within a phenomenon in its necessity, possibility, or impossibility revealed as a consequence of the free imaginative variation. Therefore, the investigator first lists all kinds of potentially necessary components which constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication by imaginatively creating different kinds of intercultural communication. Second, he leaves off each of the components one by one completely or replaces each of them with another component. As a result, the two procedures allow the investigator to decide which element is necessary and which one is not necessary to constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication. When an omission or substitution of one component changes the ontic status meant by the name of intercultural communication in an essential manner, the component is a necessary one to constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication. On the other hand, when an omission or substitution does not change the ontic status of intercultural communication in an essential manner, the component is not an essential element for the phenomenon to appear as intercultural communication.

Finally, it is important to notice that this process, particularly the process of the free imaginative variation, requires caution and reservations since the investigator is bound to rely on his past experiences about intercultural communication almost entirely.

(4) Challenging the investigator's prejudices about the ontic status of a phenomenon⁹. Although eidetic reduction has an outcome, it does not mean it is

⁹ Spiegelberg (1982) offered two other steps (watching the mode of appearing and constituting a phenomenon in consciousness) between comparison and suspension. In this study, these two steps are omitted despite their significance, although watching the mode of appearing will be considered. Constitution is omitted since it can be considered another analysis by itself although it is interrelated with eidetic analysis. For the sake of convenience, the two procedures will be briefly explained.

Watching modes of appearing. Phenomenology not only is concerned with what appears, but also is concerned with the way things appear as phenomena. People often experience phenomena in different ways. The way they come into contact with essences is a fundamental aspect of determining what they are perceiving. Therefore, clarifying modes of givenness in a critical manner can considerably help clarify the question of direct or indirect verification. Moreover, watching the modes of givenness might serve a role similar to epoche, since investigating "how" something appears can avoid the preoccupation with "what" appears. Spiegelberg indicates there are at least three possibilities to clarify the mode of givenness. The first possibility is watching how an aspect (i.e., a side) of the whole is given with the synthetic whole. The wholeness of a phenomenon is perceived through the side or aspect of a given phenomenon. For instance, we recognize a whole pencil by just perceiving the front of it. The moment we saw a side of the pencil, we transparently see the whole pencil. Watching perspective deformation is another possibility. For instance, any one of the appearing sides of a cube, except the side we are facing, is perspectively deformed, while the deformed side is transparent toward the square shape of the side of which it constitutes the perspective aspect. In other words, as Spiegelberg states, "such perspectival deformations are the very means by which the identical size and shape of the object are maintained." (p. 704) While the above two possibilities regard the type of givenness, the third possibility is about the clarity (i.e., layers of clarity) of givenness. We may experience the same experience appearing with the same sides and in the same perspective yet very differently. More specifically, we may possibly experience the same phenomenon very differently because the phenomenon is given with very different degrees of clarity and distinctness. Investigating this aspect of the mode of givenness is particularly important in revealing our prejudices, since the clarity of givenness seems to be connected with our (prejudiced) perception. Judging the degree of clarity of givenness is always already a prejudiced judgment in one way or another.

Exploring the constitution of phenomena in consciousness. Constitution is a process by which things gradually appear in consciousness. In other words, constitution determines the way in which a phenomenon establishes itself and takes shape in our consciousness. As Spiegelberg (1982) states, "the purpose of such a study is the determination of the typical structure of a constitution in consciousness by means of an analysis of the essential sequence of its steps." (p. 706) The investigator must describe how things appear as a phenomenon in his consciousness step by step, analyzing its sequence. It is important to remember that how things constitute themselves is a process. As Stewart and Mickunas (1974/1990) mentioned, one cannot experience something by merely perceiving it. Rather, experiencing something requires "the synthesis of different phases of the experience such as perception, retention, expectation, memory, imagination, and so forth." (p. 44) They continue to argue that things gradually constitute themselves showing varied sides only in and through these different phases of experiences. Therefore, in this constitutional analysis, the investigator must describe all the modes (therefore, watching modes of appearing can be a part of constitution) and activities of consciousness and the process of the merging perceptions of the things to which these activities are correlated and directed. The process of constitution becomes more clear by this dual analysis.

a final outcome. Eidetic reduction is an ongoing project, and like phenomenology itself is continuous in nature. Epoche as suspending judgment (i.e., phenomenological reduction) possesses a similar nature. Merleau-Ponty (1962) once stated: "The most important lesson which the (phenomenological) reduction teaches us is the impossibility of a complete reduction" (xiv). As he mentioned, "it is an ever-renewed experiment in making its own beginning" (p. xiv). Therefore, before interpreting the meaning of a phenomenon, the investigator once again attempts to suspend what he discovered in his eidetic analysis by trying to reflect and clarify his prejudices manifested in his discovery. Such an attempt also reveals the limitation of the outcome the investigator discovered through reduction.

(5) Interpreting concealed meanings. The final step in the phenomenological method is a post-Husserlian addition influenced both by German philosophers such as Heidegger and Gadamer, and French philosophers such as Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and Ricoeur. An attempt to interpret the concealed meaning or hidden "sense" of a given phenomenon is called hermeneutics. Husserl did not explicitly mention this procedure. Nevertheless, hermeneutics is an extremely important process and is inseparable from phenomenology. As Spiegelberg (1982) contends: "the whole study of intentional structures consists largely in an interpretive analysis and description of the meanings of our conscious acts" (p. 712). Phenomenology, particularly eidetic reduction, is always already directed to search for the meaning of a phenomenon. Therefore, phenomenology is, critically speaking, always hermeneutic¹⁰.

¹⁰See Palmer's (1969) Hermeneutics for detailed information about hermeneutics.

The particular purpose of this step, on the other hand, is to interpret the meanings of a phenomenon which are not immediately manifest in description. For this reason, the investigator has to go beyond what is directly given in order to interpret concealed meanings of a phenomenon. Although this step tends to become speculative and rely on the investigator's insight in nature, deciphering concealed meanings of a phenomenon is indispensable, especially in the case of investigating any communication phenomenon. Communication phenomena are always already directed to the process of meaning generation and interpretation.

Demarcation

Just as the study delimited the domain of archaeological analysis, it also demarcates the domain for the current eidetic analysis. The domain of eidetic analysis is neither intercultural communication as an academic field nor intercultural communication as an academic curriculum. Rather, the study delimits the domain as "intercultural communication" as a phenomenon we directly experience "as such." Basic efforts to examine what "intercultural communication" is and to examine the necessary conditions which constitute the ontic status in a critical and systematic manner have not been conducted. Therefore, the present eidetic analysis which relies on our direct experience as the major source of analysis, delimits the domain as "intercultural communication" as phenomena we directly experience.

CHAPTER FOUR

Theoretical Basis for This Study

Before outlining the theoretical basis for this study, we look at "intercultural communication" in life. In other words, we go back to our direct experiences of intercultural communication in real life. How do we experience so called "intercultural communication?" It is important to go back to look at our direct experiences in reality, since a theory is supposed to explain what is happening in reality, at least based on an original meaning of theory.

When we recall our past experiences of intercultural communication, we might notice that the manner in which we experience intercultural communication varies. People experience intercultural communication differently. One person might engage in intercultural communication rationally by asking questions to his or her communication partner in order to understand the differences and similarities between him or her and the other party. The other person might experience intercultural communication rather irrationally and paradoxically by avoiding contacts despite curiosity. Yet another person might experience intercultural communication pre-rationally by rejecting or attacking others emotionally without thought. Different people experience intercultural communication in very diverse manners. At the same time, people also experience different intercultural episodes very differently. People might even experience the same intercultural event very differently every time they experience it. This is so because people are complex and different from each other. Not only are people different from each other, but people also change, just like each culture is different from each other and each culture is transforming as

time goes by. Therefore, people's experiences of intercultural communication are naturally very different and complex. One can intuitively verify this by recalling and analyzing all past intercultural communication experiences. Experiences of intercultural communication taking place in real life contain more complexity than the prior theories of intercultural communication attempt to explain. More specifically, the diverse manners of intercultural communication people experience has not yet been explained in an adequate manner.

In order to explain this diversity, the investigator necessarily thinks about the meaning of human diversity itself, since the differences in intercultural communication experiences are derived from human differences. What does it mean to say, "people are different" ? Some might attribute this to the notion of relativity. People are different from each other, since everything is relative. Likewise, people are all different because people are relative too. This seems to be half right and half wrong. While people are different from each other, people are similar to each other. People are indispensably similar to some extent in terms of basic human similarities. People are different from each other to some extent and similar to each other to some extent at the same time. People experience and make sense of the world in different ways, while sometimes people see the world similarly, still understanding each other. People are not totally different from each other, but they are relatively different. Some are more rational than others, whereas some people are more emotional than others. Yet, some are more irrational than others.

Regardless of these differences, everybody can be rational, irrational, and pre-rational. In other words, while people experience things in a diverse manner, they share the basis of understandings. Jean Gebser (1949/1985) called the

basis of all kinds of sense-making activities "structures of awareness." Gebser found people to be making sense of the world differently based on different structures of awareness. He also discovered that people experience the world in multiple modes of awareness. According to Gebser, the concrete manifestation and the specific function of each structure of awareness are very different for different people and different cultural groups, while the different structures of consciousness are shared among different people and different cultures. Gebser also discovered there are at least four structures of consciousness which bring about a different way of sense-making activity. People are relatively different because of the relative number of the structures of human consciousness.

Therefore, different people experience intercultural communication differently because their structures of consciousness work differently. They might experience intercultural communication differently because they experience it in multiple modes of awareness. People can be rational, irrational, as well as pre-rational. Obviously, Gebser's theory of consciousness mutation allows for explaining the complex nature of intercultural communication comprehensively and realistically. It explains the manner by which different people experience intercultural communication differently, and the manner by which the same people experience intercultural communication differently, without presuming ideological and metaphysical speculations.

Therefore, this theory serves the original function of theory, which distinguishes reality from appearance, wisdom from opinions (or *doxa*), consequently accomplishing the practical efficacy *theoria* aims for, as Bernstein (1976) and Habermas (1965/1968) point out. Applying this theory to explain the

complexity of intercultural communication unveils the still hidden reality of intercultural communication in the long run.

That is why this study employs Gebser's theory of consciousness mutation. Gebser's theory of consciousness mutation explains the origin and the transformational process of intercultural communication as an academic study and accounts for why different people experience a phenomenon of intercultural communication differently. It serves, therefore, as the major theoretical framework of archaeology (chapter 5) and of phenomenology (chapter 6).

This section clarifies the nature of Gebser's project in the beginning. Then, a theory of consciousness mutation is offered as a specific theoretical basis for this study. Finally, three structures of consciousness will be described for the theoretical framework for this project.

Gebser's Project.

Jean Gebser (1905-1973) was born in Posen, Prussia in 1905. What he did in his project was a massive work of comparative cultural-historical analysis of human civilization across different epochs and different cultures. His work is no doubt one of the greatest (maybe by far the greatest) comparative cultural analysis in terms of its scope, complexity, and depth.

The scope of his work is unbelievably wide. He investigated a diverse range of cultural creations including poetry, music, painting, architecture, language, literature, science, philosophy, and ways of thinking regardless of the kind. What he investigated was not only the content of each cultural creation, but also the form of manifestation of the artifact. Gebser called any artifacts humans created "civilizational expression." For Gebser, every cultural creation expresses something. As Shimode (1975) contends, cultural artifacts are not mere lifeless

objects, but the concrete manifestation of the creator's consciousness. Any cultural phenomena, regardless of the kind, signify and express certain structures of the creator's consciousness. This is "civilizational expression." Any civilizational expressions (i.e., cultural creations, cultural artifacts) are forms of expression which are the concrete manifestation of certain consciousness structures. In this sense, Gebser's project was a cultural-historical investigation of civilizational expressions across different epochs and different civilizations and cultures.

Gebser's project presumed phenomenology, particularly Husserl's nonmetaphysical phenomenology. Gebser set aside metaphysics and just followed the clues discovered among a variety of civilizational expressions (i.e., cultural creations and phenomena). His method of analysis was very similar to the eidetic analysis Husserl proposed. Gebser compared and contrasted diverse cultural creations (e.g., forms of thought, writings, paintings, language, et cetera) in terms of the form of manifestation of each creation. Then, he eliminated what was accidental and unessential through comparison. Through the process of comparative elimination, he delineated five structures of consciousness as an outcome of the reduction. Throughout the process, Gebser described and compared diverse domains of cultural artifacts without presupposing metaphysical speculations. His findings are not based on abstracted speculations, but are based purely on a vast amount of concrete evidence. What made his project rigorous is revealed through the way he conducted his investigation. In other words, his non-metaphysical phenomenological attitude makes his investigation very convincing.

In the end, the vast amount of evidence in Gebser's investigation demonstrates the correlation among diverse civilizational expressions and their correlative consciousness structures. His investigation also demonstrates, to Gebser's own surprise, that vast periodic transformations of the structures of human awareness took place across the history of human civilizations. His investigation suggests "such mutations not only yield novel structures of awareness but also integrate and position other modes of awareness within the requirements of the currently predominant structure (whenever that may be)." (Kramer & Mickunas, 1992, p. xii) "Past" modes of awareness still continue to serve a dominant role in the current modernity. People are living in the world in multiple modes of awareness including "past" modes. The process of human consciousness mutation is always "plus-mutation" rather than "minus-mutation." This is a theory Gebser proposed in his monumental work, Ever Present Origin (1949/1985). The next section clarifies a theory of consciousness mutation (specifically called a theory of "plus-mutation") which serves as a theoretical basis for the present study.

A Theory of Plus-Mutation

Gebser, based on his comparative cultural phenomenology, discovered that human civilization experienced periodic transformations of human consciousness structures across different historical epochs and different cultures. What Gebser found interesting from his investigation was that "past" modes of human consciousness were presumed rather than destroyed or going extinct. This phenomenon Gebser called the process of "plus-mutation" which is an alternative to the Darwinian notion of "minus-mutation."

Minus-mutation is biological, restrictive, and deterministic. It presupposes linear progress and, consequently, it negates an old and deficient existence for the sake of stronger new existence. When a new mutation occurs, a new existence emerges and an old existence becomes extinct. Darwin's Origin of Species argued this, contending that the evolution of species presupposed deterministic, linear, and biological changes from deficient species to stronger ones for the sake of survival.

On the other hand, "plus-mutation" is phenomenological and overdeterministic. Gebser mentions that "consciousness structure, by contrast, unfolds toward overdetermination: toward structural enrichment and dimensional increment; it is intensifying and inductive—plus-mutation." (p.38) Hidden potentialities, which have been present since origin, suddenly emerge and are recognized and integrated, forming a new consciousness. As a consequence, all hidden potentialities become transparent and ever-present. Origin is ever-present. Kramer and Ikeda (1994), based Gebser's theory of plus-mutation, contend that "the previous structure remains so that the new is not an entirely new species but an additional variant." (p.27) Therefore, the "past" modes of awareness still serve a dominant role in our present times. Each mode of awareness serves a different role, while the "present" mode of awareness serves a predominant role in our "present" time. Likewise, even when the "present" mode of consciousness mutates toward a "new" mode of consciousness, the existence does not cease, but serves as a prerequisite. As Kramer and Ikeda (1994) contend, "all new developments [mutation] are integrated into the 'previous' structure and even rely on the old as a prerequisite being." (p.27) In other words, new consciousness mutation serves to revitalize previously deficient

consciousness through plus-mutation, which is a process of enrichment. Gebser delineated five structures of consciousness based on his investigations, which are archaic, magic, mythic, perspectival, and integral.

Three Structures of Human Consciousness

Although Gebser delineated five modes of awareness, the archaic structure and the integral structure are not explained in this section. The archaic structure does not have much correlative evidence, while integral structure is a still potentially emerging structure which has not yet come to our awareness in a solid form. In any case, modernity belongs to the perspectival world in that perspectival consciousness is a predominant structure, while both magic and mythic structures still function in their own way. These three structures of awareness will serve as the major theoretical framework for this study. Different structures of awareness correlate with the different ways people experience intercultural communication. Each structure of awareness is distinguishable in terms of its own way of perceiving space, time, and self-identity. The next section describes these three different kinds of structures of awareness: the one-dimensional pre-perspectival magic-prerational structure; the two-dimensional unperspectival mythic-irrational structure; and the three-dimensional perspectival mental-rational structure. Each structure is explained in terms of its own way of perceiving space, time and self-identity.

The one-dimensional pre-perspectival magic-prerational structure. The representational symbol of one-dimensional magic awareness is the "point." The point suggests an expression of the spaceless and timeless one-dimensionality of the consciousness. Gebser (1949/1985) argued: "Because of this spaceless-timeless unity, every 'point' (a thing, event, or action) can be interchanged with

another 'point,' independently of time and place (like the hunting scene) and of any rational causal connection." (p. 48) Every point is identical with every other point. One can replace the other completely. There is no dissociation between each point. Moreover, each point is identical with the whole, since there is no dissociation between the part and the whole. Therefore, each point can possess vitality and power magically. Each point takes over the power of the whole. The very term "magic" correlates to "make," "machine," "*Macht* (might/power--German term)," and "*Moegen* (want--German term)" as Gebser (1949/1985) and Kramer and Mickunas (1992) pointed out. Magic is essentially making things happen out of nothing. Magic is the vital want which is a source of will to master and control, and desire to obtain power. Magic is striving for power. In this respect, any kind of technology is magic including modern materialistic magic. Every making is essentially magic.

In terms of the issue of identity, in the magic awareness, one can even become others, because there is neither "you" nor "I" since there is no symbolic distance between them. Therefore, in magic awareness, there is no personal identity. Only group-ego or tribal and communal identity exists. Even in our current modernity, we experience this magic awareness once in a while. For instance, during every football season, some of us go to the stadium to see a football game. While we are watching the game in the stadium with other fans, we experience this magic awareness. We identify with the game and with other fans. We get emotional since we are emotionally and pre-rationally involved in the game. The magic awareness is pre-rational and emotional in nature. If the home team wins, we feel good, because it means we won. We want the home team to win because we are a part of it. There is a vital want. We (a part) are, in

a sense, identical with the team (a whole) during the game. There is no symbolic distance between us and the team. During the game, there is no "I" or "you." We identify with other fans and the game as, for example, "Oklahoma University" or "OU" in a point-for-point manner. Only a group-ego, an OU identity in this case, exists during the ball game. We, as OU group-ego, strives for power by winning. When OU wins, we possess the power. During the ball-game, everything we experience is the OU ball-game magically and pre-rationally. The world except the ball game magically disappears during the ball-game.

The magic awareness happens to a good actor when he is acting. In fact, when he is acting, he is not acting any more, but becoming the role. During the play, there is no symbolic difference between him and the role. As Kramer and Mickunas (1992) illustrate, "Richard Burton disappears and Hamlet appears" (p. xviii). The actor, Richard Burton, becomes Hamlet during the play. He was magically identical with Hamlet at that moment. He is making Hamlet by being him. As a result, he takes over the power magically without reason because he is Hamlet during the play.

We also experience the magic awareness in intercultural experiences. When people stay in other cultures, they sometimes experience the so-called "honeymoon" stage--particularly early in their stay. When people experience this "honeymoon" stage, they experience this in the magic mode of awareness. Whatever they experience, they magically, pre-rationally and emotionally connect each event with other events regardless of the content, with point-like identification as "sweet honeymoon." For them, everything they experience is vital and identical with "honeymoon" experience. For instance, when they experience this "honeymoon" in the US, every event they experience is identical

with the US, which is identical with honeymoon. Each event and each person they encounter is pre-rationally identical with the US. Each event and each person they meet does not symbolize the US. Each event and each person they meet is magically America when they are experiencing magic consciousness. Each point, regardless of the event or person, has a vital and magic power which is identical with America itself. There is no symbolic distance between each event, person, and the US. The opposite magic experience is culture shock. When people experience culture shock, everything they experience, regardless of the kind, is a shock experience. They emotionally and magically identify each event with every other event or person they encounter through a point-for-point identification without any rational thinking. Gebser (1949/1985) described magic in this respect as "doing without knowing." (p. 60) Therefore, the magic awareness is always pre-rational.

The two-dimensional ambivalent mythic-irrational structure. The second structure is the mythic mode of awareness. Its representational symbol is "circle," which indicates a dynamic movement of polarity, while that of the magic awareness was "point." One-dimensional point becomes two-dimensional circle with polarity as its characteristic. While the magic awareness identifies every vital event with every other vital event in a point-for-point manner, the mythic mode of awareness relates events in a polar manner. Kramer and Mickunas (1992) described the mythic awareness as follows:

---polarity means the dynamic movement of one event, image, or feeling that provokes, attacks, and requires another event. The appearance of the sky is also the appearance of its polar aspect, the earth; the appearance of love is likewise the appearance of hate, while the appearance of high, demands the polar presence of the low. One is never given without the other, and one may replace the other. Thus, gods and demons may exchange their positions through various deeds. (p. xix)

The mythic events are not taking place in a dualistic manner, but ambivalently, polarly, or complementary taking place. Each event is relating to each other in a polar, ambivalent, or complementary manner rather than relating to each other in an abstracted, arbitrary, and dualistic manner. When there is one, there is always another half just like men and women, and Chinese *yin* and *yang*. Gebser argued the very term "myth" itself indicates an ambivalent nature. He described this ambivalent nature of the word "myth" by investigating its etymology as following:

The corresponding verb for *mythos* is *mytheomai*, meaning "to discourse, talk, speak"; its root, *mu-*, means "to sound." But another verb of the same root, *myein-* ambivalent because of the substitution of a short "u"-means "to close," specifically to close the eyes, the mouth, and wounds. From this root we have Sanskrit *mukas* (with long vowel), meaning "mute, silent," and Latin *mutus* with the same meaning. It recurs in Greek in the words *mystes*, "the consecrated," and *mysterion*, "mysterium," and later during the Christian era, gave the characteristic stamp to the concept of mysticism: speechless contemplation with closed eyes, that is, eyes turned inward. (p. 65)

Gebser contended that these contradictory meanings are not actually contradictory, but indicated the ambivalent nature of the mythic structure. It becomes contradictory only from a rational standpoint. From an ambivalent and mythic standpoint, there is no contradiction. "Myth" is essentially and originally polar and ambivalent in nature¹. A word (or speech or talking) and silence do not contradict, rather they complement each other. Gebser indicated, "the word is always a mirror of inner silence." (p. 67)

In terms of the self-identity, in the mythic awareness, we become conscious of ourselves in reflection. It is like we see ourselves in a mirror and

¹. It is important to emphasize the "mythic" structure has little to do with "storytelling or fables, although stories and fables usually manifest the ways, images, sayings, and human relations in which the mythological structure appears." (Kramer & Mickunas, 1992, p. xix)

becomes conscious of ourselves symbolically with imagination. An important point is we only identify ourselves in reflection² in the mythical mode of awareness. For instance, when a Mexican male sees his national flag, he becomes conscious of his national identity in the Mexican flag as a symbol of Mexico in a reflective manner. It is important to notice that in this case he and the Mexican flag are not exactly identical. Since the flag stands in for Mexico, there is a symbolic distance between the flag and Mexico. Although we see our national identity in our national flag as a symbol of our nation, the way of identification is not the one of point-for-point identification, but the one of ambivalent and polar identification.

For another example, some of us might believe in God. This belief or speculation is based on the mythic awareness. In a sense, people needed the God so that they can be conscious of themselves through the reflection of the God mythically and ambivalently. In this case, people see themselves in the God. People needed the God in order to secure their position. Although there is a symbolic difference between the two existences, people identify themselves symbolically, ambivalently, and polarly as the offspring of God. People see themselves as a reflection of God in the mythic awareness.

Similarly, some athletes perform in the mythical mode of awareness. Marathon runners, for instance, run to challenge themselves. They find themselves through running, as a reflection of themselves. Aging basketball players Michael Jordan and Magic Johnson returned to basketball after retiring from the sport. Both of them came back in the mythic mode of awareness. Both

². This reflective nature of the mythic consciousness also implies the imaginative nature of the consciousness. Gebser (1985) contended the mythic structure has an imaginative consciousness, reflected in the imaginastic nature of myth and responsive to the soul and sky of the ancient cosmos.

of them, in fact, lacked any rational reasons for coming back. Jordan had proven his supremacy by winning several championship titles. Johnson, at another extreme, was stricken with a deadly disease. Both of them, in the mythical awareness mode had come out of retirement to find, prove, and secure their soul and identity again by being basketball players. They could become conscious of their symbolic identity and soul through returning to basketball. The decisions were not rational, but irrational in nature.

Therefore, the mythic awareness is not rational in nature, since the awareness presumes ambivalence and polarity. When we engage in intercultural communication, we sometimes experience intercultural communication in the mythical mode of awareness. For instance, people avoid intercultural communication despite their curiosity. They are curious about the event. At the same time, they are anxious imagining the unsuccessful interactions (e.g., being misunderstood by the other). Therefore, they avoid the event for ambivalent and paradoxical reasons. It is not rational to avoid the communication, but they mythically avoid the interaction. Intercultural communication can be experienced in the mythic mode of awareness. For example, it is easy to imagine a situation where a noisy neighbor creates inner conflict or ambivalence. Somebody from Japan might experience this ambivalence. On one hand, he might want to ask the noisy neighbor to be more quiet. On the other hand, he might not want to create a potential conflict; therefore, he just irrationally keeps being patient. In this case, the Japanese experience this incident in the mythic-ambivalent mode of consciousness.

The three dimensional perspectival mental-rational structure. Perspectival consciousness, which has been part of modernity since the fifteenth century

Renaissance era, is characterized as spatial awareness and emergence of ego, which makes it (spatial awareness) possible. Gebser mentions the way of perceiving space in perspectival consciousness: "the basic concern of perspective, which it achieves, is to 'look through' space and thereby to perceive and grasp space rationally. It is a 'seeing through' of space and thus a coming to awareness of space (p. 19)." Likewise, about the way of perceiving self-identity, he states that "besides illuminating space, perspective brings it to man's awareness and lends man his own visibility of himself (p. 18)." Namely, the emergence of "I" identity was necessary in order to make perspectival man an observer of space and thus able to grasp space rationally and objectively. Perspective "locates the observer as well as the observed (p. 19)." For Gebser, the positive result is "a concretion of man and space" (p.18), while the negative result is "the restriction of man to a limited segment where he perceives only one sector of reality (p.18)." Perspective, in other words, not only allows humans to strive for various kinds of material power, but also allows human to engage in "a process of establishing and systematization of the external world (p. 18)." The history of the "frontier" in the United States is a good example of successful spatial exploration and exploitation derived from perspectival consciousness.

Deficient state of perspectival consciousness. However, as the desire for both spatial expansion and the resultant power becomes extreme, the weak side of perspectival consciousness also becomes evident. It not only leads to confined human vision in a fixed single reality, but also leads to anxiety about time which implies the end of perspectival world. Gebser contends as follows:

As we approach the decline of the perspectival age, it is our anxiety about time that stands out as the dominant characteristic alongside our ever more absurd obsession with space. It manifests itself in various ways, such as in our addiction to time. Everyone is out to "gain time," although the time gained is usually the wrong kind: time that is transformed into a visible multiplication of spatially fragmented 'activity,' or time that one has 'to kill.' " (p. 22)

The addiction to both time and space characterizes the recent late-modernity (i.e., the deficient perspectival age). Particularly, addiction to time seems to transform into social values of efficiency and convenience which are predominantly accepted in modernity. Efficiency is, in a sense, an attempt to spatialize time so that it can be quantified and measured objectively. It is, essentially, a pursuit of accomplishment with minimum time. Although the value of efficiency is practically important in modernity, Gebser views the perception of time as false and not valid in its own right. He continues to state that this spatial attachment (of time) prevents contemporary man from finding an escape from spatial captivity. Although the accomplishment of spatializing time (e.g., accomplishment of efficiency and convenience) expanded man's horizons, it made perspectival man's world "increasingly narrow as his vision was sectorized by the blinders of the perspectival world view." (p.23) Gebser implies that the addiction to time and space (i.e., hypertrophy of perspectival consciousness) is an indication that we are reaching the decline of the perspectival age. It is an obvious indication of the decline of the consciousness structure when it creates the condition which destroys itself and consequently makes it deficient and self-destructive. Kramer and Ikeda (1994) demonstrate a devastating consequence of deficient perspectival consciousness prevalent in late modern American society by explaining the "freeze" case of Yoshi Hattori in 1992. They concluded

that late modern ego-hypertrophy, which indicates the deficient perspectival consciousness, might have caused the Hattori tragedy. According to Gebser, when the consciousness structure/world becomes obviously deficient, mutation toward new consciousness structure/world occurs in order to retain viability. At a minimum, phenomena of deficient consciousness imply the transition from the old to new consciousness mutation.

CHAPTER FIVE

An Archaeology of Intercultural Communication as an Independent Field: The Origin and its Transformation

If intercultural communication refers to deliberate interactions between people from different cultures with certain motives, the history of intercultural communication is as long as the history of human civilization. Since the dawn of human civilization, people have been interacting with each other with various motives such as political (e.g., diplomacy), religious (e.g., missionary), or commercial (e.g., trade) reasons. The point is that people have been making a conscious effort to interact and learn about each other (e.g., learning different languages and customs) throughout the history of human civilization. Clarifying the origin of intercultural communication is, thus, the attempt to unveil the history of human civilization and various forms of human activity (e.g., diplomatic activity, missionary activity, trading activity, et cetera). Such an attempt is, no doubt, beyond the scope of this dissertation, although acknowledging such "intercultural" activities throughout the history of human civilization is very important¹ (See Appendix).

Therefore, this dissertation limits the scope in an attempt to unveil the original motive which made intercultural communication **an independent**

¹. It is also important to acknowledge because what "intercultural scholars" have been doing is neither original nor new. People have been making a conscious effort to learn (just like a modern anthropologist) and explore new world and different cultures throughout human history. In a way, intercultural communication as a field already owes a lot to these people (e.g., monks, missionaries, diplomats, emissaries, ambassadors, traders, explorers, to name a few) and their activities. In this sense, acknowledging such "historical intercultural" activities is important. See Appendix for this acknowledgment.

area of academic studies cultivated in the United States.² This attempt is similar to investigating the origin of sociology. Like other areas of academic studies (e.g., sociology, anthropology, economics etc.), it is difficult to imagine that intercultural communication was accidentally established without any motives or interests. Rather it was established with certain motives and interests. Therefore, this chapter takes account of such original motives and interests. The task is necessary because current intercultural scholars presume such original motives and interests in one way or another. As Jean Gebser (1949/1985) indicated, origin is ever-present, although such original motives and interests have never been questioned. Because the original motives and interests are revealed when they are situated³ in the corresponding historical context, this chapter tries to clarify in what historical context, why, how, and by whom did intercultural communication come into existence as an independent area of academic study.

While it is indispensable to unveil the origin of intercultural communication, it is also necessary to examine the process of transformation of intercultural communication. Since intercultural communication has a history, it might be constituted of multiple layers of meanings, which are the consequence of historical sedimentation, while the origin is ever present. Therefore, after revealing the origin of intercultural communication, the transformation of intercultural communication (i.e., a text) must be traced. Since the

²In this chapter, from now on, the term "intercultural communication" refers to intercultural communication as an independent area of academic studies which was cultivated in the United States.

³Since a text and a context are coconstituting, understanding the meaning of a text necessitates its corresponding context. Put otherwise, understanding the meaning of a text by situating it in the corresponding context is indispensable. Therefore, by putting intercultural communication in the original historical context where it was originally established as such, the meaning and the original motives of intercultural communication may be revealed.

corresponding transformation of socio-cultural-historical context must also be considered, the investigation is necessarily archeological⁴ in nature.

This chapter carries out the archaeological historical investigation of intercultural communication by following the steps explained in the method section:

1. Unveiling the origin of intercultural communication

A. Identifying the historical context where intercultural communication was originally established (i.e., Identifying the context where the text originally appeared);

B. Clarifying the meaning of the historical context where intercultural communication originally took place (i.e., clarifying the meaning of the context where the text was originally situated);

C. Unveiling the meaning of intercultural communication (i.e., interpreting the meaning of the text situated in the context);

D. Deciphering the presuppositions embedded in the original meaning of intercultural communication (i.e., deciphering the presuppositions embedded in the original meaning of the text);

2. Clarifying the meaning transformation of intercultural communication

A. Identifying the shift of historical context;

B. Interpreting the hidden meaning of intercultural communication by situating it in the shifted historical context (i.e., Interpreting the meaning of the text by situating it in the shifted context;

⁴.The history of intercultural communication is not like a layer cake. A cake may have many layers and as I add icing the previous layers remain essentially unchanged. Instead the history of intercultural communication is like layers of rock whereby as upper layers are added they cause heat and pressure which change the essential nature of the earlier layers making coal, diamond, et cetera. The point is each layer of the history of intercultural communication changes as each new layer is added reinterpreting the past as "past," as "out-of-date," as "obsolete," etc. The current "pressure" or "layer," therefore, changes the earlier layer of intercultural communication.

C. Unveiling the implications of the meaning-transformation of intercultural communication:

Unveiling the Origin of Intercultural Communication

This section attempts to unfold the origin of intercultural communication follows the steps mentioned on the above. While this section basically following the steps, it also attempts to clarify the specific process of the appearance of intercultural communication before unveiling the original motive of intercultural communication (i.e., 1-B). Clarifying the specific process by putting the phenomenon into the specific background context (i.e., the US Foreign Service Institute) helps us to interpret the meaning of intercultural communication.

Therefore, the task follows the following modified steps:

1-A. Identifying the historical context where intercultural communication originally took place (i.e., identifying the context where the text originally appeared);

1-B. Clarifying the meaning of the historical context where intercultural communication originally took place (i.e., clarifying the meaning of the context where the text was originally situated);

1-C. Clarifying the specific process of the appearance of intercultural communication (i.e., clarifying the specific process which a text originally appeared)

1-D. Unveiling the meaning of intercultural communication (i.e., interpreting the meaning of the text situated in the context);

1-E. Deciphering the presuppositions embedded in the original meaning of intercultural communication (i.e., deciphering the presuppositions embedded in the original meaning of the text);

1-A. Identifying the Original Historical Context Where "Intercultural Communication" Originally Appeared

As many (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990) have implied, intercultural communication is a rather recently established independent area of academic studies cultivated in the United States. Before the 1940s, the phrase "intercultural communication" did not appear to be employed by laymen. It was not popular enough among scholars to make an independent academic field.

While such scholars argue that the historical epoch "intercultural communication" is established, such prejudgment is suspended in this stage (regardless of its being valid or not). As a starting point, therefore, we search for the historical epoch in which the phrase "intercultural communication" is born. More specifically, we want to know when the phrase "intercultural communication" was created, accepted, and employed as a common phrase.

A Short Dictionary Analysis of the Word "Intercultural". As people are born, live, and change throughout life, words are also born, live, and change. A word has its life and its history. Of "intercultural" and "communication," the crucial word is "intercultural." As the phrase indicates, "intercultural communication" is a specific form and area of communication among other forms and areas. The history of the phrase "intercultural communication" relies on the history of the word, "intercultural."

"Intercultural" does not seem to have a long history, although "communication" and "culture" have a history of more than five hundred years⁵. "Intercultural" as we know it does not appear in any English dictionaries before the 1960s. Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language (1966) seems to be the first English with the word "intercultural."

More interestingly, many of the English dictionaries treated the word "intercultural" as having a totally different meaning. The Second Edition of Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language (1944), for instance, indicates "intercultural" is "**(Agri.) a. cultivated, as a crop, between the rows of some other crop. b. pertaining to or designating a system of tillage in which the soil is stirred while the plant is growing, as with any hoed crop.**" (p. 1293) The New "Standard" Dictionary of the English Language (1949), Oxford English Dictionary (1933/1961), and A New English Dictionary (1901) treated "intercultural" the same way. The word "intercultural" was considered a highly specialized **agricultural** term before 1960s. Other major dictionaries, such as the first edition of Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language (1951), the first edition of The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (1969), and the first edition of the Random House Dictionary of the English Language (1973) did not even have the word "intercultural" until newer editions came into existence. The third edition of Webster's New International Dictionary (1966) added "**existing between or relating to two or more cultures**" (p. 1177) as the third meaning of the word "intercultural." "Intercultural contact",

⁵The Random House Dictionary of the English Language: Second Edition (1983), for instance, suggested the origin of "communication" is around the fifteenth century, while that of "culture" is around the fourteenth century.

"intercultural tension" and "intercultural education" are the three examples in Webster's third edition. This implies that the word "intercultural" that we are familiar with became recognizable and was adopted as a word in the dictionary between 1944 (the second edition of Webster's New International Dictionary) and 1966 (the third edition of Webster's New International Dictionary). It seems to indicate that the word "intercultural" (as in "intercultural communication") is a post-war concept⁶ under post-war post colonial era when 100 new nations were born. Let's look at other major dictionaries.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language adopted "intercultural" as "**between or among people of different cultures**" (p. 734) in its second college edition (1970) for the first time. Here, the agricultural "intercultural" does not exist. The Oxford English Dictionary treated "intercultural" as an agricultural term in its first edition (1933, reprinted in 1961), while volume II of A Supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary (1976) terminated the agricultural meaning, replacing it as others did. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (the first edition in 1967, the second edition in 1987) and The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (the first edition in 1969, the 2nd in 1982, the 3rd in 1992), on the other hand, did not adopt "intercultural" until the 1980s⁷.

While the word "intercultural" (as in "intercultural communication") began to appear in English dictionaries after the late 1960s, two of the dictionaries

⁶ World War II gave rise to a new international consciousness, which was reflected in the League of Nations and the United Nations. Before this new consciousness, for instance, European colonizers did not see Indian tribes as being "nations." They were more or less viewed as wilderness to be tamed.

⁷ The Random House Dictionary of the English Language: Second Edition (1987) defined "intercultural" as "**pertaining to or taking place between two or more cultures, ~exchange in music and art**" (p. 993), while The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Third Edition (1992) defined "intercultural" as "**of, relating to, involving, or representing different cultures, ~marriage, ~ exchange in the arts.**" (p. 940)

suggested the origin of the word. The second edition of Random House Dictionary (1987) indicated the origin of the word was around 1935-1940 (p. 993, no specific reference). A supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary (1976, Vol. II), on the other hand, implied the origin of "intercultural" as 1937 (with references⁸).

Although the first recognized use of "intercultural" might be during the World War II period, the word "intercultural" as in "intercultural communication" became a noticeable phenomenon after the post-war period. It seems to be the late 1960s or 1970s when "intercultural" became a common word⁹. The word "intercultural" did not show up in any English dictionaries until the late 1960s. This suggests that people were not aware of "intercultural" phenomena as reflectively identified phenomena until the post-war period.

Correlation to the secondary sources. "Intercultural communication" seems to be widely accepted during the post-World War II period. This argument correlates with scholars' views of Edward T. Hall as a crucial figure in the field of intercultural communication.

As many (Condon, 1981; Dodd, 1982; Gudykunst, 1985, 1988; Klopf, 1987; Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Rogers, 1994; Singer, 1987) have suggested, a starting point for "intercultural communication" as a theme of study is Edward T. Hall's (1959) "Silent Language." As Leeds-Hurwitz (1990) points out, although

⁸. There were three references: "1937 Theology XXXV. 347 Our present consideration of intercultural contacts. 1955 Sci. Amer. Apr. 84/2 In the interest of intercultural understanding various U.S. Government agencies have hired anthropologists. 1972 Ibid. Nov. 82/1 If pictorial recognition is universal, do pictures offer us a lingua franca for intercultural communication?" (p. 327)

⁹. Even though the two dictionaries suggested that the original use of "intercultural" was around 1935-1940, all English dictionaries published after 1940 until 1966 did not treat "intercultural" as in "intercultural communication," or did not even have the word in the dictionaries. That is why it seems reasonable to think of "intercultural" as a post-war phenomenon. However, the validity of this argument is still pending until the use of "intercultural" in other foreign languages is investigated.

Hall was not the first person who employed the term,¹⁰ many (Condon, 1981; Dodd, 1982; Gudykunst, 1985, 1988; Klopff, 1987; Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Rogers, 1994; Singer, 1987) credit Hall as the father of intercultural communication. More specifically, Hall seems to be the first person who "problematized" and repeatedly employed the term as we know it now. Certain historical context motivated him to be able to problematize the phenomenon of intercultural communication. As Leeds-Hurwitz (1990), based on her (traditional) historical analysis of the origin of intercultural communication, argued, the Foreign Service Institute of the US Department of State (where Hall was an officer during 1951-1955) that was established right after the World War II seems to be a background context for the emergence of intercultural communication. Her biographic analysis confirms that the post-war context appears to correlate with the birth of intercultural communication as an independent academic institution. The next section clarifies the relationship between the historical context and the birth of intercultural communication.

1-B. Clarifying the Meaning of the Post-War Historical Context Where Intercultural Communication was Originally Established

While the historical change due to the impact of the World War II was very complex and can not be easily illustrated, a crucial historical change obviously took place. This is evident from the world map before World War II and the world map after World War II. The crucial difference between the two world maps is the emergence of decolonized nations (see Roberts' (1995) world map, p. 546, for instance). Before World War II, there were no

¹⁰ Leeds-Hurwitz suggests Ruth Benedict (1941) used the term before Hall. She also points out "in his earlier writings Hall used several variants of the phrase ("intercultural tensions" and "inter-cultural problems" in Hall (1950) clearly refer to the same topic) (p. 275)

independent nations in the African continent and very few in Asia. On the other hand, there were many emergent independent nations in Asia between the end of World War II and the early 1950s, while many African nations became independent during 1960s. This century is, in a sense, a story of struggles for independence (e.g., Viet Nam, South Africa, India, Congo, Taiwan, Korea, China, et cetera).

The crucial historical change after the post-World War II period is the end of colonialism, especially the end of European colonialism and the consequential emergence of the independent nations. Concerning this change, Roberts (1995) states:

The most revolutionary change in world politics after 1945 was the end of European empires. At the end of the war, the British, French, Dutch, Portuguese, and Belgian empires were still there (the Italian disappeared between 1941 and 1943). Thirty years later, Europeans ruled less of the world than they had done even four centuries earlier. The confusion and tensions of the process of dismantling empire were bound to make heavy demands on those who had to manage it, and presented huge potential dangers. It is one of the most remarkable achievements of our century that the era of decolonization should have been navigated without world war or huge regional conflicts. (p. 531)

The independent movement of Asian nations, African nations, and Latin American nations not only signifies the end of colonial systems which had continued since the sixteenth century, but also signifies the potential emergence of new world powers. The decolonizing movement and the end of colonialism meant a significant change of power relations among nations during the post-World War II period. It also implied a necessity to re-evaluate the means of maintaining domestic and especially international order.

After World War II, the end of colonialism as an ideology definitely began the questioning of military powers as the only means to maintain world order¹¹. Since one aspect of the World War II was ideological, between fascism (e.g., Germany, Italy, Japan) and anti-fascism (e.g., the United States, Great Britain, France), the victory of anti-fascism helped people re-evaluate the means for maintaining new world order. More specifically, democracy, as a major ideology of anti-fascist nations, was becoming a dominant ideology in the world during post-World War II era. The emergence of democracy as a predominant world ideology was another crucial transformation in the post-World War II historical context.

While totalitarianism was another world ideology, democracy became a predominantly accepted ideology among the United States, West European nations, and many of the new independent nations. Democracy as an ideology helped a great deal to promote the decolonizing movement. As Watabiki (1993) argues, during the post-World War II period, liberalism, democracy, and humanism, as the United Nations¹² Charter and the Declaration of World Human Rights imply, became a world ideology. This ideological transformation led to a search for the new means to maintain world order. Because the United States was the only major unharmed nation economically and geographically, the US had to help many devastatingly damaged European nations and newly independent nations (e.g., Asian and African nations) recover from the aftermath of the World War II. Since the United States was a leading

¹¹ .Nonetheless, military power served as a means to maintain world order even after World War II. The Cold War, for instance, saw the greatest build up of military power ever--huge nuclear arsenals to maintain an order via "containment" of Russia and China.

¹² .U.N. is a version of the League of nations founded by US President Woodrow Wilson and based on US humanism. In the U.N. all nations have a vote.

democratic nation and a leading superpower along with the Soviet Union, she had to be considerate about how to help other nations and how to maintain international order to hold onto her superpower status. As Roberts (1995) implies, the nature of the aid had to take a non-military and unaggressive form. The aid had to be done in a more or less democratic and humanistic way so that world order was maintained, not with military powers, but with democracy¹³ and humanism. The United States might have made democracy a predominant world ideology to maintain her influential power over the world and to win the power relationship with the Soviet Union (a fascistic nation and the only rival as a superpower).

Within this historical context, the United States needed means to aid other nations and to maintain world order in a humanistic way considering "others" as "other humans." Such means were bound to be a communication that is democratic and humanistic and takes a non-military form. The communication required a minimum level of understanding and respect for various culture differences existing among different nations. The United States needed a humanistic means like "intercultural communication," which was also a practical¹⁴ political means in order to maintain her power and status as a superpower in the world during the post-colonial period. "Intercultural communication" presumes humanism. In the next section, the investigator clarifies the relationship between humanism and intercultural communication more specifically by tracing the beginning of humanism.

¹³. Democracy is in principle a means to maintain world order. However, in reality, democracy as a means to maintain order was always under threat of force. This century has seen literally dozens of small wars which expressed Cold War tensions (e.g., Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Indonesia, Ethiopia, Zaire, Panama, et cetera).

¹⁴. The means should be practical and efficient in nature. Another traditional American value was pragmatism.

Humanism and intercultural communication. While colonialism virtually ended after World War II, the beginning of decolonization appeared to take place much earlier,¹⁵ probably with the US revolution. The essential shift of the colonial attitude (the superior "culture" discovering and taming "savages") to the new attitude of respect and equality based on humanism (which is necessary for human communication) was already presumed well before World War II in many scholastic studies of comparative cultures in Germany (Evans Wintz, Carl Jung, Scheler, etc.). Anthropological¹⁶ works also presumed this new attitude.

It is obvious that the new attitude did not begin during the post-war post colonial period. The new attitude due to humanism, in fact, can be traced back to the Enlightenment (Neo-classical-post Renaissance historical epoch), as historians such as Toynbee (1957) and Durant (1961) contend. Enlightenment humanism rose to challenge the church and royal authorities. Then, after a period of time, the colonizers came to recognize the slaves and colonized people as humans (as other kind of humans). As a consequence, the process of decolonization started with the US revolution, the Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776), and its constituting Enlightenment bill. The recognition of ethnically different people as full citizens (a domestic struggle) gradually took place. Humanism comes from all humans. Culture differences came to be seen as only contingent in the face of transcending and shared humanity. East can meet West because essentially we are all human. Therefore, intercultural communication, which was established during the post-

¹⁵.It is also important to notice that the dissemination of information, which took prior to the post colonial era, affected the process of decolonization. For instance, Ho Che men was a student in Paris, while Sun Yat-sen was a student in England and in the US. Gandhi, similarly, was a student in England. All of them learned a new way of thinking about their "intercultural" experiences; as a result they disseminated information to their home later.

¹⁶.The word, "anthropology," was originally invented by Max Scheler to describe a new field.

colonial period, essentially presumes humanism and that we can communicate with others.

In summary, intercultural communication essentially presumes humanism, which is necessary for human communication, and its corresponding respect and equality for other humans. Intercultural communication is, in this sense, always already presumed to be **human communication**.

On the other hand, the context where the United States was situated during the post-World War II period (i.e., the post-colonial period) appeared to make "intercultural communication" a practical means¹⁷ to help other nations recovering from post-war destruction. The emergence of democracy as a predominant world ideology allowed "intercultural communication" to appear as a theme of academic study in the US. Metaphorically speaking, the public face of "intercultural communication" should be democratic and humanistic in nature to compete with other ideologies (e.g., socialism and communism).

Under such a shift of the historical context after the World War II, the shift seemed to motivate the US Foreign Service in particular to consider the new means (i.e., intercultural communication) to win converts without bullets or as a supplement to them. The US Foreign Service Institute seemed to be the first organization to perceive "intercultural communication" as a new appropriate (which is humanistic) and convenient means to maintain American power. While intercultural communication essentially presumes humanism, it tends to become highly instrumental in nature due to the US's another major value (i.e., pragmatism). Therefore, the next section attempts to unfold the specific process

¹⁷ It might be practical because it potentially persuades other nations to be like the US and therefore expand US market for global trade.

of the emergence of intercultural communication as a highly effective tool for achieving ulterior motives. The specific background of the US Foreign Service during the post World War II period (i.e., post colonial period) provides context for the birth of intercultural communication as a field.

1-C. Clarifying the Specific Process of the Establishment of Intercultural Communication in the United States: Situating It In the US Foreign Service Institute as the Specific Background

While the term "intercultural communication" seems to have appeared in the US during the post-colonial period, the specific process of its establishment as an independent academic institution is still unanswered. This section attempts to make clear the specific process of the appearance of the academic area, considering the US Foreign Service Institute as the specific background of the appearance. The original motive which established intercultural communication as an academic institution is more clearly elucidated when the process of the appearance is considered.

When something emerges as an academic institution, usually it does not appear accidentally. Rather, it usually takes place with some needs derived from the awareness of problems. Intercultural communication is such a case. Intercultural communication made the democratic post-colonial period possible. In other words, intercultural communication as a field necessarily emerged as a solution from an awareness of problems (e.g., tyrannical colonialism.) There might be a correlation between awareness of problems due to culture differences and the awareness of the need for intercultural communication. Therefore, this section attempts to unveil the process of the appearance of

intercultural communication by explaining how the awareness of the problems of understanding culture differences built up.

The United States' role in the post-World War II period and the initial awareness of the need to solve intercultural problems. While communication study became a useful tool for the US government during World War II¹⁸ (Rogers, 1994), intercultural communication finally became recognizable after the World War II, although the awareness was still vague. Blanche (1969) describes the post-war context:

The magnitude of wartime destruction and dislocation made it clear that world recovery--both economic and political-- would involve the United States even more than it had after World War I. There would be new duties and tasks related to the administration of occupied areas, relief, rehabilitation, and refugees. At the same time, it was evident that some of the activities of the special wartime agencies should be carried on, notably in the fields of economics, intelligence, information, and culture. (p. 24)

Barnes and Morgan (1961) specifically stated the role of the Foreign Service as follows:

As the end of hostilities came within the sight, it became clear that the post war Foreign Service would inevitably be confronted with a considerable increase in its tasks. Postwar reconstruction would impose new duties in connection with the administration of occupied areas, relief, and refugees. (p. 254-255)

The above two descriptions indicate the US's crucial role in world recovery. Therefore, indispensably, the US needed to send many foreign

¹⁸ Before intercultural communication had been problematized, the study of communication had become a discipline of social sciences during 1940s, more specifically during World War II. As Rogers (1994) explained the origin of communication as a field of study, "World War II had a tremendous impact on the field of communication." (p. 10) He continues: "World War II thus created the conditions for the founding of communication study." (p.11) In short, Rogers (1994) contends that the governmental demand made "communication" (mass communication, mainly) a member of social sciences. "Communication" was accepted and was useful/practical for the US government during World War II.

service personnel to various nations to help each nation's recovery. Although each task was technical in nature, it was obvious each foreign service personnel needed to engage in "intercultural communication" in one way or another. The post World War II context (i.e., the post colonial historical context) demanded that US foreign personnel engage in more contacts with foreign nationals.

However, many foreign diplomats during the postwar period did not seem to be effective enough to accomplish their overseas assignments successfully. Fortune magazine (1946) indicated: "the Foreign Service made virtually no preparation for the problems that World War II thrust upon it, although the brewing of the war had been well reported in its own dispatches from the field" (p. 83). Fortune reported ten specific stories which indicated the terribly ineffective performance of the Foreign Service of the United States (p. 83-84). Then, Fortune contended: "the foreign representation of the US must be judged" (p. 83) As Fortune (1946) argued, the US government started to be concerned with the effective representation of the US abroad. The US government finally seemed to recognize the necessity of the minimum "intercultural" type training to enhance the effective representation of the US abroad, consequently to enhance a positive image of the US as a world leader. Barnes and Morgan (1961) similarly stated the importance of "intercultural" related training during the postwar period,

Effective representation of the United States abroad requires that members of the Foreign Service know and understand the people with whom they work. Thus, area training is offered to acquaint officers with the manifold political, economic, and social aspects of the various important areas of the world. (p. 315)

Effective representation of the United States, here, implies dealing with the people of different cultures as equal "humans." The world order should be maintained through democracy (and humanism), which represents and symbolizes the United States. This means that to deal with the people of different cultures (and consequently to maintain international order in this manner) was "intercultural communication," which required a minimum understanding and respect of other cultures. More specifically, intercultural communication meant a political means to maintain international order through active behavioral conformity which was based on an ancient rule: "in Rome, do as the Romans do." A way to manage cultural differences in a democratic way leads to maintaining world order democratically. "Intercultural communication" was an active behavioral conformity. An active behavioral conformity was perceived to be democratic as well as to be the most practical¹⁹ and efficient means to achieve the US's goals in foreign nations under the post colonial historical context. The United States of America, virtually, became another form of empire, with imperial problems.

The creation of the US Foreign Service Institute as an indication of the fundamental awareness of the need to solve problems due to culture differences. Along with the minimum recognition of the necessity of intercultural understandings, finally, with the passage of the Foreign Service Act (1946), the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), which is a specialized training institute, was established under the US Department of State (DOS) on March 13, 1947 as an item of the Act. The US government considered the regular training of the Foreign Service Officers essential to their effective representation of the United

¹⁹.It is more convenient and cheaper than war.

States abroad. The training institute was created to train each trainee to conform his or her behavioral pattern to those of foreign nationals to achieve efficiency (i.e., fulfilling his or her oversea assignment within allocated time limitation).

The foundation of this training institute was significant in terms of the birth of intercultural communication as an academic study. The FSI was not established without the awareness of the problems derived from contact with foreign nationals. Under different historical contexts in different political ideologies (e.g., colonialism, imperialism, authoritarianism, and many others), the contact with foreign nationals was not considered an "intercultural" contact, but a political contact. On the other hand, the post-colonial context and its consequential ideological shift forced the US to see the contact as an equal human contact -- an "intercultural" one. The US government became aware that the problems of "the contact" with foreign nationals were derived from the culture differences between the Americans and foreign nationals, although the culture differences were perceived as language differences. The awareness of intercultural communication began to emerge despite its partialness. Therefore, the US government hired many anthropologists and linguists to train the US diplomats after the World War II. Moreover, the new training institute was founded on an awareness of the lack of training. They needed a way to deal with "culture differences" (i.e., language differences at this stage) and consequential "intercultural" problems²⁰. This need becomes more obvious when the contents of the training in the FSI are clarified.

²⁰One of the crucial issue here is the reason the US government established the specialized training institute. Even though there were training programs and training schools prior to the World War II. how come the new training institute was established? The US is very rational and goal-oriented nation. She does not do an unnecessary thing. If the US decided to train foreign diplomats more extensively including intensive foreign language training, that was an evidence

The Training program contents as an indication of awareness of the need for intercultural communication. While the US government realized the importance of training Foreign Service Officers for the sake of enhancing their representation of the US abroad and enhancing the effective goal achievement of their oversea assignments, the nature of the training program in the FSI did not seem to be "intercultural" enough. The FSI consisted of two schools: the School of Foreign Affairs and the School of Language. The School of Foreign Affairs offered "courses for junior, midcareer, and senior officers and training for selected officers at university graduate schools in language and area studies, economics, and political science" (Barnes & Morgan, 1961, p. 314-315).

The School of Language might be the biggest success in the FSI. Based on the Army method developed and successfully executed during World War II, the language training in the FSI offered full time intensive instruction in eleven foreign languages and part time intensive instruction in thirty-one different languages. Based on the theory of descriptive linguistics, many excellent Linguists who had been recruited successfully developed a very practical linguistic training (Hall, 1992; Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990).

An important point is the nature of the training. The training purpose was to allow each trainee to be able to use a foreign language practically in actual situations, with minimum training period, so that he or she could successfully achieve his or her oversea assignment as quickly as possible. The crucial

which indicated the US government was aware of the problems which disturbed foreign officers' efficient goal achievements. The introduction of the intensive foreign language training in the new training institute seems to be an evidence the US government (or at least some of the powerful members) was aware there was a problem derived from language differences when foreign personnel contacted with foreign nationals. In short, the decision of establishing new training institute and of introducing new training programs was implicitly or explicitly based on the awareness of the contact with foreign nationals as "intercultural contact" based on the existence of culture differences.

issue was that training should be technical, efficient, and, above all, should be practical for the purpose of achieving oversea assignments within the allocated time limitation. The program necessarily offered a practical linguistic know-how to each trainee. Therefore, each instructor of foreign languages was necessarily a native speaker of the language. One underlying premise of this practical training was derived from an awareness that the most crucial problem each trainee would face in a foreign country was language differences. An effective goal achievement was believed to depend on the successful acquisition of the foreign language of the country to which each trainee was assigned. The various problems derived from "intercultural communication" seemed to be reduced to problems derived from the language differences rather than culture differences. The nature of the language-based training signifies the partial awareness of the problems of culture differences. Culture differences are reduced to language problems. Other aspects of culture differences such as value differences and nonverbal differences were excluded in this training.

It is also important to notice that the training was based on a strong belief²¹ that such language barriers can be overcome technically. Although highly specialized technical training was indispensable and appropriate, it lacked a cultural aspect (what Hall called "cultural know-how") which always goes with a language aspect. Learning a foreign language means learning the whole culture behind the language. Hall seems to be the first person who realized the shortcoming involved in the program.

²¹ This belief seems to be reinforced by the great success of "the Army method," which was a technical language training process during World War II. The language training, based on a linguistic model, emphasized appropriate use of the spoken language rather than the traditional focus on learning to read and write a language and on grammar as the key to a language. Again, the great success of this technical language method appears to reassure this belief.

Edward T. Hall's participation in the FSI: Hall as the first individual who recognized the need for "intercultural communication" training in the FSI in a clear and a complete manner. Edward T. Hall is a cultural anthropologist. He was teaching at Bennington College before participating in the FSI. According to his autobiography (1992), he was chosen to head up a new program at the FSI. Following Harry Truman's inspiring speech in 1949 which called for the US to encourage various kinds of technical assistance for third world countries, the US Congress enacted a law establishing the Technical Cooperation Authority (TCA) in 1950. Dr. Henry Bennet, its director, hired Hall to design as well as conduct the training program for the technicians in the TCA.

In addition to language training, Hall had in mind "intercultural not intracultural, and the concentration was on what people took for granted and did not verbalize" (Hall, 1992, p. 201). Hall pointed out the importance of specific cultural know-how as an indispensable part of the training program in addition to the language training. Hall realized the necessity of "intercultural" training, in a very clear manner, to solve the problems due to culture differences. Hall understood verbal language differences, but also the implicit nonverbal language (i.e., proxemics, chronemics) differences. The awareness of culture differences and of their consequential problems clearly connects to his awareness of the need of intercultural communication.

Hall seemed to be the first person²² who claimed the need of "intercultural communication (training)" in a clear and decisive manner in the FSI and in the State Department (although the State Department remained

²² Although Hall is the first person who claimed the need of "intercultural" training in the FSI and the State Department, this does not mean he was the first person who recognized the need of "intercultural communication." If other anthropologists such as Mead or Malinowski had been hired instead of Hall, they might become recognizable as the departure of "intercultural communication" as an independent institution.

blind to this new dimension). Hall was the first person who realized "such skills [cultural know-how] still constituted a mandatory tool in the kit of the foreign aid technician and were therefore necessary ingredients in the training for Point IV" (p.202).

While Hall clearly recognized the need for "intercultural" training, he seemed to be aware of "intercultural communication" specifically in this context as a useful and an important cultural know-how to train the TCA technicians. However, when Hall participated in the FSI, there were no suitable orientation materials. As Hall (1992) recalled, "all that was available was the usual economic, political, and historical texts based on European intellectual needs" (p. 202). But, specifically, what kinds of orientation material was Hall looking for?

The birth of intercultural communication: Hall's microcultural training as the manifestation of his awareness of "intercultural communication". Hall himself suggested the necessity to consider five issues before creating his "intercultural" training program:

First, it was important to make the culture concept as real as possible. Second, the anxiety aroused by leaving home and going out into a new and strange world must be recognized and dealt with. Third, there must be an opportunity to work with the language of the country of assignment. Fourth, the technicians needed basic and simple formulas for staying healthy in the tropics as part of the background information on the country. Fifth, they needed experience with someone (a living, breathing model) from the country to which they were assigned. In building my program I tried to view the world as seen through the eyes of the technician and then reinforce and strengthen what I already knew about work with other cultures. (Hall, 1992, p. 203)

Although the content of each suggestion is different, each consideration attempts to enhance the trainees' practical goal achievement. Hall's training

program, most importantly, was supposed to be a practically useful means to making the most of real intercultural encounters by actively conforming their behaviors to those of foreign nationals. Well aware of the demands of the US government, Hall also knew the complexity and difficulty of any intercultural understandings²³. Therefore, he had to create a training program which was practical in nature as well as an enhancement of the trainees' intercultural understandings.

In the long run, the training program Hall created and which satisfied the two criteria was "microcultural" training. A "microculture," for Hall, meant a smaller unit of culture which is reflected in tone of voice (i.e., paralanguage), gestures (i.e., kinesics), time (i.e., chronemics), and spatial relationships (i.e., proxemics) as a smaller units of culture respectively. Hall considered each aspect a manifestation of microculture.

This "microcultural" training seemed to be crucial. Hall knew difficulties were not only derived from language difference, but also from differences in the hidden languages (i.e., the differences in the various aspects of nonverbal communication), which were the manifestations of smaller units of culture existing among different cultures. Hall argued that such hidden/silent languages take place at the level of out-of-awareness; therefore, people do not even recognize the existence of the hidden dimension. However, Hall also contended that the silent languages²⁴ do differ across different cultures, as do the (verbal) languages. In other words, Hall appeared to imply the necessity of

²³He understood the difficulty and richness of intercultural communication based on his past experiences. It seems his entire life is full of intercultural experiences. For instance, he spent years in the Navajo and Hopi reservations in Arizona in his youth.

²⁴Silent languages involve several dimensions of nonverbal communication such as paralanguage, spatial relationships, perception of time, and kinesics.

learning "silent nonverbal languages" as well as learning manifested verbal languages in intercultural situations. For Hall, the "silent languages" have their own vocabularies and rules used in different contexts. It was Hall's belief that nonverbal languages can be learned systematically, as can verbal languages, although learning nonverbal languages requires more conscious effort due to the nature of its out-of-awareness.

The way to learn the "silent nonverbal languages" was microcultural training which taught specific rules of each dimension of the "silent languages" (e.g., appropriate nonverbal behaviors) in concrete situations. Hall seemed to believe that if somebody mastered a verbal language as well as a silent nonverbal language, he or she could communicate effectively with foreign nationals. Therefore, microcultural training which teaches silent languages was a necessary part of his training foreign personnel.

Hall created this microcultural training for three interrelated reasons. First, the audience of the training was government employees who only wanted to know how to behave in certain contexts and how to interpret cues in the country to which they were assigned. Hall's trainees were people who needed to know specific information to get their jobs done efficiently (i.e., as quick as possible). Microcultural training, in which people were drilled concretely in a systematic manner, satisfied their practical need to successfully managing intercultural problems.

Second, Hall wanted to design intercultural communication training that focused on actual contact/interaction with different cultures. Rather than learning abstract and general notions of culture (e.g., ethnocentrism, prejudices, culture relativism, etc.), for Hall, the most practical way to enhance the trainees'

intercultural understanding was by making them grasp concrete and specific cultural know-how (i.e., specific nonverbal behavioral rules in specific situations). The microcultural training could not only satisfy the trainees' practical needs, but could also allow the trainees as laymen (not as anthropologists) to understand the process of intercultural communication²⁵.

While the above two reasons for Hall to choose microcultural (i.e., intercultural) training were for the sake of the trainees, the third reason seemed to be personal. As Hall and Whyte (1960) clearly suggested, examining "the actual communication process between representatives of different cultures" had been a lacking area in traditional (cultural) anthropology²⁶. Hall understood that communication was a necessary counterpart of culture²⁷ due to his anthropological insight and rich intercultural experiences. Since one of Hall's strong and consistent contentions had been an interdependent and inseparable relationship (1959, 1966, 1992), the process of creating and enacting microcultural (i.e., intercultural) training itself through the trial and error

²⁵.Hall recognized that the microcultural training could enhance the trainees' intercultural understanding but also it could "broaden knowledge of ourselves by revealing some of our unconscious communicative acts." (Hall & Whyte, 1960, p. 5) Hall realized intercultural communication could make the trainees concretely realize their unconscious communicative behaviors that were ethnocentric in nature. Hall believed it was essential to understand our own ethnocentric tendency concretely to communicate effectively in any intercultural situations.

²⁶.It is unsure whether this argument is valid or not. It is difficult to imagine that the anthropologists before Hall had been ignoring this dimension of human interaction.

²⁷.The idea of the mutual relationship between communication/language and culture already existed well before Sapir and Whorf. von Humboldt seems to be the first person who matured the idea. For instance, in his book *Linguistic Variability and Intellectual Development* (first published 1836), he argued the significance of human languages as mirrors of the individual mentalities of the nations. It is also important to notice this idea (culture=communication) can be traced back to the ancient Greeks. Isocrates equated language with thinking--thought patterns with group identity.

appears to have become a strong motive to prove his contention²⁸ and to enrich the field of anthropology²⁹, accompanying much stress with it³⁰ (Hall, 1992).

While the above three reasons were different yet interrelated, obviously Hall invented microcultural training as intercultural communication training to effectively deal with potential problems the trainees might face in their oversea assignments. In short, **microcultural training was the concrete manifestation of the awareness of intercultural communication.** Hall was aware that the contact with foreign nationals was problematic not only because of linguistic differences, but also because of differences in nonverbal languages existing among different cultures.

Hall, in short, labeled this problematic contact derived from culture differences as "intercultural communication" since it is in a communication process that different cultures interface. He foregrounded "intercultural communication" as an independent and worthy theme in a systematic and deliberate manner³¹. His was a new way of problematizing a phenomenon of intercultural interaction.

Intercultural communication was essentially problematic; therefore, studying and solving (here, by training) intercultural problems became a necessary conclusion. Intercultural communication, in other words, appeared

²⁸.If you read his "silent language" (1959) and his autobiography (1992), you will feel Hall's strong motivation, enthusiasm, and excitement to create his microcultural training and its consequential "map of culture."

²⁹.As Leeds-Hurwitz (1990) implies Hall did not seem to create a new academic discipline such as intercultural communication. Rather, Hall seemed to enrich the discipline of anthropology by integrating the notion of communication into the concept of culture so that anthropology might have a practical value and deal with intercultural communication in a concrete manner.

³⁰.Dealing with government employees seemed to bring much stress to Hall. See Hall's autobiography for details.

³¹.It is possible that similar efforts might have taken place in European cultures. European cultures are very close, yet very different. And over the centuries they have noted the differences making fun of and fearing each other. Therefore, strictly speaking, this statement is limited to the United States.

as a phenomenon to solve the problems intercultural communication necessarily involves.

1-D. Interpreting the Meanings of Intercultural Communication

This section attempts to decipher the hidden meaning(s) of the origin of intercultural communication considering the role of the historical context and the specific process of its appearance.

The post World War II historical context forced the United States to engage in much more contacts with foreign nationals than ever before. Although efficient goal achievement was crucial, not all US representatives could achieve their assignments within the expected time limit. Analyzing the reasons for the inefficiency was necessary. A crucial reason was perceived to be culture differences which existed between the US representatives and foreign nationals. In other words, whenever the US representatives contacted with foreign nationals, the contact was problematic and the source of the problems was perceived to be the existence of culture differences. Here, many members of the US government began to recognize that what the US representatives were dealing with was not just a usual political contact, but an **intercultural** contact. Namely, the awareness of intercultural communication necessarily took place here as a problem.

The US government had to think about ways to deal with culture differences which were the genesis of the problems. A very important point to remember is that the US government had to consider the shift of historical context which took place after World War II in order to solve the problems of culture differences. Since the post World War era was the post colonial era, the US also had to maintain world order in a democratic manner. Maintaining

international order in a democratic way was an important consideration in the post colonial period. The US also had to consider the effectiveness of the means to solve culture differences. The solution had to be practical and efficient. Efficiency was another important value for the US.

The means the US government chose was active behavioral conformity or adaptation. The active behavioral conformity was effective as well as appropriate. Conforming and adapting the US representatives' behaviors to those of foreign nationals was the most effective means under a post colonial period. It also could maintain international order in a democratic and humanistic manner since the US representatives were the conforming party.

Therefore, the US created a new training institute focusing on foreign language training as a concrete method of behavioral conformity to deal with intercultural problems. Practical linguistic training was the initially perceived solution. Intercultural communication emerged as a solution to deal with culture differences effectively and appropriately. An ideal of training for the purpose of solving the problems of culture differences already necessitated the awareness of intercultural communication. The theme of intercultural communication was clearly foregrounded.

Intercultural communication, in short, took place when the US government was aware of contact with foreign nationals as a problem derived from culture differences. Such awareness of culture differences as the genesis of the problems demanded intercultural communication to appear as a phenomenon to deal with the problems effectively. Ideological shifts in the post colonial period also demanded intercultural communication to emerge as a phenomenon in order to maintain world order in a democratic manner.

Intercultural communication was essentially a problem derived from culture differences as well as a necessary solution as behavioral conformity³² to deal with the "intercultural" problems in an effective and appropriate way.

In summary, intercultural communication is essentially Western presuming Western ideologies (e.g., efficiency, conformity). It is originally a political creation in order to retain US political power in the post-colonial historical epoch and in order to spread American ideologies (e.g., democracy). It is also fundamentally technical³³.

Although this section summarized the birth of intercultural communication and interpreted the origin, the fundamental presuppositions which created and are maintaining the unity of the phenomenon remain unclear. The next section attempts to clarify the presuppositions embedded in the origin of intercultural communication as a field.

1-E. Unveiling the Fundamental Presuppositions Embedded in the Origin of Intercultural Communication

As Nietzsche (1887/1974), Gadamer (1960/1989), and Kramer (1992) contend, a perception is already always interpretive. Every time we see something, actually we do not see the thing, but we can not help but interpret the meaning. For instance, when somebody sees a woman walking down a street, he is not seeing an object that is a blob of moving color, but he sees/interprets a woman (e.g., pretty, charming or attractive.) Likewise, intercultural communication did not appear as a physical phenomenon composed of two people from different cultures. Rather, it appeared as a

³².This is the great myth of Darwinian assimilation. To communicate does not equal to conform.

³³.As intercultural communication is taught, it is behavioral. It attempts to teach new behaviors that are "better." This is the reason for the emergence of behavioral social science. To maintain order, social engineering is strictly concerned with behavior.

problem which was supposed to be solved effectively and appropriately. More specifically, culture differences that involve intercultural communication were interpreted to be problematic. The important issue to clarify here is the reason(s) culture differences (consequently intercultural communication) were presumed to be problematic.

Whereas the foundation of intercultural communication (as a discipline) has been established based on this culture differences-as-problem view, the reasons behind this view have never been questioned. It has been a deeply embedded presumption that culture differences (consequently intercultural communication) were supposed to be solved. However, there seem to have been at least two presuppositions which were even more deeply embedded in this view.

Incompatibility between culture differences and maintaining order. The first presupposition is that culture differences are problematic because they are presupposed to disturb the order in a host environment. Particularly, intercultural scholars tend to view culture differences as a problem to preserve the order in a host environment³⁴. Here, it is crucial to be aware of the presupposition of the incompatibility between culture differences and maintaining order. The logic is as follows: each culture already has an established social reality (i.e., an intersubjective world) based on its own values, rules, norms, etc. before an intercultural stranger enters into the host environment. Current histories teach us that cultures are and always have been dynamic and permeable. In order to maintain each social reality within each culture, competing social realities (e.g., an intercultural stranger's different

³⁴. However, it is also true that many great cities throughout history have been born on the cross-roads of trade where cultural diversity is simply a fact.

social reality) have been viewed as irresponsible. Regarding the relationship between differences and maintaining order, Murphy and Min Choi (1993) state as following:

Actually, once social realism begins to gain acceptance, promoting difference is viewed as irresponsible. Prudent persons do not act impulsively and resist authority but instead try to adjust to reality. Due to this predisposition to acquisition to reality, difference becomes an impediment to rational behavior. Hence, difference is either eliminated or associated with viewpoints that have been domesticated and do not illustrate the frail nature of reality (p.204).

Murphy and Min Choi claim also that "repression (to promoting difference) is thus not cruel, but rather logical and necessary" (p.204). The above is a logic to rationalize the incompatibility between culture differences and preserving order with its corresponding reality. Therefore, the United States government could not disturb world order by enhancing culture differences in a foreign nation, particularly under post colonial historical context. A fundamental rule, "in Rome, do as the Romans do," should be applied. The US government had to deal with the problems of culture differences by adapting their behaviors to those of the foreign nationals. Conformity was the presumed solution to maintain order³⁵.

³⁵Culture differences were bound to be problematic. However, prior to World War II, culture differences could not manifest as obstacles to domestic and international order. Prior to the World War II, domestic and world order had been predominantly maintained through power, usually through military power. Therefore, there had been no room where culture differences could manifest as problems, particularly in the colonial era. The powerful party always made the powerless party conform through military power. Therefore, as a natural consequence, the powerless party's culture had been repressed or sometimes exterminated whenever the powerful party invaded the powerless party's environment. On the other hand, in the post colonial period, minimum consideration of culture differences was to be included to maintain world order. Particularly, the US, a chief democratic nation, had to maintain world order in a democratic way. Therefore, whenever the US was aware of culture differences in a foreign environment, the US had to conform to the foreign environment in principle. However, in fact, many US representatives had been disturbing the order in a foreign nation, especially right after the World War. It took some time for the US representatives to adjust their attitude and behaviors.

Incompatibility between culture differences and efficiency: Efficiency as a predominant value in the United States. While maintaining order through similarities has been, more or less, a sort of historically applicable commonsense premise (transcending time as the old famous adage, "In Rome, do as the Romans do", implies), the second reason seems to reflect on one of the predominant values of modernity. That is, culture differences have become a problem because the differences are bound to be a suppressive factor mitigating against efficiency or convenience.

Promoting culture differences is presupposed to be incompatible with facilitating efficiency, which means wish-fulfillment in the quickest manner. For example, even a small daily conversation may not flow smoothly because the cultural stranger may not speak fluently. In this case, the conversation may be judged ineffective, inconvenient, and inefficient by either participant or both. It is so mainly because of an attitude which sees conversation as primarily a process of information exchange for ulterior motives, not as relationship maintenance or friendship building.

Although this is one example, obviously culture differences create many problems for efficiency. The logic of this matter appears to relate deeply to the concept of "normality" in the modern industrial West. Culture differences, which non-indigenous people represent, tend to generate abnormal and inconvenient situations (e.g., implicit and explicit misunderstandings in rather simple daily conversations), which seldom occur in normal interactions with other indigenous individuals. This emergent abnormal circumstance, due to culture differences, tends to disturb efficiency greatly. Because of the culture

In any case, throughout the history of mankind, maintaining order through conformity and similarity has been a historically embedded presupposition regardless of the ways of its conformity.

differences, a simple daily conversation becomes a problem. Because such a problem does not occur usually, as a natural consequence people obsessed with convenience or speed presuppose that culture differences are supposed to be solved, overcome, bridged, restrained, minimized, or even destroyed for the sake of this predominant social value in modernity. As Kramer and Ikeda (1994) suggest, "at least some modern 'problems' are problems only because they are perceived as obstacles to efficiency and convenience" (p.28-29). Likewise, it can be said that culture differences may have become crucial problems only because they were perceived as totally incompatible with the modern value of convenience.

Perspectival consciousness as the essential reason creating the above mentioned two presuppositions: Perspectival consciousness as the origin which maintained the unity of intercultural communication. As the investigator pointed out before, culture differences are presumed to be problematic because they are presumed to be incompatible with maintaining (domestic and international) order. Culture differences are presumed to be problematic because they are presumed to be incompatible with the predominant modern value of efficiency.

The culture-differences-as-problem presumption is derived from the two presuppositions. It is important to notice that these two presuppositions are naively and unquestionably accepted beliefs reflecting a certain structure of consciousness, which Gebser (1949/1985) labeled "perspectival" consciousness (i.e., mental-rational consciousness structure, see Chapter 2 for details) which functions dominantly, particularly in Western modernity.

Regarding the first presupposition about the incompatibility between maintaining order and culture differences, the awareness of the incompatibility

is based on perspectival consciousness. The social reality and the corresponding pre-existing order in a perspectival world are to be maintained linearly through conformity in order to avoid chaos. It is the foreigners' responsibility to linearly adapt into the social reality pre-existing in the host environment. The linear conformity for the sake of maintaining order indicates the directional and purposive awareness (which is a characteristic of perspectival consciousness) toward certain goals. This awareness is very perspectival, which is directional and goal-oriented. The manner of the way of maintaining order is essentially one-directional. Therefore, maintaining order through enhancing culture differences are considered irrational and irresponsible. The "best" way and the "most rational" way to deal with the competing social realities derived from different cultures is to prioritize the pre-existing social reality over the competing realities by linearly suppressing them. The order is maintained based on the host's social reality. The awareness of incompatibility between culture differences and maintaining order clearly is a manifestation of perspectival consciousness, which is the unilinear goal-oriented mentality.

Efficiency (i.e., a modern value judgment which desires and values one's wish fulfillment with minimum speed), on the other hand, also correlates with perspectival consciousness. Efficiency, in short, is derived from the value of time as "time is money." Time here means an objectified, quantified, measured time which is a manifestation of perspectival consciousness. "Spending time," "killing time," "saving time," "using time," and "taking time" are some of the expressions which indicate the nature of perspectival time. Time is not naturally occurring any more. Clock time is the indication of the perspectival will to

control time in a uni-directional manner. Perspectival consciousness locates and fixes time arbitrarily and spatially. Time is sectorized and rigidified and, therefore, fragmented.

It is also important to notice that modernity's predominant values of time and efficiency are derived from an awareness of the temporal/time anxiety Gebser (1949/1985) mentions. Modern perspectival humans are anxious about time all the time. Expressions like "give me more time" and "I need time" signify the modern perspectival temporal anxiety. Therefore, an awareness of incompatibility between culture differences and the value on efficiency is a clear indication of perspectival temporal anxiety. Fundamentally, it takes much time to understand other cultures. Moreover, enhancing culture differences, which are presumed to create various problems, is not an efficient or rational thing to do.

While the two kinds of presupposed incompatibility are derived from perspectival consciousness, it is extremely important to notice the culture differences-as-problematic presumption which created the origin of intercultural communication. Intercultural communication is and has been essentially the perspectival solution to solve problems presumed to be derived from culture differences. To put this in other words, perspectival consciousness³⁶ is the

³⁶It is easy to notice that ideologies (i.e., efficiency and conformity) and metaphysics (i.e., objectivism, relativism) derived from perspectival consciousness have been presupposed and sedimented in all aspects of intercultural communication studies in terms of choice of topics, definitions, chosen methods, and theories.

It is also important to point out that so-called "Cartesian Anxiety," a philosophical term has been sedimented in the area of intercultural communication. This "anxiety" is very typical for social scientists obsessed with objectivity. In essence, when they can not discover the objective reality "out there," they become anxious. Cartesian anxiety is essentially derived from dualism (i.e., subject-object dichotomy), which is the clear manifestation of perspectival consciousness. Regarding this notion, Richard Bernstein (1983) argues, in his book "Beyond objectivism and relativism," that "--either there is some support for our being, a fixed foundation for our knowledge, or we cannot escape the forces of darkness that envelope us with madness, with intellectual and moral chaos" (p.18). In other words, this anxiety presupposes a Grand Either/Or.

origin and creation of intercultural communication as a worthy independent theme of investigation. Intercultural communication is a manifestation of perspectival consciousness that also reflected on perspectival values (and ideologies) of conformity and efficiency without realizing nihilistic (i.e., self-negating) consequences.

Therefore, intercultural communication is supposed to deal with the various problems of cultural differences as quickly as possible. But, how exactly

Either "there must be some fixed, permanent constraints to which we can appeal and which are secure and stable" or "there are no such basic constraints except those that we invent or temporally accept" (p. 19) which represents objectivists' and relativists' beliefs respectively. That is, Cartesian Anxiety is the either/or dichotomy, which created objectivism and relativism.

The same is applicable to the area of intercultural communication. Since participants in intercultural communication are not able to engage in the process normally identified with intracultural communication, they easily encounter various kinds of communication chaos such as misunderstandings and conflicts. Therefore, it is crucial to find the determinate and fixed criteria or knowledge to keep us from falling into chaos. In this sense, Cartesian Anxiety deeply haunts the area of intercultural communication. Thus, intercultural scholars have tended to seek the absolute solution (i.e., knowledge) of the problems due to culture differences.

On the other hand, the attempts to find the absolute solution is reflected on various phenomena of intercultural communication. The phenomenon of intercultural communication competence is a good example of this issue. Possession of intercultural communication competence (i.e., absolute knowledge) is presumed to be the answer to overcome various problems due to culture differences. Intercultural communication competence, here, tends to be viewed as the master knowledge (or skills or ability) applicable in any intercultural context. Therefore, numerous researchers have attempted to discover the basic and fixed dimensions (i.e., criteria or standards) of intercultural communication competence (Gudykunst, Hammer & Wiseman, 1978; Gudykunst & Kim, 1992; Kim, 1991; Martin, 1988; Spitzberg, 1988 and many more) presupposing their existence. While many tried to find out general intercultural communication competence, other scholars tended to find out specific intercultural communication competence. Unlike the pursuit of general intercultural competence, specific intercultural competence attempted to focus on specific knowledge or skills applicable to certain specific cultures. Although different researchers take different positions, they take either intercultural-competence-as-general-view or intercultural-competence-as-specific-view presuming this either/or. Cartesian Anxiety also has influenced researchers attempting to find an ideal model of human being in terms of becoming intercultural, including multicultural man (Adler, 1982), universal man (Tagore, 1961; Walsh, 1973), and intercultural identity formation (Kim, 1988; Kim & Ruben, 1988). Discovering such ideal identity is presumed to be the (absolute and fixed) answer to overcome the challenges of intercultural communication. It is evident that Cartesian Anxiety has affected these studies.

The various studies of intercultural adaptation are another area where Cartesian Anxiety has operated. For instance, Kim and Gudykunst (1992) clearly mention "for most people, even for natives, complete adaptation, or assimilation, is a lifetime goal" (p.216). This statement clearly presumes intercultural strangers' complete unilinear adaptation as the ultimate and the fixed solution. Intercultural strangers are presumed to be adapted or assimilated into a host environment in a fixed linear way in the long run. Otherwise, when they can not accomplish the ultimate goal, they are presumed to be viewed as "abnormal." This dichotomy clearly reflects Cartesian Anxiety.

did intercultural communication solve the problems? The next section describes the way perspectival consciousness handles these problems by referring to the specific (perspectival) solutions the US government³⁷ devised. The next section also indicates the relationship between the solutions and the nature of intercultural communication

Active behavioral conformity as the perceived most effective means to solve the problems of culture differences: Technization³⁸ of intercultural communication. The United States government had to find out the most effective and appropriate means (which are perspectival in nature) to solve the problems derived from culture differences. The US government chose was US representatives' behavioral adaptation to foreign nationals' behaviors. Therefore, the US government established a new training facility which could enhance the trainees' behavioral conformity. The concrete means for this behavioral adaptation was, initially, useful foreign language training. The training should give enough situational language rules necessary for each US representative's efficient goal achievement. Therefore, the training was usually highly concrete and situational. It was a natural consequence that each instructor of the foreign language was a native speaker of the language. It was the most effective³⁹ and practical way for the trainees to conform their behaviors through imitating the natives' language style.

³⁷.Governing is a directional-perspectival issue.

³⁸.Technization is "a process of becoming technique" (Husserl, 1954/1970, p. 46). What happened through technization was that intercultural communication came to be seen as increasingly instrumental--as a mere tool for other purposes, for instance, to accomplish overseas assignments.

³⁹."Effective" means having immediate effects or applications. In this sense, "effective" and "practical" are almost synonymous. However, as Habermas (1968/1973) contended in his Theory and Practice, "practical" was defined differently in the past. For instance, in ancient Greek, "practical" meant "ethical." Being practical meant being able to make an ethical and prudent judgment in each situation (See Aristotle's Ethics for the original meaning of "practical." See

An important point is that the US culture originally had a strong belief that everything could be controlled and solved technically,⁴⁰ including nature. There was a strong belief and a will that problems of culture differences were supposed to be technical problems and, therefore, could be solved technically. Therefore, when the US government encountered the problems of culture differences, a technical solution was already presumed before the problems were perceived. Human differences are objectified and are reduced to technical problems. It is crucial to notice there was a strong manipulative will to solve and control the problems as quick as possible for the sake of maximizing the US's political power and interest. The solutions which have immediate use-values (which are efficient and practical) were supposed to be picked regardless of the nature of these solutions.

As a result, the US government, specifically some linguists hired by the US government, created effective language training which could allow the trainees to accomplish their oversea assignments within a limited time frame. While the training content was different, the nature of the microcultural training Edward Hall introduced later was the same as the earlier practical language training. Both presumed that problems of culture differences could be controlled and solved technically with limited amount of time by giving practical linguistic as well as cultural know-how to the trainees. Intercultural

Habermas' (1968/1973) and Bernstein's Beyond Objectivism and Relativism (1983) for the transformation of the meaning. Even without having immediate use-values and applications, people could be practical in the past.

⁴⁰."Technique" is derived from the Greek word "techne," which is "a working with the hands, a craft, a manual skill, an art." (Partridge, 1958, p. 698) Thus, a technique was originally an artistic skill for artistic production. It was only employed for productions, not employed for human action in an original sense. While techne is not employed for human interaction, it is important to notice techne is used for human interaction for the purpose of enhancing (the US's own) interests in modern technological world. Since techne has immediate use-value, it becomes practical. Being technical is supposed to be practical and effective.

communication, therefore, had to be technical in nature. Intercultural communication originally had been problematized as technical know-how (i.e., *techne*). Here, technization of intercultural communication took place. Technization of intercultural communication was the most rational⁴¹, effective, and practical solution for the highly goal-oriented (perspectival) US government.

Although the technization of intercultural communication might be an indispensable process, the decision has been sedimented in the studies of intercultural communication and the movement to the technization necessarily led to several consequences. The next section explains briefly how the technical know-how-as-intercultural-communication has been embedded in the present studies, then unveils the consequences.

Historical sedimentation of intercultural communication as technical know-how. After intercultural communication had been studied and problematized as technical know-how under a political context (i.e., the US Foreign Service) during late 1940s and early 1950s (1946-1955), intercultural communication developed as an area of communication in an academic context. Although there have been some changes, many of the current studies of intercultural communication are historically sedimented products presupposing the origin. Particularly, two areas of studies illustrate this point.

One is the area of intercultural training, particularly culture-specific training. Culture specific training is still a vital area of intercultural communication which aims to give **practical and specific skills** to trainees.

⁴¹ Etymologically, rational came from Latin origin "ratio" which means "to reckon," "to divide," as well as "to calculate" in the sense of "to think" (Gebser, 1949/1985; Partridge, 1958). It implies calculated technical thinking for the purpose of achieving certain goals. It is, thus, directional and perspectival.

Various rules, norms, values, customs, ways of thinking, and traditions which are specific in a target culture are introduced through various means (e.g., simulation exercises, utilization of critical incidents) for the trainees to be able to apply them usefully in actual situations. In essence, the nature of any culture-specific training is the same as Edward Hall's microcultural training, although the contents and the means to introduce the training can be different. Any culture-specific training is essentially skill oriented based on the same belief that culture differences can be overcome technically through active behavioral conformity by grasping situationally applicable information. As a consequence, the trainees who successfully masters culture specific techniques are expected to communicate effectively with foreign nationals. Both programs are also based on a strong will to control and solve culture differences and to seek out efficiency. Particularly, this will to pursue efficiency led to another famous research trend in intercultural communication.

Relating to the research in intercultural training, one of the most predominant areas in the studies of intercultural communication is obviously intercultural communication competence or intercultural communication effectiveness. While there have been many disagreements in terms of definitions, perspectives, and methods, all studies of intercultural communication competence or effectiveness have an essential similarity. The similarity is the motivation for the studies. What is the essential reason any scholar wishes to study intercultural communication competence or effectiveness? The scholars necessarily have a will to pursue efficiency. A will for efficiency and convenience essentially have been motivating scholars to study intercultural communication competence and effectiveness. Regardless

of the contents, people who try to study intercultural communication competence or effectiveness necessarily have a shared motivation for efficiency, presupposing culture differences as problems to be necessarily solved. The origin of intercultural communication as a perspectival solution is clearly present.

The next section unveils several consequences derived from the technization of intercultural communication.

A consequence of intercultural communication as technical know-how.

Intercultural communication emerged as technical know-how for the purpose of controlling and solving the problems derived from culture differences in an efficient and perspectival way. While intercultural communication as-a-technical know-how did have some values, intercultural communication did not emerge for the sake of understanding other cultures as a primary motive. Rather, it emerged as a phenomenon for the sake of enhancing the value of efficiency as a prime motive. Therefore, as long as intercultural communication tries to understand culture differences for the sake of maintaining power by enhancing efficiency, intercultural understanding has remained shallow. Intercultural communication as technical know-how always already presupposes the understanding of culture differences and a minimum frame for the participant to be able to accomplish his or her goal (i.e., achieving his or her oversea assignment). Therefore, understanding for the sake of understanding had never been achieved⁴². Understanding culture differences was necessary only because it did enhance efficient goal achievement. The motive of the

⁴².In a sense, the way of understanding was very instrumental, like Popper's view of language as a mere tool. Although Hall viewed communication as a cultural expression and understood the complex relationship between communication and culture, the context (i.e., the FSI in the US Department of the State) in which he was situated might have forced him to train his trainees in a technical and instrumental manner.

intercultural understanding was for the sake of enhancing own power, not for the sake of understanding others.

The motive for the understanding is, in other words, an egoistic one. The person who has practical skills for intercultural communication might be able to achieve his or her goal efficiently, but he or she would never understand the complexity of culture differences. The person might accomplish his or her goal through an efficient understanding, but at the same time, he or she might be sacrificing a meaningful understanding of other human cultures.

Understanding, as Gadamer (1960/1989) and Bernstein (1983) contend, necessarily requires phronesis which is an ethical and prudent understanding. Both Gadamer and Bernstein argue that technical understanding is always already not a true understanding for human beings. Although intercultural communication as technical know-how is an inescapable emerging phenomenon under a post World War II historical context, the way of intercultural understanding for the US representatives was a technical surface understanding lacking an ethical dimension. Ethics, which are essential for any human understanding, had never been a primary concern compared to the concern for the value of efficiency. This tendency became more severe when intercultural communication began to be problematized objectively as an inquiry of social sciences.

Objectifying and theorizing intercultural communication as the clear manifestation of social scientizing intercultural communication: From a specific technical know-how to a general technical know-how. Although communication studies joined other social science disciplines during post World War II period, intercultural communication began to be problematized and studied within the

discipline of communication as a social science during 1970s. However, it was the early 1980s when intercultural communication significantly developed as a social science. In other words, many started to argue the necessity of theorizing intercultural communication. For instance, Gudykunst, an influential intercultural scholar, kept arguing that theorizing intercultural communication was a necessary step if intercultural communication was to develop as a social science (Asante & Gudykunst, 1989; Gudykunst, 1983; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1981) He, in fact, as an editor of the Annual of intercultural communication, changed an editorial policy in 1983 for the purpose of maturing intercultural communication as an academic field of social sciences. As Gudykunst and Nishida (1981) argue: "it is our contention that if the study of intercultural communication is to develop further, it needs to move--toward a consistent theoretical framework for the analysis of communication between people from different cultures" (p. 88). Put otherwise, theorizing intercultural communication was perceived to be an indispensable task. As a result, after this change of the editorial policy, many started to theorize intercultural communication. It was a process of objectifying, scientizing⁴³, and theorizing intercultural communication.

It is worthwhile to notice the functions and the nature of a theory as intercultural scholars perceive them. Social scientists view the major functions theory serves as explaining/understanding, predicting, and controlling the phenomenon of interest. Here, there is a pre-judgment that the better a scientific theory is, the more it can explain, predict, and control the phenomenon of interest. It is important to think about the reason people wish to

⁴³.Scientizing is a process of making something scientific.

explain/understand, predict, and control. Since a science is, essentially, a sense-making activity, explanation or understanding is critical. On the other hand, why do people predict and control? One essential reason is a desire for efficiency. The circumstances where both prediction and control are impossible are perceived to be uncertain, anxious, unstable, and chaotic. A good scientific theory can domesticate such inconvenient situations into certain, secured, stable, and ordered situations through prediction and control. This is the process of scientific domestication. As a consequence, inconvenience/inefficiency can be avoided. It is important to notice that a value judgment is already made here also. Stated differently, the more a theory can achieve prediction and control, the better and the more practical the theory is.

While theories in traditional sciences aim at understanding, prediction, or control, the initial goal of a theory of intercultural communication might be understanding⁴⁴ rather than prediction and control, as Gudykunst and Nishida (1981) and Gudykunst (1983) contended, although the ultimate goal of intercultural communication theories is presumed to be prediction and control. Put in other words, theories to explain the general mechanism of intercultural communication were necessary to help intercultural communication move toward a mature science.

More interesting to remember is that a good theory is perceived to be more practical⁴⁵. Fisher (1979), for instance, suggested: "The key to choosing one theory over another, then, is never which is more 'true' or 'correct' but which

⁴⁴.There is another presumption. It is assumed that understanding leads to control. That knowledge equals power. In fact, the degree of "understanding" has come to mean (in behavioral terms) the ability to manipulate. "Understanding" is a subjective state. Control and manipulation have come to equal "understanding."

⁴⁵.And the more practical, the more "rational."

one is more useful or interesting." (p. 21) Gudykunst, similarly, frequently argues, quoting Kurt Lewin, "There is nothing so practical as a good theory." A good theory is presumed to have a practical value. Consequently, Gudykunst argues for the necessity of theory in applied intercultural phenomenon. He frequently argues that intercultural training will be theory-based rather than focusing on culturally specific applicable knowledge and skills. Instead, he argued a theory based culture-general training might be more useful and practical in some cases. General skills and knowledge which are based on a theory of intercultural communication are perceived to be applicable to more situations and to have more flexibility. The movement of theorizing intercultural communication meant the movement of finding a general techne from a situational techne, while the process of technization remained the same.

Consequences of scientization⁴⁶ of intercultural communication. While theorizing intercultural communication might have been a necessary step to make intercultural communication mature as a field of communication studies, it necessarily had consequences. More specifically, theorizing intercultural communication in a scientific and objective manner led to a crucial consequence. Although this consequence is the same for any social science which attempts to develop status by theorizing in an objective manner, the process necessarily dissociated the subjective dimension from the objective dimension, which were originally integrated. A subjective dimension, which pertains to the subject and particular perspectives, feelings, beliefs, and desires

⁴⁶ Scientization is a process of becoming scientific. It is a consequence of "scientism." Habermas, in his Knowledge and Human Interests (1968/1971), explains "scientism" as science's belief in itself, which is "the conviction that we can no longer understand science as one form of possible knowledge, but rather must identify knowledge with science." (p. 67) Therefore, scientization of intercultural communication means a process of making the area of "intercultural communication" scientific through theorizing and attaining scientific knowledge derived from scientific methods and procedures.

(which are considered unjustified), was bound to be neglected for the sake of pursuing objectivity (which is justified knowledge). Being scientific is presumed to be objective. Being scientific by being objective is more valuable than being non-scientific by being subjective. A clear value judgment was already made here in the name of objective science as the ultimate goal. As a consequence, subjective dimensions, such as particular viewpoints, personal opinions, personal experiences, ethics, values, were excluded as sources of science.

Likewise, such subjective factors were excluded for the sake of theorizing intercultural communication. While technization of intercultural communication through pursuing situational techne disturbed a prudent understanding of culture differences and complex human communication, theorizing intercultural communication in an objective manner resulted in the lack of considering subjective factors in the process of theorizing.

Although it might be an indispensable process, the process of excluding subjective factors for the sake of theorizing and ultimately maturing intercultural communication as an independent academic field might be a crucially disadvantageous event for intercultural communication. Such a process might oversimplify the complex nature of "intercultural communication" phenomena.

Summary: Intercultural Communication as a Manifestation of Western Perspectival Ideologies

This section summarizes the archaeological historical investigation of the origin of intercultural communication. Intercultural communication as an independent theme of investigation was foregrounded originally in the US within the post-World War II historical context, which correlated to post-colonial era (which decolonization process began with the US revolution). On one

hand, it presumes humanism which was a new attitude of respect and equality toward "others" originating in the Enlightenment. Intercultural communication as an independent academic study, in other words, presumes that we can communicate because we are all **human**.

While intercultural communication presumes humanism, as anthropology and comparative cultural studies do, intercultural communication was originally a political means to maintain world order in a democratic manner so that the US could maximize her political interests and political powers over other nations (particularly the USSR) in the post-colonial historical epoch. It also helped the US to diffuse the major ideologies (e.g., democracy, individualism) to other nations (especially to decolonizing nations) so that the US could remain a superpower and compete with another superpower. Therefore, it was originally a political creation which was the manifestation of the Western ideologies (i.e., the US ideologies) in general.

Specifically, intercultural communication was originally created as a technical cultural know-how which was necessary for the US foreign officers to accomplish their oversea assignments in an efficient and a practical manner. Intercultural communication necessarily had immediate use-values to deal with problems due to culture differences. Understanding culture differences was not the major issue. The major issue was to get the job done as quickly as possible. Because the historical teleology changed, the US only had to consider the appropriate means to get the jobs done efficiently. Intercultural communication was an appropriate as well as practical means for the US government. It was a convenient means for them that was not designed to decipher complex human diversity. Human understanding was, in fact, not the

issue in the original context where intercultural communication originally took place. Therefore, intercultural communication was originally highly ideological and political in this sense. It was a technical and linear solution and a manifestation of the predominant modern Western values of efficiency and conformity. Stated differently, intercultural communication was a Western ideology and is a concrete manifestation of perspectival consciousness.

Social scientists, particularly communication scholars, uncritically adopted this notion and established an area of communication called "intercultural communication." Therefore, intercultural communication as a field of study has been always already a manifestation of Western perspectival ideology. While intercultural communication was originally a manifestation of Western perspectival ideology, it slightly changed its meaning when the historical context significantly shifted after the end of Cold War. The next section, as the second half of archeology, attempts to clarify the meaning-transformation of intercultural communication in the post-Cold War historical epoch.

Clarifying the Meaning-Transformation of Intercultural Communication

Up to this point, this research has sought to unveil the origin of intercultural communication. While deciphering the origin is indispensable, unfolding the process of its transformation is also a necessary task for archaeological historical investigation of intercultural communication. This task is especially important for intercultural communication, since the critical shift of historical context (i.e., the end of Cold War) which correlated with the transformation of the meaning (although the origin still remains present), took

place during the 1980s. Whenever the context shifts, the meaning of the text also transforms, since the text is always situated in the background context. Deciphering the meaning of the text is always completed by situating the text in the socio-cultural historical context.

Therefore, this second part of the archaeology identifies and clarifies the shift of historical context (2-A), then deciphers the transformed meaning of intercultural communication by putting it in the new historical context (2-B). Finally, the implications of the meaning-transformation are unveiled (2-C).

2-A. Identifying the Shift of the Historical Context

While history continues on and on, some crucial historical events⁴⁷ take place in time of transition. While the end of World War II meant the finale of colonialism, it also meant the beginning of another ideological war: the "Cold War" between democracy (led by the US) and communism (led by Russia). The end of Cold War, therefore, not only was an event which changed the relationship between the United States and Russia (i.e., former Soviet Union), but also an important event which meant the end of ideological war. The end of the Cold War clearly indicated a shift of historical context. Put otherwise, the end of Cold War implied a total domination of Western perspectival ideologies (e.g., capitalism, democracy) on a world-wide scale. Historical events, such as the integration between West Germany and East Germany and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, which happened after the end of Cold War, clearly point to the predominance of perspectival Western ideologies and logic over the others. Western rational values, which reflect perspectival consciousness, are diffusing all over the world through various means (e.g.,

⁴⁷.It is important to notice even crucial events are transitional because all events are "transitional."

various kinds of technologies, various forms of mass media, various sojourners). This implies an emergence of new colonialism of Western rational and linear ideologies. Western perspectival ideologies are now becoming a world ideology. This dramatic shift necessarily transformed the meaning of intercultural communication.

(2-B). Clarifying the Meaning of Intercultural Communication by Situating it in the Post-Cold War Historical Context

Intercultural communication was, specifically, a necessary technique for US representatives to efficiently achieve their goal achievements for overseas assignments during the post World War II period. Intercultural communication was an indispensable tool for some limited American foreign personnel rather than for everybody. It was an indispensable tool to maintain the US's power and interests in international relations. Therefore, many of the studies of intercultural communication in the initial stage were so called "culture-specific" studies that attempted to find out situational skills and situational rules applicable to particular intercultural encounters. Intercultural communication was highly specialized cultural know-how.

On the other hand, the end of Cold War, along with scientization of intercultural communication and the noticeable emergence of globalization derived from revolutionary change of mass media and other communication technologies, changed the meaning of intercultural communication. While intercultural communication was a highly specialized skill for a specific population in the initial stage, intercultural communication, during the post-Cold War period and up to the present is becoming an indispensable skill for everybody in the world. In other words, not only a particular population of

people in the US, but also virtually everybody in the world is beginning to be aware of intercultural communication as an indispensable tool in the post-Cold War period. The study area of intercultural communication is diffusing all over the world. Various forms of multi-cultural organizations have been sensitive to intercultural training. There are many correlations easily observed which signify the diffusion of perspectival consciousness. Western perspectival ideologies have been diffusing all over the world through diffusion of intercultural communication, which is essentially a manifestation of perspectival consciousness. When perspectival ideologies transformed to world ideologies, intercultural communication also transformed a crucial world ideology into what was originally a Western ideology. Therefore, intercultural communication became widespread and is perceived to be the indispensable tool for virtually everybody in the world. There could be several reasons for this shift of the meaning.

First of all, the post Cold War historical context determined the predominance of Western rational ideologies over others. It also symbolized that world order was bound to be maintained through the Western rational ideologies in a peaceful manner (in principle). In other words, many laymen, scholars, and practitioners began to perceive interconnectedness among different cultures as the essential characteristic of the post Cold War period. Besides, revolutionary communication technologies (such as internet, communication satellite, fax, etc.) enhanced people's awareness of interconnectivity among the world. One famous concept in the post-Cold War period is the global village⁴⁸ as McLuhan (1962) originally labeled it. Many

⁴⁸Village implies collective community where people are emotionally interrelated with each other. In this sense, global village might not be an appropriate reference. People in our "deficient" late

people all over the world were interested in the concept and viewed it as a key to protecting themselves from various problems due to culture differences, such as racial and cultural conflicts taking place in the present modernity.

Although it is a myth, the concept of "global village" symbolizes people's keen awareness of indispensable interconnectedness among different cultures. In fact, intercultural communication is perceived to be indispensable as a daily event. As the awareness of interconnectivity among the world became acute, many started to treat "intercultural communication" as an indispensable tool. It is presumed that in the post Cold War period (i.e., globalizing modernity), nobody can avoid intercultural communication. Intercultural communication taking place as a daily common event is an indispensable tool for everybody. It is not a choice any more. Intercultural communication is now a predominant world value.

Second, while people perceived intercultural communication as an indispensable skill, they were also beginning to be aware of the problems taking place domestically and world-wide, mainly through mass media. An important point is that people were aware of the problems as intercultural problems derived from culture differences. Many domestic and international racial conflicts, many co-cultural conflicts (e.g., gay vs. straight, intergenerational conflicts) were perceived to be intercultural problems which intercultural communication should give the answer. Intercultural communication seems to be treated as the only inevitable answer to solve the problems of culture differences so that domestic as well as world orders can be maintained in a peaceful manner. Intercultural communication is indispensable

modernity do not interconnect with each other emotionally. They interconnect with others technically (through technologies such as internet and satellite). Global "city" might be more appropriate as Brisenski argued.

not only because nobody can avoid the phenomenon, but also because intercultural communication is perceived to be the only means to protect people from the chaos culture differences bring.

In short, in the post Cold War period, intercultural communication transformed from a Western ideology to a world ideology and a predominant world value. It still serves as the means to maintain world and domestic order, protecting people from intercultural problems cultural differences create. It is also an indispensable tool and a means for everybody to become a member of "global village" as an end.

(2-C). Unveiling the Implications of the Meaning-Transformation

There are several implications of the meaning of intercultural communication as a world ideology under the post-Cold War historical epoch (i.e., late modern deficient perspectival world). This investigation necessarily considers the implications of perspectival consciousness as the predominant world-wide diffusing consciousness under the new epoch.

The implications of the world-wide scale diffusion of perspectival consciousness. The diffusion of perspectival consciousness on a world-wide scale is leading to various forms of the conflict of culture logics within each nation. The diffusion of perspectival consciousness means the diffusion of various forms of perspectival ideologies and logics through various means. The conflict and confusion take place when the diffusion is so rapid and acute that people in different cultures can not deal with the diffusion any more. Besides, people are not consciously aware of the diffusion. Usually, the process of diffusion takes place without recognition. As a result, each culture (especially non-Western cultures) is confused between the traditional ideologies and logics

and the perspectival Western ideologies and logics. In short, various forms of conflict between the traditional logics and the perspectival logics are taking place all over the world. The essence of the problem is that the diffusion of perspectival ideologies is creating the second America or the second Western perspectival world all over the world. This is, in a sense, invisible imperialism regardless of the more specific implications of the diffusion.

This diffusion correlates to the conflict of cultural logics on a world-wide scale, but also has another implication. The diffusion not only confuses people due to conflicts between the traditional cultural logics and the perspectival logics, but also sometimes exterminates the traditional cultural ideologies and logics. The perspectival values and logics are diffused through various means such as sojourners, various forms of cultural artifacts (e.g., ways of thinking, music, clothes, mass media, various technologies, et cetera). Such perspectival cultural artifacts (regardless of kind) are diffusing all over the world making virtually another perspectival culture (e.g., perspectival Western Japan, China, Korea, et cetera).

In fact, people might actively and magically adopt the various forms of perspectival logics and ideologies without recognizing its implication. Younger generations around the world are particularly susceptible. They are flexible and enjoy perspectival cultural artifacts (i.e., Western clothes, Western music, the value of freedom and democracy, Western hair style) as symbols of being modern. Being modern is being Western and, therefore, perspectival in essence. It is easily observed that younger people from all over the world accept and enjoy being modern and Western. Since being modern is the predominant world value in the present world, people attempt to be that way

rather than being traditional. Being traditional tends to be avoided and rejected because being traditional signifies the out-of-date. The problem is that people can not integrate the two different ways of experiencing the world any more. Therefore, various forms of cultural artifacts in each culture which signify each cultural traditional values and consciousness are being exterminated⁴⁹. This implies the extermination of the uniqueness of each culture. People are doing this actively without recognizing the nihilistic results (i.e., people are actively negating their own identity). People only see things through their uniqueness (including their cultural uniqueness). The diffusion of perspectival consciousness implies the process of homogenization by exterminating the uniqueness of each culture.

The implications of intercultural communication-as-world ideology. First of all, intercultural communication is a cultural artifact, or a civilizational expression in Gebser's term, just like music, art, architecture, technology, etc. Intercultural communication is a concrete manifestation of perspectival consciousness which signifies perspectival ideologies (e.g., efficiency, conformity, rationality). As long as intercultural communication (the specific manners of expression or logic intercultural communication inherently possesses) is used within the perspectival region of the world, it might be harmless. However, whenever intercultural communication is applied to non-Western cultures, crucial problems arise. Fundamentally, intercultural communication is and has been Western and purely perspectival; and can only

⁴⁹Hojoo (1978), for instance, contends various forms of Japanese traditional arts are facing a problem of extinction. He argues this is not only because mastering such manual skill takes long years of practices, but also because younger generations tend not to pursue mastery of such traditional arts. Another problem he mentions is that such delicate manual skills can not be reproduced by any machines. While Japanese traditional arts are facing a problem of extinction, this might be applied in other countries, although the investigator can not determine this issue due to the lack of information.

be applied to Western and perspectival cultures. Therefore, a regional logic can not explain the logics that are not perspectival in nature. Tragedy began when a regional logic became the world logic.

The more crucial problem is that intercultural communication is and has been, in essence, a convenient/efficient and a democratic means (which is *techne*) to assimilate different cultures into a "Grand Western culture." Intercultural communication assimilates culture differences into one "global" culture. Since intercultural communication is supposed to be the Grand Logic, it does not allow the existence of alternative logics. As a result, intercultural communication serves a role to exterminate cultural diversity in an indispensable and strange⁵⁰ manner. Intercultural communication as the world logic implies the process of homogenization of various types of cultural logics.

So, how are we doing? It is not looking good. In fact, intercultural communication, which is supposed to be the solution, is the very source of the problems of culture differences. This becomes more clear when the ultimate consequence of the presuppositions is critically investigated. Therefore, this concluding section of archaeological historical investigation of intercultural communication attempts to unveil the uncanny⁵¹ nature of intercultural communication.

⁵⁰This is very strange because intercultural communication and the members of the community attempt to understand and respect cultural diversity, while what the discipline has been doing is exterminating cultural diversity without the recognition.

⁵¹"Uncanny" here means a state where the ultimate solution transforms to the genesis of the ultimate problem. More specifically, "intercultural communication" was supposed to be the ultimate solution for respecting cultural diversity. However, "intercultural communication" is becoming the ultimate problem to co-exist with other cultures. It serves a role of exterminating of cultural diversity. This process (the turn from a solution to a problem) is very uncanny. Regarding uncanniness, see Culler (1982), Freud (1919/1925), Hertz (1979), Miller (1976).

Deciphering Uncanny Consequences: Crisis of Culture Differences

The concluding section of this chapter deciphers the uncanny nature that the intercultural-communication-as-perspectival ideology inherently possesses. It questions the two fundamental perspectival values that constitute intercultural communication and Cartesian Anxiety, which has been sedimented into social scientists' awareness. Then, the uncanny nature of intercultural communication and the crisis of culture differences are clarified by investigating the ultimate consequence of each value. Finally, the necessity of alternative presuppositions is discussed as a way to close the gap between reality and theory.

A Questioning of the two values and Cartesian Anxiety

While several solutions to overcome cultural differences and to maintain order (i.e., a social reality) have been proposed, have we actually solved the problems? Do theories of intercultural communication satisfactorily explain various phenomena of communication with strangers in modernity? Recalling the continuous increase of interethnic conflicts both domestically and internationally, constant incidents of culture shock as well as re-entry culture shock, immigrants' identity crisis problems, and constant overt and covert communication misunderstandings, social scientists' various solutions appear to have not been working well. Strangely, their solutions and theories sometimes seem to cause new problems rather than solve old ones. For instance, the previously overlooked causes of culture shock might be hidden conformity pressure toward a single social reality as a commonsense process (i.e., as a widely accepted norm) as well as the anxiety of feeling abnormal or inferior.

When a cultural stranger does not accept what has been called "commonsense," she or he might experience a "shock" since she or he expected intuitively to be able to function in a new environment, but could not. This discrepancy between expectation and reality might lead to various reactions of "shock" phenomenon. Since the nature of commonsense involves a sort of strong assimilation power, many ordinary people are capable of understanding the commonsense and adapting to the commonsense, creating a static social reality in each host environment, as Kim (1988) claims. However, cultural strangers within a new environment might have difficulty adapting to a new social reality (through some degrees of unlearning) when the discrepancy between the nature of their previously established reality and the nature of the new reality becomes greater. When they (cultural strangers) can not enact the commonsense efficiently and normally, they feel abnormal and inferior. In a host environment, conformity pressure might haunt the cultural strangers, causing them to experience various kinds of emotional shocks. Although some people assert the irresponsibility of promoting a competing different reality, since intercultural communication is becoming "ordinary," maintaining a static single social reality through employing the value of conformity seems to be impossible. Rather, if we continue to do so, conflicts (e.g., ethnic war) will increase even more, while our still predominant commonsense and theories proposed by social scientists attempt to force us to make rather impossible requests (i.e., maintaining social order and reality through homogeneity and conformity).

Essential problems about various proposed solutions by various scholars might be due to the presumed values and Cartesian Anxiety which are the

foundation of the solutions. Namely, it is a natural consequence that the solutions have been ineffective when the foundation (of the solutions) itself is deficient. Therefore, the next section will examine the validity of the three foundations by considering the ultimate consequence of these foundations.

Ultimate Consequence of Conformity

What if this world successfully could bridge and overcome cultural differences in the long run? Although each culture could maintain a social reality of its own, we are trying to erase, suppress, or even destroy each cultural stranger's unique cultural heritage at the same time. As a cultural stranger conforms better and more effectively into a host society, strangely, he or she loses unique cultural identity.

Identity is only possible through differences. If everybody is Japanese, how can somebody identify himself or herself as Japanese? The unique "Japaneseness" becomes meaningless if everybody is Japanese. Successful and efficient conformity by a cultural stranger in a host environment might become a nightmare since the stranger is losing unique identity in the long run without fully recognizing it. Successful adaptation, which is supposed to be a solution, becomes a significant problem when somebody accomplishes it. This is a nihilistic and uncanny consequence since an ultimate solution transforms into an ultimate problem without recognizing it.

Both parties (e.g., a host and a cultural stranger) can only recognize and appreciate their uniqueness and meaningfulness by seeing through the differences among them by engaging in the interaction. It is necessary to re-evaluate the validity of our predominantly accepted presumed commonsense (maintaining order through conformity) and to seek out the possibility of

maintaining order through diversity and multiple differences. In other words, an alternative theory, one that can explain communication with strangers without presupposing the values of homogeneity, harmony, and conformity, should be developed.

Ultimate consequence of seeking efficiency⁵²

Human beings are different from each other. Some think, express, and act in a directional goal-oriented manner, while others do not. Although both are equally meaningful in their own ways, when the value of effectiveness becomes a criterion, one (most likely one who is goal-oriented) may be viewed (and even labeled) as more competent and successful than the other who is less goal-oriented. This social judgment is only made in terms of the comparison based on the degree of efficiency. This comparison, which is based on the value of efficiency, becomes a big problem when efficiency is valued obsessively. Namely, the existence of efficiency is only possible with the existence of inefficiency or less efficiency. Seeking efficiency is never-ending and never satisfied completely because there is always more efficient existence⁵³. Thus, seeking ultimate convenience or efficiency becomes uncanny and meaningless since there is no ultimate efficiency. However, human beings tend to ignore such an ultimate consequence when they are addicted to the value of efficiency. Moreover, the existence of efficiency is based on the existence of less efficiency.

⁵²Efficiency may apply to either individual-level or group (or collective)-level. However, efficiency here means individual-level efficiency. It indicates individual's own wish fulfillment in the quickest way.

⁵³This kind of "perspectival" efficiency is similar to power. Unless both (efficiency and power) are exercised, they lose their vitality.

If everybody is equally efficient, nobody can recognize his or her efficiency. In order to recognize his or her efficiency, somebody needs to sacrifice himself or herself. The value of efficiency can only remain vital because of the hidden sacrifice. The value socially creates many losers and few winners. Without recognizing the nihilistic consequence, people are obsessed with more efficiency, which is presumed to lead to a so called "winner." It is important to be aware that "a winner" in this sense is judged on the basis of efficiency. People sometimes tend to forget or even ignore a moral dimension for the sake of efficiency. Efficiency rationalizes obsession of individual interest without considering human relationships and contextual factors involved in each situation. Kramer (1992) argues this point:

By this means, individuals may "account" for their behavior, even if it is inconsistent with their ethical values, by telling themselves that the behavior and the morality of it are two completely different domains (e.g., "that's business"). Indeed, morality, being of the realm of judgment, is utterly ignored in lieu of brute behavior patterns. (p. 41)

The above statement implies that since people think, in this modern world, behavior and morality belong to different dimensions. People tend to think it might be all right (or even necessary) to do things against ethical values for the sake of seeking to fulfill their egoistic desire. When people are obsessed with self-efficiency, they do practically anything by using any kinds of means in order to accomplish their ends conveniently. Accomplishing their own convenience is the primary purpose, while consideration of morality might be secondary or even be ignored. Being ethical, which is supposed to be a basis for human behavior and judgment, is becoming a secondary issue because it does not bring immediate use-values. The value of efficiency makes human

ethics and objective reason⁵⁴ (Horkheimer, 1974) deteriorate and, therefore, makes human beings pursue their own desire without considering much about the ethical complexity of human relationships. Once they accomplish their individual goals more efficiently than others, yet the means they employ are not ethical, this tends to be rationalized due to the obsession of the value of convenience. This obsession creates egocentric individuals who never stop pursuing their ego.

The problem of pursuing convenience is that it never satisfies human ego. The more one accomplishes convenience, the more efficiency he or she wants to accomplish for the next. Pursuit of efficiency snowballs. However, logically, in modernity, the ultimate consequence of pursuing ultimate convenience is the lost of human trust and meaningful and enriching human relationships based on a decent ethical judgment. Pursuit of efficiency makes each human being feel able to live alone without meaningful relationships. In this sense, therefore, pursuit of ultimate efficiency leads to extreme individualism and alienation, as Kramer and Ikeda (1994) suggest. Moreover, people sometimes feel like they can treat other beings as means to their ends when the value of efficiency becomes obsessive. The value ultimately will cause various problems derived from a moral dimension.

The obsession with efficiency not only leads to the deterioration of human morality in general, it causes a problem of meaning, particularly in the area of

⁵⁴ In his Eclipse of Reason (1974), Horkheimer argues two kinds of reason: subjective reason and objective reason. Subjective reason, for him, is a calculated thinking for the purpose of achieving somebody's subjective goal whatever it is. It is a directional calculated thinking to coordinate the right means with a given end. Therefore, it has immediate utilitarian values. In this sense, the more reasonable you become, the more practical and effective you become. On the other hand, objective reason is a higher order reason which pursues human ethics which applies for everybody. It tries to think what "good" and "ethical" is. Unlike subjective reason, objective reason emphasizes ends rather than means.

intercultural communication. Although many theories have been developed, the value of efficiency affects these theories a great deal. The theories should have use-values (e.g., efficiency, convenience) so that people can improve their convenience by using them. Therefore, the theories are more or less useful in terms of facilitating convenience, and not very useful in terms of really understanding the enrichment of intercultural communication. For example, almost all theories of intercultural communication contend that misunderstanding is a communication problem derived from culture differences. Since it becomes a barrier to the pursuit of efficient or convenient communication process, it is presumed misunderstandings should be efficiently restricted, minimized, or even destroyed in many ways. However, without the emergency of misunderstanding, we can not really learn much. Failure essentially is a genesis of success.

Experiencing misunderstandings (failure of successful communication) is the beginning step toward understanding because recognizing misunderstanding leads to new understanding. Since abnormal communication tends to be a normal process in intercultural communication, only through numerous trial and errors, meaningful understanding, which understands both one's own uniqueness and the other's uniqueness through comparison, can gradually emerge, although perfect understanding is impossible. However, in modernity, the obsessive value of efficiency does not allow us to view misunderstanding as the origin of meaningful understanding, but to view them only as problems. Misunderstanding becomes a crucial problem only when the value of efficiency is a central concern.

Likewise, intercultural communication is becoming a crucial problem since the phenomenon itself exists against the value of efficiency. Therefore, scholars attempt to develop theories to minimize the effects of culture differences so that communication becomes more normal and is presumed to be more useful. However, differences generate the origin of meaning itself. Culture differences themselves compose the essential meaning of intercultural communication. Total pursuit of efficiency ultimately leads not only to the destruction of culture differences, but also of meaningfulness and enrichment of human diversity without recognition. It is time to re-evaluate the validity of the value of efficiency or convenience in modernity.

Ultimate Consequence of Cartesian Anxiety

While the dualistic grand either/or dichotomy has been facilitating theoretical developments in the area of intercultural communication, it is also evident that this either/or dichotomy has been increasingly narrowing intercultural scholars' visions. For example, in the phenomenon of intercultural adaptation, it is believed that a cultural stranger is supposed to adapt to a host environment linearly regardless of his or her cultural origin. Due to the unconscious influence of Cartesian Anxiety, people have tended to believe this is the best and the absolute (fixed) way. Therefore, capability of adaptation is usually associated with individuals' ability, rarely associated with the cultural strangers' unique background. However, the way each cultural stranger tries to adjust is supposed to be influenced by his or her unique and complex background. It is reasonable that each cultural stranger has unique way of adjusting into a host environment, although the shared ways of adjustment

probably exist in cases of shared background. There should be multiple ways of adaptation rather than the fixed linear ways.

Likewise, Cartesian Anxiety has led to the development of various two-valued cultural dimensions as strong analytical tools, such as low/high context (Hall, 1976), individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity (Hofstede, 1980) and so on. Although such dichotomies have been parsimonious and theoretically useful, it is also evident that such dichotomies are sometimes oversimplified and are not applicable to certain culture⁵⁵. For instance, while Japan has been categorized under collectivistic culture, Hamaguchi and Kumon (1982) argue that the collectivism/individualism dichotomy can not explain Japanese communication behavior well enough. They propose "contextualism" as a more appropriate category to explain unique Japanese behaviors and values. Although this is only one example, it seems that Cartesian Anxiety essentially has limited people's pursuit of multiple alternatives. It is time to question the validity of Cartesian Anxiety and pursue an alternative in the area of intercultural communication.

⁵⁵The two-valued cultural variability is problematic. For instance, Kramer (personal communication, 3-18-96) suggests about the individualism/collectivism continuum that the continuum presupposes the inability to be both highly individualistic and highly collectivistic at the same time. The presupposition here is since high individualism and high collectivism are two oppositional ends of one same line, it does not make sense if a culture belongs to high individualism and high collectivism simultaneously. Stated differently, this explanatory framework itself presumes a linear dualistic logic, which is inherently a manifestation of a Western blind prejudice. Metaphorically speaking, although, in fact, it is a certain specific kind of blindly wearing glass, it has been presumed to be the "universal glass" (presumably as a "derived etic") which can be applied to anyone in any cultures. However, obviously this is a scientific "myth" which leads to a crucial problem. The way it explains the phenomenon of intercultural communication is itself based on certain cultural logic; therefore, it might not be applicable to some other cultures.

Ultimate Problem Taking Place in the Present Late-Modern Deficient
Perspectival⁵⁶ World

The foundation of intercultural communication itself is inherently destined to negate itself when it fulfills its own teleology. In essence, intercultural-communication-as-perspectival ideology does not know how to deal with culture differences. Namely, intercultural communication, which is based on the presuppositions of conformity and efficiency, simply does not know how to co-exist with culture differences. The solutions intercultural communication proposed or picked were based on pure ideological and metaphysical speculations. Moreover, they were only indirectly suggesting that people should conform to perspectival ideologies for the sake of a "bigger" purpose. Multi-cultural identity, intercultural identity, and global village are all social scientific figments based on the social scientists' strong will for social engineering a new reality.

What is truly confusing is that co-existing with different cultures is in fact taking place in the present reality, while perspectival consciousness is diffusing and creating the conflict of cultural logics all over the world. In a world where perspectival consciousness is virtually predominant, every perspectival person attempts to assert individual and group rights. Therefore, there are numerous co-cultures and co-cultural movements. In the reality of the perspectival world, allowing the existence of such co-cultural differences is politically appropriate. Culture differences have been co-existing in reality with many problems.

⁵⁶ Perspectival consciousness is becoming deficient as it negates itself. Several perspectival solutions (e.g., global village, being intercultural, the addiction for efficiency) of intercultural communication are creating more crucial problems (e.g., gradual loss of cultural diversity, impossibility of co-existence with diverse cultures while maintaining orders). This situation signifies the deficient state of perspectival consciousness. This is not post-modern, but late-modern.

There is the huge gap between reality and theory that can not be fulfilled by intercultural communication. Reality is always much more complex, consisting of different structures of consciousness intermingled with each other. Even perspectival people experience their world in multiple modes of awareness. Intercultural communication as the manifestation of perspectival consciousness is destined to be unable to close the gap until the foundation of intercultural communication itself is challenged and questioned. Whether we can question and challenge the perspectival presuppositions and find out the alternative ones of intercultural communication directly correlates to whether perspectival consciousness mutates to integral consciousness. In reality, different structures of awareness are always already interconnecting. While there is an ideology named intercultural communication (particularly within the academic world), there is an actual phenomenon of intercultural communication we directly experience in reality.

The next chapter, therefore, examines the actual intercultural communication phenomenon which we experience and which is taking place in reality. Specifically, the necessary conditions which constitute a phenomenon of intercultural communication is investigated through an eidetic analysis.

Before moving to an eidetic analysis of intercultural communication, the investigator states several limitations of the present archaeology as the last section of this chapter.

Limitations of the Present Archaeology

Although the investigator did his best for this present archaeology, the attempt was far from being complete. In order to connect this attempt with the next attempt, the investigator critically reflects on the limitations in this study.

The first limitation is a lack of depth in terms of understanding both American history and World history. While we tend to presume history as mere past which dissociates from the present, this is obviously not true. By conducting this initial archaeology, the investigator realized how ignorant he was (and he still is) about our history (e.g., history of human civilizations, American history, history of Europe, World history, history of intercultural activities such as diplomacy, missionary, and embassy, and history of anthropology, to name a few). More importantly, he realized we (people living in the present epoch) always presume such histories. Any history is not mere past, but ever-present history. Our present is intimately interconnecting with our history (and histories). The past is not gone or extinct. The past is our past and is ever-present. The investigator recognized this by doing this archaeology. For instance, this archaeology implies the establishment of intercultural communication (as an academic field) had an intimate relationship with the post-war, post-colonial historical era and the US's role in that context. But, the process of decolonization did not begin at the end of World War II. Such process has its own history and can be traced back to the US revolution in the late 18 century. Moreover, Enlightenment and humanism, which the US revolution and the movement of decolonization presume, may be traced back further. In this study, the investigator could not clarify the background of the US revolution and the origin of humanism and Enlightenment in detail. As a consequence, this attempt obviously lacks depth in terms of articulating the interconnection between the origin of intercultural communication and its corresponding embedded history. In the next attempt, the investigator must

learn more about American history and the history of Enlightenment and humanism.

Another limitation comes from the fact that the investigator limited his examination to the US region and its corresponding language. Giving up the search for the possibility that the area might have taken place in other places (other than the US) in other languages (other than English) definitely limited the validity of the investigator's claim. In the next attempt, he must pursue this possibility. Regardless of the difficulty, it is important to pursue such a possibility.

Delimiting the domain, on the other hand, as an independent academic field also limited the study. Even though intercultural communication might not take place as an independent field of inquiry, many scholars in different disciplines (such as anthropology, sociology, political science, international relations, education, psychology, social psychology, et cetera) problematized the topic in their own way with different motives and interests. The investigator limited the study significantly by ignoring the relationship among such conscious efforts cultivated in the academic world.

Fourth, as is obvious, intercultural communication belongs to the field of communication. Yet, this archaeology did not investigate the original establishment process of communication as a discipline. Investigating the process of its establishment and the relationship between the origin of communication and intercultural communication leads to a deeper understanding of the present intercultural communication and how it has been shifting. In fact, this leads to another limitation. While communication (and intercultural communication) aims to be social scientific, communication as a

discipline already always presumes the history of social science. Actually, communication has been trying to be scientific in order to gain more legitimate status as a discipline of social science. Therefore, investigating the origin of social science is also crucial along with unfolding the origin of communication. Such an archaeological attempt should enhance the validity of the present claim about the origin of intercultural communication.

Fifth, delimiting the search for the origin of intercultural communication as an academic study also significantly limited this study. The area of intercultural communication presumes the existence of the various forms of intercultural activities such as diplomacy, missionary, trading, et cetera. Intercultural communication, in a sense, has been taking place from the beginning of human civilization. In the future, the investigator needs to learn more about such histories so that he can understand the essence of "intercultural communication" in a more meaningful manner.

For the above reasons, the present attempt is limited. But, at least, this limited attempt successfully made him realize what he did not know and how ignorant he was before. In this sense, this attempt was very meaningful for the investigator. Archaeology is essentially an on-going process.

CHAPTER SIX

An Eidetic Analysis of Intercultural Communication

Prior chapters were attempts to unfold the sedimented meanings of "intercultural communication" and its transformation. The was to unveil the several ideologies and metaphysics which have been creating the phenomenon of intercultural communication as well as creating an ultimate contradiction. As a consequence, the archaeology in the previous chapter demonstrated that intercultural communication-as-an ideology does have a crucial referential problem. In short, there is a severe bifurcation between intercultural communication-as-an ideology and "intercultural communication" we directly experience in our reality. Intercultural communication as an ideology is different from our direct experience of "intercultural communication." However, prior studies have never critically investigated the ontological status of real "intercultural communication." This task should be carried out because the ultimate foundation of all genuine knowledge is derived from our direct and personal experience.

This chapter, therefore, attempts to unveil the "intercultural communication" we directly experience. The purpose is to decipher the necessary conditions which constitute the ontic status of intercultural communication. Therefore, this chapter tries to do another kind of phenomenology of intercultural communication based on the above archaeological historical investigation. This archaeology should help us bracket metaphysical and ideological aspects of intercultural communication (which is the

first step of eidetic analysis). Such a phenomenological attempt requires certain systematic procedures derived from a phenomenological method called "eidetic analysis." This chapter, thus, follows the five-step procedure described in the method section. Those five steps are reappear below:

1. Suspending metaphysical speculations about the existential status of a phenomenon;
2. Describing a phenomenon;
3. Apprehending the necessary conditions for a phenomenon to take place;
4. Clarifying the investigator's prejudices about the ontic status of a phenomenon;
5. Interpreting the concealed meaning of a phenomenon.

Phenomenological Suspension of Metaphysical Prejudices

The first step of a phenomenological method is the phenomenological suspension of metaphysical and ideological prejudices about the ontic status of a phenomenon. The first thing the investigator should do is to suspend any metaphysical as well as ideological speculations about the phenomenon's nature of reality. Put otherwise, the investigator necessarily suspends any speculations about what is presumed to be "intercultural communication." This process is crucial, since such speculations might distort or even preempt the exploration. However, as Kramer and Mickunas (1992) indicate, "the most difficult aspect of this process is the effort to become cognizant of one's blindness--" (p. xiii). This process, first, indispensably recognizes his prejudices about the phenomenon's (i.e., intercultural communication) nature of reality. What is presumed to be "intercultural communication" should be elucidated and then suspended in this stage. Before getting into the procedure, the investigator must emphasize one

thing. He tries his best to elucidate metaphysical prejudices about intercultural communication in order to bracket those speculations. However, the process is never complete, since the investigator is a historical being located in a specific historical epoch and specific place: he can not escape from his prejudices. He sees things from his prejudices in a way Gadamer (1960/1989) described. What he can do is to enable his prejudices as much as possible in a very critical manner, remembering he has prejudice, regardless of his effort to avoid it. He attempts to continue a critical attitude by questioning himself continuously. The process of enabling his prejudices is a never ending one.

In this step, the investigator not only attempts to suspend the presuppositions about the existential status of intercultural communication, but he also attempts to bracket the ideological presuppositions of intercultural communication which are historically sedimented. The archaeological historical investigation in the previous chapter helps us to see and reflect this form of presuppositions. Bracketing such historically sedimented ideological prejudices is also indispensable, since such ideological presuppositions automatically always already causes people to see, problematize, and explain the phenomenon in a certain manner.

Metaphysical Speculations about Intercultural Communication

As suggested in the review section, the phenomenon of intercultural communication has been predominantly considered a communication process among (or between) two or more individuals from different cultures. There are several presumptions about this common view.

First, intercultural communication is presumed to be human communication which requires a direct person-to-person contact. Put otherwise,

intercultural communication has been presumed to require animate beings, which are the only participants of the communication event. More specifically, the communication events other than person-to-person communication have been excluded from the inquiry of intercultural communication. However, intercultural communication might take place when people encounter a foreign environment. Then, they appear to engage in intercultural communication even though they do not meet a foreigner. An experience of learning a foreign language seems to make people engage in intercultural communication also. Even though the experience does not require direct human communication, the process itself appears to be a form of intercultural communication. These examples might suggest a direct human contact might not be a necessary condition to constitute intercultural communication. Stated differently, this condition might be a metaphysical prejudice about intercultural communication's nature of reality. Consequently, such prejudice is bracketed at this point.

While the requirement of direct human contact might be a metaphysical speculation about the ontic status of communication, there seems to be another metaphysical prejudice about "culture." Intercultural communication was presumed to be a communication among people from different cultures. This definition involves a crucial metaphysical speculation. This definition, namely, implies people are the only and the pure representation of a culture. Different cultures mean different people from different cultures. Whatever a culture is, the physical condition that two individuals from two different cultures communicate automatically guarantees intercultural communication whatever the quality of the communication is about. However, such mere physical condition might not always make communication events intercultural. Is a communication between

an intercultural married couple intercultural or interpersonal? Is each individual still a pure representation of each different culture? This is a difficult question. For another example, suppose a person was born in France, but spent most of his adulthood life in the US. Is he a representation of France, America, both, or neither? When he communicates with his long-time American friend, does the physical condition make the communication intercultural or interpersonal or both or neither? There seem to be many cases in which a mere physical condition, two individuals from two different cultures, exists, yet does not automatically guarantee the communication event to be an intercultural one. Moreover, this mere physical condition might be just a physicalism--a metaphysical speculation about intercultural communication. Such prejudice should be suspended at this point.

Besides, human beings (animate beings) might not be the only representation of a culture. For instance, every culture has numerous cultural artifacts¹ made in its own culture. Regardless of kind, cultural inventions mean and express something. All of the cultural artifacts are civilizational expressions (Gebser's term). Each cultural artifact signifies something. This "something" is a manifestation of culture. Shimode (1975) implies that cultural artifacts are the most concrete form to signify the essence of the culture. If something made in Japan by Japanese is accepted among Japanese and recognized as a Japanese cultural artifact, it might signify something about the nature of the Japanese²

¹ Here I am using the term, "cultural artifacts" in a very broad sense. Cultural artifacts, in this paper, are any kind of cultural inventions. Anything can be a cultural artifact (e.g., art, buildings, languages, religions, ways of thinking, any kinds of traditions, such as rituals or customs, et cetera) as long as it was invented with certain motives.

²This is not the case always. For instance, Japanese cars or Japanese stereos are globally marketed products which might not signify the uniqueness of Japanese culture unlike Japanese "kimono" signifies. Yet, such transcultural artifacts signify something about the diffusion among different cultures.

culture as well as the transformation. In other words, any cultural artifact might be a concrete manifestation of a culture. Moreover, as Roland Barthes (1972) suggested, not only can we not not signify, but also everything can not not signify. This means that every cultural artifact might communicate with us by signifying something. Everything means something. When people encounter a foreign cultural artifact, the experience might be a form of intercultural communication. Presupposing a human as the only representation of a culture might be another metaphysical prejudice of intercultural communication to be suspended.

There is yet another metaphysical prejudice about the traditional definition³ of intercultural communication, especially about a "culture." The traditional definition presumes each communication participant involved in intercultural communication is a member of a group. Therefore, intercultural communication is sometimes equated with intergroup communication (Gudykunst, 1985). Interethnic communication, intergenerational communication, and communication among co-cultural groups are presumed to be a part of intercultural communication. These are consequences of viewing a culture as "any pre-existing group." This definition treats culture very categorically so that a culture is distinguishable from others. While a "culture" in this definition of intercultural communication is presumed to be a pre-existing group that each participant can identify with as a member of the group, such presumption might be speculation about the nature of reality of "culture" or "group." The ontic status of "culture" should be bracketed at this point.

³The traditional definition of intercultural communication refers to an interactive communication process between people from different cultures. Since Edward Hall, intercultural communication has been presumed to be human communication. Second, the definition views culture as pre-existing group category (e.g., nation, ethnic group, racial group, etc.).

The traditional definition of intercultural communication might involve several presuppositions about what intercultural communication is. Although intercultural communication in the definition might be a form of intercultural communication, there might be other forms of intercultural communication which have been excluded from the common definition. Metaphysical speculations about intercultural communication automatically exclude potential forms of intercultural communication that are incompatible with the metaphysics. Therefore, any metaphysical prejudices about the ontic status of intercultural communication, which might limit or distort the present investigation, should be bracketed until further examination has been taken place.

Ideological Speculations about Intercultural Communication

As the archeological investigation indicates, there are several historically sedimented presuppositions about the area of intercultural communication which are ideological in nature. Since such ideological presuppositions also lead us to preempt or distort the investigation, it is important to clarify and bracket them until more solid evidence emerges.

As the archeological investigation indicates, intercultural communication has presumed culture differences as problematic. This presupposition is essentially ideological. Culture differences are presumed to be problematic only because they (i.e., culture differences) are presupposed to be incompatible with the predominant value of efficiency as well as incompatible with the orders (e.g., domestic as well as international orders). Therefore, enhancing culture differences has been perceived as politically inappropriate. Culture differences are supposed to be suppressed, overcome, bridged, even eliminated.

Because such presuppositions are essentially speculations derived from certain ideologies, culture differences might not be problematic all the time. Rather, culture differences often lead people to identify their uniqueness. It is often the case that sojourners who are staying in a foreign environment rediscover the uniqueness of their native country. Culture differences might not be problematic all the time. However, intercultural communication has presupposed culture differences as problematic due to rather political reasons. Such presuppositions automatically limit the perspective and the investigation of intercultural communication in an uncritical manner. In this stage, such ideological speculations are to be bracketed to avoid preempting and distorting the investigation.

Phenomenological Description

The second step of the eidetic analysis, in this study, is the description⁴ of the phenomenon of inquiry. As Spiegelberg (1960/1982) contends, a description presupposes a framework of class name since describing itself is based on a classification of the phenomenon. He also stated, "all it can do is to determine the location of the phenomenon with regard to an already developed system of classes." (p.693) Phenomenological describing might be easier for the more familiar phenomena such as a book, a pen, or a chair. It is easier since people can intuitively understand and agree what "a book" or "a pen" or "a chair" is. Determining the location of such phenomena is a relatively easy task since the boundary of the class name is distinguishable clearly from other phenomena. On

⁴ This is sort of a strange step, coming right after suspending speculations about what intercultural communication is. This step attempts to describe what intercultural communication is. In a sense, one of the characteristics of the eidetic analysis is circular in nature. Each procedure intimately relates with other procedures. It is important to notice that even though each step is separated, this is done for the sake of convenience. In reality, each procedure will mingle with the others, although the major operation in each step can be noticed.

the other hand, describing new phenomena or new aspects of old phenomena requires much more reservation, caution, and effort. It is no doubt, a difficult task to accomplish. Spiegelberg (1960/1982) points out this issue:

But as soon as we want to describe new phenomena or new aspects of old phenomena, we can do little more than assign them places within the wider framework of classes with whose other members they show at least some similarity or structural resemblance, since we are unable to name their distinguishing features. (p. 693-694)

In one way or another, describing such new phenomena or new aspects of old phenomena can become controversial; consequently, these descriptions might be prejudiced. In fact, in such a case, the description can not escape prejudice. The thing to do is to be aware of one's prejudice(s) in a very critical manner and not to forget that the description is inadequate. Describing intercultural communication fits this category. Intercultural communication is essentially a new phenomenon. Moreover, the phrase "intercultural communication" already involves sedimented connotation, which has been deeply embedded historically. Therefore, describing intercultural communication might become prejudiced without recognizing this. Nonetheless, this section is an effort to describe the phenomenon of intercultural communication with caution and reservation. Since "describing by negation is usually the simplest way to at least indicate the uniqueness and irreducibility" (Spiegelberg, p. 694) of a phenomenon, we must attempt to describe intercultural communication by clarifying what "intercultural communication" is and what it is not.

Describing the Phenomenon of Intercultural Communication

This section briefly examines whether "intercultural communication" is a phenomenon in our actual and direct experience in reality. This is important

because if intercultural communication is a mere figment and is not based on our direct experience, the current task is meaningless.

Is intercultural communication an actual experience in our reality? Yes, the investigator thinks so because of direct experiences of it. At least, two situations seem to the investigator to reveal intercultural communication in a particularly clear manner. The first situation is our active engagement of intercultural communication, while the second is the undergone experience of intercultural communication from the outside. When we initiate communication with someone from a foreign country, for instance, we might be aware we are actively experiencing intercultural communication. On the other hand, when somebody from a different nation initiates communication with us and we end up communicating with him or her, we have undergone experiencing intercultural communication. Particularly, whenever we are staying in a foreign environment as a stranger, we experience intercultural communication with more clarity.

In any case, what is important here is that we experience "intercultural communication." In fact, in the present modernity, we experience various forms of intercultural communication in various ways on a daily basis. Intercultural communication is a phenomenon we directly experience in our reality.

Describing intercultural communication is an extremely difficult task. First, intercultural communication as a reflectively identified phenomenon is a newly emergent (actually created) phenomenon in modernity. As Spiegelberg (1982) suggested, "as soon as we want to describe new phenomena or new aspects of old phenomena, we can do little more than assign them places within the wider framework of classes with whose other members they show at least some

similarity or structural resemblance, since we are unable to name their distinguishing features." (p. 693-694)

There is another reason describing intercultural communication is a difficult task. In order to describe a phenomenon of intercultural communication, describing "communication" is also necessary. Even though the description of "communication" might be ideal, obviously, accomplishing the task in a critical manner is beyond this study's capacity. In order to do an eidetic analysis (i.e., an analysis to delineate necessary conditions of a phenomenon) of intercultural communication in a critical manner, an eidetic analysis of communication is necessary. While the task deserves close attention, this section focuses on describing "intercultural communication" as its primary purpose.

First of all, intercultural communication is a form of communication. It is classified as a form of communication. It belongs to a category of communication. The next logical question is to describe communication. Again, this is a very difficult task. In fact, there are more than one hundred ways of describing communication (Dance & Larson, 1976). Nonetheless, the attempt must be made.

Describing a phenomenon of communication. On the basic level, communication, initially, is not a substance or an organism which can subsist by itself. Unlike substance, communication does not have extension and duration. It is rather a directional process which requires a carrier or medium. In other words, communication is a dependent entity.

Communication is usually described in terms of conveying messages. This description correlates to the etymology of the word "communicate," which is *communicare*, meaning to impart, to give, or to make known. Furthermore,

etymologically speaking, communication, community, commune, commonsense, communal are all derived from the same word origin, *communis*, which means to make common or the state of being shared by all or many (Partridge, 1958). This suggests that communication involves some mutuality, commonness, or sharedness. This correlates to our direct awareness of communication.

Whenever we are directly aware of communication in reality, the exchange of message with varying degrees in various manners seems to involve in the phenomenon of communication. When we convey and exchange a message, what exactly are we exchanging? What we are exchanging through various forms of means in various ways is not a lifeless mechanical objective message, but an idea or a meaning. Describing communication in terms of exchanging meaning or ideas seems to correlate to both the origin of the word "communication" and to our direct experience of it in our reality.

Describing a phenomenon of intercultural communication. We experience intercultural communication in our reality. We experientially know the phenomenon of intercultural communication based on our direct awareness of it. We experience intercultural communication by distinguishing the boundary between intercultural communication and other phenomena intuitively based on our direct experience of it (without recognizing that we do this). In other words, we intuitively (experientially) know what is intercultural communication and what is not. In short, experientially and intuitively, we know the essence of intercultural communication⁵. What we have to do is to describe intercultural communication relying on our actual experience as a guideline for our description.

⁵The reader needs caution for this interpretation. The investigator, who has been studying the concept of "intercultural communication, experiences intercultural communication in his life. At least he thinks so. However, this does not mean everybody experiences and identifies something as "intercultural communication" in a similar way. Critically speaking, it is still unsure whether "intercultural communication" is a highly intersubjective phenomenon. In this sense, "we," that the

The simplest way to describe a phenomenon is by negation, as Spiegelberg (1982) contends. Therefore, this section examines what is not intercultural communication. Experientially, we know what is and what is not intercultural communication. For example, when we are communicating with our familiar friend in our familiar home boundary in a mindless manner, we may not be aware of the event as "intercultural." The communication is natural and flows effortlessly. We do not reflect on how we are communicating. Rather, we experience such communication pre-reflectively with "natural attitude." Whenever we are living in our natural world with natural attitude, we are simply aware of the things and people surrounding us as they are pre-reflectively. They are taken for granted as the background of our natural world. We can do things and communicate with people pre-reflectively and naturally within our natural world. Under this circumstance, we are not aware of such communication as intercultural communication. The communication which we can experience with our natural attitude is not described as intercultural communication. As long as we are experiencing things and people with our natural attitude, the unity of our natural world is maintained. "Intercultural communication" does not yet become a theme of awareness.

On the other hand, when we experience intercultural communication, the communication is unnatural and somehow different. It takes effort to get the meaning across and to understand what the communication partner tries to say. In other words, we are aware of intercultural communication by experiencing various forms of "conflicts" with varying degrees. The communication is not going the way we are used to. Because of the unnaturalness, we experience

investigator used in this section, might not be appropriate. It is possible "intercultural communication" is a highly intersubjective phenomenon among only "intercultural" scholars, although the phrase "intercultural communication" appears to be widely accepted.

intercultural communication rather reflectively. We tend to reflect how we are communicating when we experience intercultural communication. We can not communicate naturally and effortlessly anymore. Intercultural communication somehow breaks the unity of our natural world. It (intercultural communication) shifts our natural attitude to an unnatural and reflective attitude. Somehow, we can not take things granted any more. In this sense, intercultural communication is similar to the experience of moving to a new environment. The shift of attitude is indispensable in order to deal with the unnaturalness derived from intercultural communication in one way or another, and consequently to regain the unity of our horizon. In this sense, intercultural communication is very similar to any experiences of new learning that require reflectiveness and trial and error.

In this stage, this description of intercultural communication might be selective, yet necessary. As Spiegelberg (1960/1982) contends, "it [selection] forces us to concentrate on the central or decisive characteristics of the phenomenon and to abstract from its accidentals." (p. 694) Another thing to notice is that this description is based on the investigator's prejudice. Although this is indispensable, it should be noted. In the next section, the investigator moves to "comparison" stage.

Apprehending Necessary Conditions Through Comparison

The comparison stage is one of the most important stages in an eidetic analysis, since comparison essentially elucidates necessary conditions for something to show itself as a phenomenon. For instance, compare a chair to a desk. We experientially know what a chair is and what a desk is. Stated differently, we know the meaning of both "a chair" and "a desk." More

specifically, we not only know the meaning of both phenomena, but we already know how the two are similar and different from each other based on our direct experiences about them. In a sense, when we know what "a chair" is, we already always presuppose the knowledge of numerous existences which are not a chair because we compare among them. Comparison already presupposes a process of elucidating similarities and differences existing among phenomena.

Comparison clarifies identify. A chair can maintain its identity because there are numerous non-chair existences. If nothing other than a chair exists in our world, the chair can not be identified as a chair. A chair is only identifiable in relation to other existence which are not a chair. A chair can only be meaningful and unique because it is different from other existence. When we are living in our world with a natural attitude, we naturally presume knowledge of numerous phenomena.

We can make sense of numerous phenomena pre-reflectively. Stated differently, we just experientially understand the essence of each phenomenon and essential relationships between each phenomenon pre-reflectively. It is also important to notice comparison is done so that we can function naturally in our world. Without recognizing it, we are comparing numerous phenomena; consequently, we can make sense of them pre-reflectively. However, since this comparison takes place pre-reflectively, we usually can not clarify what the essence of each phenomenon is, although we know the essence experientially. In other words, in order to elucidate the essence of one phenomenon, conscious comparison is necessary. This conscious and systematic comparison is the task of this stage.

Particularly, Spiegelberg (1960/1982) suggests two kinds of comparison in order to elucidate necessary condition(s) for something to show itself as a phenomenon. The first is comparison within the same phenomenon, while the

second is comparison between a phenomenon of interest and other different phenomena. The first comparison examines an "internal relations within one essence." (p. 699) For example, this applies to the process of comparing one chair to other different kinds of chairs. By comparing numerous different kinds of chairs, regardless of real or imaginative chairs, the necessary components which constitute a general chair (i.e., essence of chair or chairness) are clarified⁶.

Spiegelberg (1960/1982) explains this process illustrating "triangle" as an example as following:

Thus, in the case of the triangle we shall have to determine whether three sides, three angles, and certain shapes and sizes of these sides and angles are necessary to them or required by the essence "triangle," or whether they are merely compatible with it. Questions like the following would arise: Can a triangle without these elements still be a triangle rather than another figure? Or would a figure without them be an essential impossibility, since it would include incompatible ingredients? (p. 699-700)

In order to accomplish this task, Edmund Husserl indicated "free imaginative variation" (*freie Variation in der Phantasie*) as an appropriate operation. A process of free imaginative variation is, as Kramer and Mickunas (1992) contend, a thought experiment conducted by comparing imaginatively created numerous kinds of the same phenomenon. Therefore, in essence, our past experiences of the phenomenon are actively employed as the source of information. A systematic procedure is indispensable. The major goal, here, is to clarify the nexus among components within a phenomenon as its necessity, possibility, or impossibility is revealed as a consequence of the free imaginative

⁶ It is extremely important to notice in this point that clarifying the essential components which constitute the general essence of a phenomenon requires a different procedure called "investigating general essences" as Spiegelberg (1982) regarded the second step of his phenomenological method (p. 696-699). Although this deserves the distinct procedure, this procedure is a prerequisite for elucidating essential relationships within a phenomenon. Besides, in order to investigate general essences, comparison is necessary. It seems natural to include this procedure as an integral part of the current process of comparison.

variation. Therefore, the investigator, first, lists all kinds of potentially necessary components which constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication by imaginatively creating different kinds of intercultural communication. Second, he leaves off each of the components one by one completely or replaces each of them with different components. As a result, the two procedures allow the investigator to decide which elements are necessary and which are not necessary to constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication. When an omission or substitution of one component changes the ontic status meant by the name of intercultural communication in an essential manner, the component is a necessary one to constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication. On the other hand, when an omission or substitution does not change the ontic status of intercultural communication in an essential manner, the component is not an essential element for the phenomenon to appear itself as intercultural communication.

Finally, it is important to notice that this process, particularly the process of the free imaginative variation, requires cautions and reservations since the investigator is bound to rely on his past experiences about intercultural communication almost entirely.

Comparison Among Different Kinds of Intercultural Communication

In the beginning, the investigator needs a series of concrete intercultural communication phenomena as examples which stand for the eidos (essence) of intercultural communication. By lining up particular intercultural communication phenomena in a continuous series based on the order of their similarities and relationships to each other, we should be able to grasp the essential components which constitute a phenomenon of intercultural communication.

The next section lines up particular intercultural communication phenomena in a continuous manner in terms of the type of culture differences which characterize each particular intercultural communication we experience in our real experiences.

The most clearly identifiable intercultural communication might be communication between two people from different nations, such as communication between Japanese and Germans. Communication participants' difference in nationality characterizes this most typical type of intercultural communication. The difference in nationality has been perceived as the most noticeable element of intercultural communication since the difference in nationality usually correlates to the difference in the participants' native language which creates noticeable culture differences. This difference in the native language also tends to create noticeable intercultural problems (e.g., misunderstandings, conflict). This type might be the most typical and easily identifiable intercultural communication event.

While the next type of intercultural communication takes place within the home boundary, the ethnic boundary and the correlative ethnic differences characterize this type of intercultural communication. The type of intercultural communication which is characterized by ethnic differences is usually called interethnic communication, such as communication among Chinese-Americans and Mexican-Americans. While ethnic differences may or may not correlate to the language differences the participants use as the first language, the ethnic⁷ difference tends to correlate with noticeable culture differences (e.g., differences in cultural tradition, value differences) which lead to the awareness of intercultural

⁷. Defining "ethnic" is complex and requires another phenomenological investigation.

communication. Historically, interethnic communication has been perceived as a typical form of domestic intercultural communication (Kim, 1984; Nwanko, 1979; Sarbaugh, 1979; to name a few).

While interethnic communication might be one of the most noticeable forms of domestic intercultural communication, there might be many forms of intercultural communication within the home boundary. Intergenerational communication, characterized by the age or generation difference, is an example, while intergroup communication, which political power inequalities characterize (e.g., communication between gay and straight, between disabled and abled, between dominant groups and oppressed or minority groups), is another potential form of intercultural communication taking place within the domestic boundary. In each particular case of this category, there is no language difference.

Nonetheless, each involves a different type of culture differences (some people call these differences co-culture difference); therefore, each might be a form of intercultural communication. Therefore, recently, many (Gudykunst, 1985, 1988; Gudykunst & Kim, 1992; Sarbaugh, 1979) consider the difference between intercultural and intracultural communication meaningless, since often intercultural communication takes place intraculturally.

Gudykunst (1985, 1988) and Gudykunst and Kim (1992) actually contend that intergroup communication or communicating with strangers is more appropriate than the term "intercultural communication." Gudykunst (1988) argues that intercultural communication is a form of intergroup communication. Culture differences are subsumed in group differences in this argument.

The extension of this argument ultimately leads to another famous argument: all kinds of (human) communication are intercultural communication to

some extent. The rationale for this argument is that no one can escape from belonging to some sort of (co-)cultures or groups. This argument correlates to another argument: there is no pure interpersonal communication. Even the communication between wife and husband is not purely interpersonal. Rather, it can not escape from being intergroup communication to some extent. Consequently, any human communication is intercultural to some extent.

Lining up different kinds of intercultural communication in a continuous manner in terms of the type of culture differences, the investigator must attempt to grasp the essential affinity among different kinds of intercultural communication. When this operation is performed, it becomes clear that intercultural communication is not defined by spatially pre-existing boundaries. It does not have to be limited by national boundary. It can take place intraculturally.

If every human communication interaction is intercultural communication to some extent, does this mean that every human communication is intercultural communication all the time to some extent? It can be argued that every human communication is potentially a form of intercultural communication.

Communication between Japanese and American, for example, might be a form of intercultural communication most of the times because of the difference in nationality and the correlative language difference. However, it does not mean the interaction is always intercultural. Sometimes, we communicate with others well enough without even speaking a word⁸, yet without being aware of the communication as "intercultural."

Assume an extremely (apparent) intercultural situation like a communication between one 18 year old Namibian girl and a 60 year old white

⁸. This does not mean intercultural communication is linguistic in nature. Intercultural communication might take place without a word also.

American man. Their communication might appear to be completely intercultural. They have nothing in common. Their languages, values, world views, and things they like and dislike are totally different. They might think they can not even engage in communication since they do not even share the same language. Does this mean their communication is always intercultural? Do these differences in their attributes determine the interaction as an intercultural one all the time? Their communication, in fact, might be very intercultural most of the times. Nonetheless, they might engage in intracultural communication also. For instance, suppose the old man falls down suddenly in front of her. Even though they feel like they can not communicate with each other, at the very moment he falls down, she realizes something is wrong instantly without effort through his painful facial expression and his tone of voice. In this case, they appear to communicate with each other perfectly without even speaking a word. In this particular moment, their communication seems to transcend intercultural communication. In other words, in this moment, they seem to transcend any culture differences. Their communication seems to be "intracultural" (in the true meaning) or "trans-cultural." Humans are much more similar than we think (on a very basic level).

Next, suppose communication between a wife and a husband, which is rather opposite the previous example. Their communication might be predominantly "intracultural" or "interpersonal," which requires little effort. Stated differently, both of them might make sense of each other without effort. They sometimes even communicate without saying anything. However, their communication might sometimes be intercultural also. Not only is everybody different, but also everybody changes as time goes by. Particularly, when one of

them (i.e., either a husband or a wife) behaves in an unexpected manner, the other party might feel strange and perplexed. He thinks he can make sense of her behaviors, but in fact he can not. In this moment, he appears to experience intercultural communication. The communication in this moment for him seems to be an experience similar to when he meets an individual from a foreign nation. He feels anxiety and uncertainty since he can not make sense of her. The communication is not natural any more.

As the above example illustrates, human communication is not always intercultural communication, but is potentially intercultural for a particular moment, whatever the form of the communication is. It is necessary to judge when exactly we experience intercultural communication. Obviously, in essence, intercultural communication might not be determined by the pre-determined attributes of the groups or (co-)cultures involved. Put in other words, unlike what most intercultural scholars have been arguing, pre-determined empirically manifested differences, regardless of the kind, might not necessarily constitute the essential ontic status of intercultural communication. The differences in experiential background among communicators do not either guarantee nor pre-determine a phenomenon of intercultural communication.

Rather, regardless of the type of intercultural communication, whenever somebody experiences intercultural communication as such, she perceives the culture differences between her and the other in various modes of awareness and through various phenomena. But, what do "culture differences" exactly mean here? When somebody says, "I can not make sense of a Japanese boy," what exactly is it that the person can not make sense of? In this case, what exactly could not make sense was the logic a Japanese used. Differences in

culture mean differences in logic. Each culture (and each individual) has its own logic. A logic is a manifestation of a culture.

The term "logic," as it is used here, in a very broad way, means the basis of understanding or the structures of any sense-making activities. A "logic" is, in Gebser's terms, a structure⁹ of awareness which is the very basis of any sense-making activities. As Gebser argued, people experience the world in multiple structures of awareness. An apparently rational individual can be very emotional at times. What it means here is that we naturally use different logics to make sense of our world. Sometimes, we are aware of our world rationally, while we perceive our world irrationally or pre-rationally and emotionally at other times.

It is still unsure whether we perceive the existence of different logics (i.e., our structures of consciousness), but we are, no doubt, aware of differences in styles and sometimes difficulties in intercultural communication. What we are aware of is differences in styles. There are many ways and styles that culture differences manifest. Whenever we experience intercultural communication as such, we perceive differences in styles (i.e., differences between your way/style and my way/style) while the differences are most likely uncertain. In other words, it is here argued that **the awareness of differences in styles is a necessary element** which necessarily constitutes a phenomenon of intercultural communication. It can be said that intercultural communication is a specific place where different cultural logics show themselves. We are aware of style differences within "the specific place."

⁹ There are numerous different ways a structure (e.g., the mental-rational structure) manifests. For instance, a dominant structure of consciousness in both England and America is the mental-rational, yet the manifestation of the mental-rational structure is very different between the two. Each has its unique way. In this sense, differences in culture are differences in style.

While such awareness of style differences is potentially a necessary element, is the specific mode of the awareness also necessary? Based on the free variation, we are potentially aware of style differences in multiple modes of awareness. It is possible to be aware of style differences magically/emotionally/prerationally, mythically/ambivalently/irrationally, or perspectively/linearly/rationally. Different people potentially might be aware of style differences differently (i.e., in different modes of awareness).

By way of contrast, the next section lines up another series of particulars which might not fully develop. Think about a sojourners' various intercultural experiences in the new environment. Eating foreign food, living in different places, and watching TV in a foreign language are definitely examples of intercultural experiences. Whenever we are aware of these events, we are aware of "style" differences in various ways with varying degrees, just like experiencing intercultural communication. The only difference between these intercultural experiences and intercultural communication is the nature of the content of awareness. While the content of the awareness of any intercultural experience can be either inanimate or animate existence, that of intercultural communication might be limited to animate existence. Since such a decision correlates to the ontic status of "communication," the decision in this analysis should be bracketed until the further examination is carried out.

In summary, although a further investigation about culture is needed, an awareness of differences in styles is a necessary component to constitute the phenomenon of intercultural communication. The awareness necessarily breaks the perceiver's unity in his or her natural world. In order to re-integrate the unity, the perceiver indispensably experiences so called "intercultural communication."

At this stage, this is all we can say. Next, the second part of this comparison examines essential relations between several essences through free imaginative variation. It compares intercultural communication to other similar phenomena in a systematic way.

Comparison Between Intercultural Communication and Other Similar Phenomena

When the investigator compares intercultural communication to other similar phenomena, he necessarily considers several things. First of all, the ontic referent "intercultural communication" is composed of two different referents, "intercultural" and "communication." More accurately, since "intercultural" is derived from a prefix "inter" and "cultural," the ontic referent, "intercultural communication" is a composite referent derived from three referents. Therefore, intercultural communication involves three kinds ("inter," "culture," and "communication") of different essences. Consequently, it is necessary to compare each essence with the others in a systematic way in order to (a) elucidate necessary conditions for intercultural communication to take place and, (b) to clarify the essential relationships between intercultural communication and other similar phenomena. This task requires careful thinking and great caution.

While this is going to be a challenging task, this task is carried out by the free imaginative variation. As Spiegelberg suggested, "keeping one essence constant we try to combine it with various other essences, leaving off some of its associates, substituting others for them, or adding essences not hitherto encountered together with them." (p. 701)

Intercultural communication and any new experiences. First, intercultural communication is very similar to any new experience such as learning a new thing, moving to another place, or meeting new people. Both intercultural

communication and any new experience make the participant of the experience reflective and unnatural. When we are aware of both kinds of experiences, the unity of our natural world is somehow broken (with varying degrees and in various ways); therefore, our natural and pre-reflective attitude shifts to an unnatural and reflective attitude.

While there are similarities, there are also essential differences. Second, in every new experience, we expect unexpectedness and unpredictability. At least, in every new experience, we are waiting for something unexpected to happen. In this sense, any new experience is not strange.

On the contrary, when we experience intercultural communication, we are not always expecting unexpectedness and unpredictability. When we experience intercultural communication in our home environment, our experience of intercultural communication is not necessarily a new experience. Sometimes, we can experience very "old" and familiar communication as intercultural communication. For example, when communicating with a spouse, we do not perceive it as intercultural communication. The communication is "old," familiar, and expected. However, once in a while, we experience unexpected unexpectedness in the communication. For instance, a wife is conversing with her husband. It is supposed to be a natural and easy communication. But, somehow, both argue in a totally unexpected manner. This is not supposed to happen. It takes effort and reflectivity to understand the unexpectedness. Somehow, you know some sort of conflict of logic is going on, although the difference of the logic between you and your partner is still very uncertain. Familiar and natural intracultural (or transcultural) communication transforms to intercultural communication, which is uncertain and unnatural. It is uncanny

because familiar communication changes to unfamiliar and unnatural communication. In other words, we can experience "familiar and old" communication as intercultural communication in reality. Not only are we different, but also we change along with temporal flux.

This uncanny feeling also takes place in a peculiar manner when we experience intercultural communication in a foreign environment. When we do this, it is very similar to any new experience. Whatever we experience in a foreign environment is a "new" experience. In this sense, we expect unexpectedness and unpredictability. We are waiting for the culture differences we encounter in such a context. However, in a peculiar manner, we experience unexpected unexpectedness once in a while. We find out unexpected similarities in a foreign environment. What we expected was not similarity, but difference. However, we find this unexpected similarity when we experience intercultural communication in a foreign environment. This experience is also very uncanny. In a sense, through the experience of intercultural communication, we also experience similarities and differences at the same time in a strange and unexpected manner.

Any human communication is, in a sense, a potential intercultural communication. Fundamentally, intercultural communication potentially might take place virtually in any human communication regardless of the nature of relationship, place, and time. What essentially makes intercultural communication is the **uncanny** feelings we experience through the exchange of ideas and meaning in various modes of awareness, while not all new experiences are uncanny.

Intercultural communication and adaptation. Intercultural communication and experiences of adaptation have similarities and differences. As in every new experience and intercultural communication, in experiencing forms of adaptation (e.g., moving to another place, marrying somebody, et cetera) we are aware that different logics are competing--ours and the newly emerging ones. In both intercultural communication and experiences of adaptation, we experience competition, or at least the meeting of different logics.

However, while adaptation moves to a new logic linearly by somehow suppressing an old one, intercultural communication essentially deals with the conflict of logics in a very different way. When we experience any type of adaptation, we have no choice but conform to a new logic. The new logic has more power than the old logic. The new logic attempts to override the old one in one way or another. Adaptation essentially presupposes linear conformity, power¹⁰, inequality, and homogeneity.

On the other hand, when we experience intercultural communication, we deal with the difference in the logics in various ways. We might reject the difference emotionally and pre-rationally. We might also irrationally deal with the conflict by attempting to avoid it despite our curiosity or its imperative. It might be the case that we seek out and sort out the differences between the different logics in a rational manner. In experiencing intercultural communication, we are dealing with the differences in the logics in various ways, including potential adaptation in multiple modes of awareness (i.e., magically/pre-rationally/emotionally, mythically/irrationally/paradoxically, and perspectively/rationally/linearly). While we experience adaptation as only a

¹⁰. According to Gebser, power is any making which is a magic. Any might or potent is usurped strength, and thus always threatened by impotence. In other words, power loses its vitality unless it is demonstrated.

perspectival mode of consciousness, as a perspectival phenomenon (i.e., based on linear conformity), we experience intercultural communication in multiple modes of awareness.

Summary¹¹

This section, based on the two kinds of comparison, summarizes the necessary conditions delineated through eidetic analysis. In summary, intercultural communication is not a fixed event that is pre-determined by the differences in the experiential background pre-existing among communication participants. It rather takes place potentially in all forms of human communication regardless of time, place, and the nature of the differences pre-existing among the communicators.

Instead, whenever we experience intercultural communication, it is like a dynamic place, metaphorically speaking, where different logics (i.e., different ways of sense-making or different structures of experiencing reality) show themselves through the exchange of ideas or meaning. We are aware of the differences in styles through intercultural communication. In essence, the awareness itself is uncanny since it forces us to be aware of human differences in an unexpected manner. It is also uncanny in another sense. Whenever we experience the phenomenon, we are certain about the existence of differences but at the same time we are uncertain about how the differences are manifested. We essentially experience intercultural communication and its corresponding uncanniness in multiple modes of awareness. Again, it is a dynamic place where the uncanniness breaks the unity of our natural world. When the uncanniness breaks the unity, we experience the different logics and the corresponding

¹¹. This summary, in a way, functions as a "constitution" of a phenomenon of intercultural communication. It needs to be elaborated in a systematic way at another time.

phenomena named "intercultural communication." Essentially, we experience intercultural communication in multiple modes of awareness in order to re-integrate the unity of our natural world. In this sense, the experience of intercultural communication always forces us to reflect the taken for granted common-sense world by foregrounding it. It essentially changes our natural world to the unnatural world. This becomes problematic.

Challenging the Investigator's Prejudices about the Ontic Status of a Phenomenon

Before interpreting the hidden meaning of a phenomenon of intercultural communication, the investigator tries his best to challenge his potential blind prejudices about his eidetic analysis of a phenomenon of intercultural communication. First of all, he treated "intercultural communication" as a phenomenon we directly experience in reality. This might be a prejudice. "Intercultural communication" might be a mere social scientific figment which does not have a referential reality. If so, what are the phenomena we directly experience in reality as "intercultural communication?" There are certain phenomena we directly experience as "intercultural communication." What are they? Is it better to make a new term which refers to this ontic status of this phenomenon? In fact, it might not be a bad idea. The ontic status of "intercultural communication" has been ambiguous. We have been presuming the ontic status of intercultural communication without knowing the potential ambiguities. Because of the ambiguities of the existential status of "intercultural communication," the investigator is still unsure whether he can call his direct experience of certain phenomena "intercultural communication" as such. While

there are certain "intercultural communication" phenomena taking place in reality, it is unsure whether we should call them "intercultural communication" or call them something else. Since there have been ambiguities about the existential status, your "intercultural communication" and his "intercultural communication" could possibly be different. All the investigator can say here is that the referent named "intercultural communication" and its referential phenomena might not be the same. There could be a potential dissociation between the two.

Therefore, the necessary conditions delineated through the present eidetic analysis could be the necessary conditions which constitute the investigator's "intercultural communication." His "intercultural communication" might not be the same as others' "intercultural communication." The only thing he can say is that he attempted to delineate the necessary conditions which correlate to his direct experience of "intercultural communication" as faithfully as possible. Moreover, he tries his best to analyze the phenomena themselves, not the expressions that refer to them, as Spiegelberg (1960/1982) suggested. Yet, the necessary conditions he elucidated are potentially just the manifestation of his prejudice until many others engage in the similar task and compare each prejudice.

Second, there might be another prejudice. In this eidetic analysis, the necessary conditions the investigator elucidated might be the necessary conditions which constitute any intercultural experiences. All intercultural communication phenomena are intercultural experiences, but not all intercultural experiences are intercultural communication. There could be additional necessary conditions which constitute the fundamental configuration of intercultural communication phenomena. Another eidetic analysis of

"communication" is necessary for a more critical eidetic analysis of intercultural communication. This is a significant limitation for the present analysis.

Finally, this present eidetic analysis is necessarily a manifestation of the investigator's prejudices. While he tried his best to reflect and see his blind prejudices, there might be more blind prejudices. Therefore, the necessary conditions he delineated for this study are to be compared to the others' versions in a critical manner. Such comparison is encouraged, particularly about "intercultural communication," for which the ontic status is still ambiguous.

Interpreting Concealed Meanings

In the final analysis of eidetic analysis of intercultural communication, the investigator attempts to interpret the concealed meanings of the phenomenon of intercultural communication. The goal in this step is to discover "meanings which are not immediately manifest to our intuiting, analyzing, and describing." (Spiegelberg, 1982) The investigator must go beyond what is given.

In the first place, we experience intercultural communication through being aware of the different cultural logics (i.e., different structures of awareness). Intercultural communication is a sort of peculiar place where multiple ways of experiencing the world and multiple cultural logics (i.e., multiple structures of awareness) appear through the exchange of idea. Intercultural communication makes us recognize not only that different people see and make sense of their world in different ways, but they see and make sense of their world in multiple modes of awareness. Intercultural communication reflexively illuminates the diversity of our human world.

Intercultural communication also forces us to see our prejudices. As Kramer (1992) suggests, we only see our prejudices and our uniqueness in relation to others who are different. Through the comparison¹², we see ourselves. Intercultural communication, therefore, makes us reflect and see our blind prejudices we never knew before. In this sense, intercultural communication leads to self-understanding. We can know the unknown prejudice through intercultural communication. Whenever we interpret things, we only do that by using our own prejudices. Our prejudices are tools we use in order to make sense of things, people, and our world. Whenever we experience intercultural communication, we can reflect and recognize our prejudices in relation to the different prejudices others have. The more important point is that our prejudices are not one kind. There are multiple kinds of prejudices. Intercultural communication illuminates the multiple kinds of our prejudices. Although the manifestation of each kind of prejudice is different from all others, intercultural communication makes us realize the similarity of the prejudice among us in an uncanny manner. In a way, we are familiar with the structure of the prejudice, while we are uncertain of how exactly it is different. While the manifestation of the prejudice is different, the logic and the structure behind the prejudice is not so different, as Gebser (1949/1985) notes. We are not that different. But at the same time we are not that similar. The experience of intercultural communication, in other words, reminds us of latent human similarities and latent human diversity at the same time in an uncanny manner.

¹². The comparison is also possible between ourselves over time.

Limitations

The final section of the present eidetic analysis points out several limitations. First of all, "intercultural communication" is a form of communication. Nonetheless, the investigator did not examine the necessary conditions which constitute the phenomenon of "communication." The lack of conducting an eidetic analysis of "communication" leaves a significant limitation to this present analysis. Regardless of the difficulty of the task, the investigator needs to challenge the task if he wants to know more about "intercultural communication."

Another limitation is related to the procedures. The present analysis omitted two procedures which could be involved. Conducting these two additional procedures (i.e., watching modes of appearing and watching the constitution of phenomena in consciousness, see Spiegelberg, 1982, p. 682) in a critical manner should lead to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon.

Finally, again, the concluding claim the investigator made in this study is his version (i.e., his interpretation out of numerous interpretations) and is definitely the manifestation of his prejudice (i.e., perspective) regardless of his effort to critically reflect his prejudice. Therefore, his concluding claim should be compared and contrasted with others' alternative claims. The investigator is more than successful if his interpretation somehow contributes to the field of intercultural communication as a member of the field and a co-bearer of the history of intercultural communication. He also hopes that his attempt stimulates other members who are also co-maker of the field of intercultural communication in one way or another.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Latency in Intercultural Communication

Latency---what is concealed---is the demonstrable presence of the future. It includes everything that is not yet manifest, as well as everything which has again returned to latency. (Gebser, 1949/1985, p. 6)

In this dissertation, the investigator demonstrates that the current field of intercultural communication has suffered from a bifurcation between the intercultural communication taking place in reality (i.e., intercultural communication in reality) and intercultural communication as an ideology (i.e., intercultural communication in theory) through a semiotic literature review (Chapter 2) and an archaeological historical investigation (Chapter 4). Simply stated, intercultural communication, as a field, has many latent aspects which are still concealed. In other words, there are still latent presuppositions, latent theories, latent methods, latent topics, et cetera. Every latent aspect correlates to latency of intercultural communication. What we who are interested in intercultural communication) must do is examine the latency of intercultural communication in order to close the gap between reality and theory.

Therefore, the final section indicates several latent aspects of intercultural communication. The first part mentions a latent presupposition regarding the meaning of culture differences, and is followed by a discussion of the latent potentiality of the relationship between culture differences and maintaining orders. Then, latent theories, latent methods, and topics in studying latency of intercultural communication are examined. The study concludes by implying the true meaning of "being intercultural" and human diversity.

A Latent Presupposition in Intercultural Communication

This section attempts to clarify a latent presupposition about the meaning of culture differences, unveiling this latency by illustrating the way of identifying inanimate objects and human existence. A latent presupposition about differences and maintaining order correlates to the first latency.

Culture Differences as the Genesis of Meaning and Identity

The present intercultural communication (as an area of study) presumes culture differences as problematic. Yes, culture differences do become problematic. Culture differences do become a barrier for effective communication and efficient human understanding. Culture differences are sometimes problematic. While culture differences may become problematic in reality (e.g., interracial conflicts), there is something else we already always presume in terms of culture differences. In order to clarify this another presupposition (which is still latent) in terms of culture differences, it is worthwhile to illustrate the way we identify inanimate existence and other people.

The way of identifying inanimate existence. Suppose there is a pen in front of an investigator. Somebody asks, "what is it?" He answers it is a pen. Somebody asks, "how do you know it is a pen?" This sounds like a stupid question, yet this is a very philosophical question that the investigator should take seriously. In fact, this is a very difficult question. Intuitively, the investigator knows it is a pen. He just knows it is a pen intuitively based on his previous experiences. He already knew this was a pen. However, there is a deeply embedded presupposition at this point. The very reason he knows this is a pen is that he already knows what is not a pen. This is not a chair, nor a pencil. He knows this is a pen because he knows what is not. In other words, the moment

he sees it, he judges it is a pen presuming the differences between the pen and all the things which are not pen. He intuitively know the clear boundary between the pen and things which are not pen. A crucial point to notice here is that he could identify it as a pen only because of knowledge of the differences between the pen and other objects. If he did not know the differences between the pen and the others, he could not identify it as a pen. Differences are the very source of identity. Something can be a pen only because there are things which are not a pen. Pen can be meaningful only because there are other objects which are different from a pen. Pen functions meaningfully because pen has its unique function which is different from other objects. Differences render meaning and identity.

However, once we know the meaning and the function of each inanimate object through direct experience by using it, we take for granted the meaningful differences between each inanimate object. This is possible because the essence of each inanimate object remains the same until it becomes abnormal (e.g., things are broken sometimes). Stated differently, we intuitively and perfectly know the essence of each inanimate thing presuming the essential differences (i.e., the essential interconnection) between each thing. Whenever we see each inanimate thing, the thing is only identified and becomes meaningful in relation to other different existence. There is a deeply embedded **latent** presupposition about the very way we perceive and identify inanimate things. We are presuming differences as the very source of identifying each object without mindfully recognizing so. Yet, it is true that differences are the genesis of identity and meaning. This presupposition can, in fact, be applicable to the very way we perceive other people.

The way of identifying other animate beings. This section examines the way we perceive and identify other people in relation to the way we identify other inanimate objects.

Suppose the investigator is communicating with his friend. He is a person familiar to the investigator. He identifies his friend as a male African American. When he identifies his friend in this way, he presumes what is not his friend. He presumes his friend is not Japanese, nor a white American. In other words, he identifies his friend presuming the differences between him and other people. The way the investigator identifies his friend is the same way of identifying inanimate objects. If his friend is not different from other people including the investigator, he loses his identity and meaning. He can be unique and meaningful because he is different from others, just like a pen can be meaningful and retain the identity of pen in relation to the existence of other different objects. In order to retain identity, regardless of animate or inanimate existence, differences are necessary. Again, differences are the genesis to render meaning, uniqueness and identity.

While differences render identity and meaning in both inanimate and animate beings, the evaluation of the differences are clearly different between the identification of inanimate objects and the identification of other people. When we perceive the differences between us and other inanimate objects, we do not perceive the differences as problematic. Since the boundaries and the differences between the objects and us are perfectly clear, there is nothing to fear about the differences. The differences can not be problematic. We know exactly what they are. In a peculiar way, there is a perfect understanding between the objects and us. There is no room for miscommunication in this case.

On the other hand, when we perceive the differences between us and others, we usually perceive them as problematic. This becomes more clear when we perceive culture differences between us and others in experiencing "intercultural communication." There is an essential reason for us to perceive the human differences (particularly culture differences) as problematic. The essence of any inanimate objects remains the same¹, while the essence of human existence does not stay the same. While there is a clear boundary between inanimate objects and people and between each inanimate object, the boundary and the difference between each individual is ambiguous. This is so not only because every one of us is different, but also because each one of us is always already changing as time goes by. Not only are we uncertain about the differences between each of us, but also we are uncertain what we are and precisely how we are changing. The boundary between human existence is always already ambiguous. The very reason we perceive human differences as problematic is based on this ambiguity about the differences. We know there is a diversity, but we are uncertain about the exact difference.

This problematic awareness becomes more intense when in experiencing "intercultural communication." When we experience intercultural communication, the "culture" differences and the boundaries are so uncertain that we feel unsecured and anxious. As a result, we perceive them as problematic. This is very problematic because we are very uncertain about the culture differences, while we are very certain about the existence of the culture differences. There are culture differences in a very obvious manner, but the culture differences are

¹The essence of each inanimate thing remains the same until it becomes problematic in terms of its function. The essence changes when it becomes useless or broken, for instance.

too uncertain to be dealt with. Yes, culture differences become various forms of barriers to effective intercultural communication. But the very reason we perceive the culture differences as problematic is not due to the culture differences themselves, but due to the fear of uncertain culture differences. The more crucial problem is that we are uncertain about the culture differences between us and others not only because we are uncertain about others but also we are uncertain who we are and what we are. The very foundation of identity is threatened through meetings with others who are uncertainly different from us. For this reason, we are aware of culture differences as problematic.

While this is natural for human existence (especially for perspectival people), it should not be forgotten that the very existence of culture difference is the genesis which is making our identity meaningful and unique in a latent manner. While we naturally perceive culture differences as problematic, the differences make us recognize who we are and recognize our uniqueness. The investigator, for instance, came to recognize his Japanese identity and the unique nature of Japanese culture while living in the US. He did not identify his Japaneseness in the same way when he was in Japan. He did not even think about the meaning and the uniqueness of being Japanese and the Japanese culture. Through the multiple culture differences between Japan and the US, he recognized his identity as Japanese and the meaning of being Japanese. Intercultural communication always already leads to self-understanding and helps us identify who we are by comparing us to others who are different from us. While culture differences are perceived as problematic, culture differences are always already the genesis of identity and uniqueness. Moreover, the fact we are different implies we have something unique and meaningful to give and provide.

Being Japanese is unique and meaningful in the US, since Japanese can potentially offer something meaningful, unique, and different to the US culture and people who are not Japanese. Differences, regardless of kind, essentially strengthen each other's uniqueness and identity. This is a latent truth hidden in intercultural communication and culture differences. As a latent potentiality, regardless of their evaluations (e.g., hatred, rejection, avoidance, appreciation, curiosity, et cetera), culture differences are always already the genesis of identity which is meaningful and unique. In fact, if we open our eyes to see this latency, we do not have to presume culture-differences-as-problematic as the only presupposition. In fact, the incompatibility between culture differences and maintaining orders (i.e., an essential presupposition in intercultural communication) may not need to be presupposed. On the contrary, maintaining orders through culture differences may be possible as a latent presupposition of intercultural communication.

Maintaining Orders through Culture Differences

The modern world presupposes maintaining order through harmony or sameness. However, Murphy and Min Choi (1992) argue, based on the theory of "systasis" which was introduced by Jean Gebser (1985, originally in 1949), that there can be compatibility between order and diversity. According to Gebser (1985), "systasis is the conjoining or fitting together of parts into integrity" (p. 310). Employing this notion, Murphy and Min Choi explain the compatibility between order and differences as follows:

Rather, differences via relationships define the parts as coconstituting. Simply put, what are seen as "components" are codependent on one another; they share sides rather than represent an ultimate reality. As opposed to a static hierarchy, the systatic process generates a system of fluid, coconstituted, and coconstituting identities that are generated from shifting differences. The ever-present process of flux resembles a mosaic of ever-changing pattern--systasis is comparable to a living quilt. The integrity of each patch is manifested by the existence of different patches. Together, such fluid identities constitute patterns--'order.' " (p.212)

As described above, unless a fixed reality is presumed, order and differences do not conflict with each other. Here, order is mere association of differences. Moreover, preserving order through (allowing) differences seems to be the only way since various people and groups have different realities that have always already existed within a country. War is the ultimate suicidal attempt to preserve order through destroying differences. If attempts to preserve order through sameness continue, the long-term consequence might be very disastrous. In order to coexist with others, the systatic relationship with others must be pursued. Murphy and Choi contend "the systatic process is constantly generating a 'non-totalized whole,' because this type of 'order' is multi-dimensional, flexible, and unrelated to 'a reality.' " (p.212) Each individual is meaningful and unique because he or she is different in relation to others. The origin of meaning is due to the coexistence of differences. Each individual can identify himself or herself only through differences between him or her and others. The so called systatic relationship is the coexistence of multiple differences which render meaning, identity, and uniqueness. Likewise, culture differences might not be the source of various problems, but the origin of unique and meaningful cultural identities. Maintaining order through human diversity is possible when we unveil the latent relationship between human diversity and human identity.

Latent Potentiality in Studying Intercultural Communication

The second latent aspect is latent potentiality for studying intercultural communication in terms of a theory, a method, and a topic. It is indispensable to reveal this latency. We must problematize intercultural communication as bearers, but also as co-bearers of a history of intercultural communication.

Theoretical Latency in Intercultural Communication

Not only do different people experience intercultural communication differently, but also people experience intercultural communication in multiple modes of awareness. More specifically, the experience of intercultural communication may be magical/pre-rational/emotional, mythical/irrational/ambivalent, or perspectival/rational/linear. The experience of intercultural communication is much more complex than it appears to be. However, many of the current theories of intercultural communication only explain a rational dimension of its experience. While such theories explain some aspects of intercultural communication, they become partial and simplified regardless of approaches (e.g., positivistic, system, ethnographic approach). It is crucial, therefore, for such theories to recognize their limitations and partiality in a critical manner. But in fact it is difficult to recognize their limitations and partiality in a precise manner, since there are no theories of intercultural communication that explain latent dimensions (mythical and magic dimension) other than the rational aspect. Without any theories which explain latent aspects of intercultural communication, the rational theories might have difficulty identifying their own partiality and limitations in a critical manner. Comparison essentially clarifies limitation. More importantly, such theoretical comparison unveils the uniqueness

and the meaningfulness as well as the partiality and the limitation. There is latent theoretical potentiality intercultural communication has not yet fully investigated. There are latent aspects and dimensions which have never been explained. It is important to remember that the original function of theory, *theoria*, was not to predict nor control, but to distinguish "reality from appearance, knowledge from mere belief and opinion." (Bernstein, 1976, p. 180)

In this respect, this study provides a theory to explain latent dimensions of intercultural communication. More specifically, the investigator employed Jean Gebser's (1949/1985) multiple structures of awareness as the theoretical basis for this study. Gebser's theory explains multiple dimensions (including latent dimensions) of intercultural communication which is taking place in reality. The theory functions in the original role *theoria* was supposed to serve. The theory explains people's intercultural communication experiences in terms of their multiple modes of awareness. It not only explains a rational dimension, but other latent dimensions of intercultural communication in a complex, a realistic, and above all in a **meaningful**² manner. The investigator, in this stage, is not advocating this theory. He is simply stating that the theory has a convincing exploratory power to explain the complex reality of intercultural communication. This sort of theory which unveils the latent areas of intercultural communication is beneficial not only because of its strong exploratory power, but also because it strengthens the uniqueness and the meaningfulness of other theories of intercultural communication by giving them a point of comparison.

²Explaining human diversity in a complex and a realistic manner without presuming ideological and metaphysical speculations seems very meaningful.

Methodological Latency in Intercultural Communication

There are various methodologies (e.g., traditional scientific approach, ethnographic approach, critical approach) and corresponding methods (e.g., survey, experiment, interviewing, observation) for the study of various phenomena of intercultural communication. As is obvious, these approaches and the corresponding methods presume Cartesian dualism (i.e., subject-object dichotomy, which leads to relativism and objectivism). While each method can be strengthened with careful considerations, the argument offered is that there is a latent method which is characterized by reduction rather than induction (i.e., subjective methods such as ethnography or conversational analysis) or deduction (i.e., objective traditional scientific methods such as survey or experiment). Such methods, which are characterized by reduction³, are totally latent in intercultural communication. Such methods of reduction, such as a phenomenological method (i.e., eidetic analysis or archaeology) or semiotics, are beneficial for several reasons. First, they⁴ try to avoid metaphysical speculations which might preempt its investigation by going back to things themselves. Going back to things themselves implies the refutation of subject-object dichotomy that leads to relativism⁵ and objectivism. Rather than presuming dualism, the

³Obviously, reduction does not mean to decrease. It means a process of discovering the invariant by ignoring and omitting the nonessential and accidental factors one by one. It is a process of reducing a nonessential to an essential in a systematic way, usually through comparison.

⁴Sometimes, the phenomenological method is perceived to be subjective. This is totally misleading. Rather, phenomenology and phenomenological method refutes subject-object dichotomy. In essence, there is no knowledge without our personal direct experiences. In other words, personal direct experiences are the genuine source of knowledge, as Spiegelberg (1982) contends.

⁵In the field of intercultural communication, the notion of culture relativism is very famous and accepted. It assumes every culture is relative to and different from each other. Therefore, to understand different cultures, one must understand them from their cultural viewpoints. This is applicable to understanding others. Since each one of us is relative and different from each other, understanding her from her viewpoint is necessary. People call this cultural empathy. This notion of empathy which was derived from relativism is in fact problematic. Although the attitude

phenomenological method examines the things (i.e., the texts or the phenomena) themselves without presuming metaphysics. Particularly, the investigator argues the potential value of Gebser's semiotic analysis of cultural artifacts. While semiotics generally implies the study of signification and meaning by examining the form of the things' (whatever they are) manifestation, Gebser's semiotics⁶ attempts to delineate (and reduce) the structures of awareness, manifested in the cultural artifacts, by comparing the forms of each artifact in a systematic manner. This is a latent method of studying intercultural communication. We presume human existence as the prime (and actually the only) source of each method. However, there are many **intercultural artifacts** which are the true manifestation

of empathic understanding is very helpful, it is not realistic. We understand others only through our viewpoints. Understanding others from others' viewpoints through some leap is a myth. Likewise, understanding other cultures from their perspectives is a myth. This mythical empathic understanding brings up another crucial problem. In this form of understanding, we do not have to use our own perspective to understand others. Therefore, it becomes impossible to critically evaluate the differences between us and others. Understanding the differences and the similarities between us and others is essential for true understanding. This is the same story for understanding other cultures. What we truly have to do for understanding others or other cultures is not to emphasize but to reflect and clarify our own blind perspectives, uniqueness, or prejudices as critically as possible through comparing others or other cultures with our own. We only understand other cultures through our cultural perspectives. For perspectival men, that is the only way to make sense. Ethnocentrism is in a way indispensable. The thing we have to do is to critically enable the blindly accepted ethnocentrism. We have to know our ethnocentrism in a critical manner. We have to be ethnocentric because the only way to understand other cultures is to understand through our cultural perspective. We experience intercultural communication by using our perspective and by understanding the differences between us and others through comparison. Finally, as Gebser's five structures of awareness implied, just as we are not totally different but relatively different, so is culture. Each culture is relatively different. This implies we are different and similar at the same time.

⁶Gebser's semiotic analysis of comparative elimination is extremely beneficial for cross-cultural communication. We presume each culture has its own logic (e.g., collectivistic in Japan, individualistic in the US). However, culture is not fixed. Rather it is always transforming just like we are transforming. It is important to notice culture is a manifestation of logic as well as the process of cultivating logic itself. Culture is a process as well as an effect. Japanese 100 years ago are very different from the present Japanese. In fact, when we use humans as the prime source to examine the cross cultural differences, many problems arise. Instead of using people as a prime source, comparing the manifestation of various kinds of cultural artifacts made in a culture to the manifestation of those in another culture seems to be a reasonable way to examine the differences and the similarities between the two cultures. The semiotic analysis of cultural artifacts also helps us to examine the transformation of a culture without speculation. In any case, Gebser's comparative cultural semiotics (i.e., cultural phenomenology) is a latent method in studying both intracultural, cross-cultural and intercultural communication in a unique and a meaningful manner.

of the integration of two different structures of awareness. A semiotic analysis of intercultural artifacts is a latent method of understanding the reality of intercultural communication. This method can help us understand the complex and hidden reality of intercultural communication⁷.

Latent Topics in Intercultural Communication

As the final aspect of latency, it is now possible to suggest some latent topics in intercultural communication. It is obvious that one of the predominant areas in intercultural communication has been devoted to (perspectival) solutions (e.g., various forms of intercultural training, intercultural effectiveness, intercultural communication competence, intercultural adaptation) to the problems associated with culture differences. Particularly, intercultural communication effectiveness/competence has been one of the major topics in the current "globalizing" late-modernity. However, the studies of communication effectiveness or competence are creating new problems in an uncanny manner rather than offering a solution.

While studying effectiveness does help in facilitating the process of intercultural communication, it requires more careful consideration (especially about ethics) than we realize. There is a latent area which has been missing in the field of intercultural communication. While effectiveness in intercultural

⁷For instance, a semiotic analysis of various kinds of multicultural organization (by analyzing the forms of its organization) might signify something interesting about the reality of intercultural communication. While a semiotic analysis is a latent method to study intercultural communication, phenomenological method and historical method, such as a biographic textual analysis, are also latent methods. One example might be a historical and biographic analysis of diaries kept by people whose life was in a transitional era. A Japanese' diary, which was written about experiences in the transition era between Edo and Meiji eras, is about intercultural experiences related to the revolutionary change of cultural logic. This example definitely offers interesting insight to the area of intercultural communication. Finally, here it is also important to notice that many of the cultural artifacts are, in fact, intercultural in nature. We are already always cultivating our culture through interactions with other people (i.e., other cultures/other logics/other ways of understanding).

communication has been a dominant topic, meaningful intercultural communication is a latent topic area. Instead of attempting to facilitate effective and efficient communication as a goal, we must investigate how different people meaningfully engaging in intercultural communication in different ways. In reality, people manage culture differences in their own ways. The way they manage culture differences might not be effective. But different people have their own unique and meaningful ways and styles to deal with culture differences.

People are different. Some are effective, while others are less effective at intercultural communication. Nevertheless, everybody experiences and deals with this in his or her own way. People have their own ways to adjust to a different and new environment. Investigating the people's unique styles of adjustment, for example, seems to be more valuable than searching for the ultimate way of intercultural adaptation. Investigating different people's⁸ different manners of engaging in intercultural communication in reality correlates to investigating their unique management of their identity. Meaningful intercultural communication is a latent topic.

Another latent topic is the variation in forms of conflict of culture logics between the traditional and the new. This issue is crucial. Any form of diffusion (e.g., technological or transformational) of multiple culture logics are always already intercultural. This topic is appropriate in the area of intercultural communication, but it has been a latent topic⁹.

⁸Different people. here. implies not only do different people from other cultures but also different people from within the same home boundary. This leads to another latent topic, which is the native's intercultural communication. Not only different people from different cultures experience intercultural communication differently, different people from the same boundary experience it differently. So called "host" nationals' intercultural communication has been a latent topic. People have tended to presume intercultural communication as strangers' intercultural communication.

⁹Another latent topic is communication in a transition era. In any transition era, multiple structures of awareness and the corresponding multiple cultural logics appear themselves. The

A Latent Meaning of Intercultural Communication

When we hear "intercultural communication," we probably associate it with a sort of communication event between us and somebody who is from a foreign nation. Of course, such a case tends to make the communication intercultural. While we might experience various differences and difficulties in understanding each other, we sometimes discover similarities in an unexpected manner. Even when we feel we have nothing in common in an intercultural communication, we accidentally find out some similarities or commonness in the event once in a while. We find out we are not as different as we expected. We had once believed that we and the others are so different that we have nothing in common. But, in fact, we have some similarities. We are surprised by the fact we are not that different. We tend to forget about the fundamental similarities which have always already existed among us in a latent manner.

On the other hand, when we communicate with a spouse, we do not usually perceive the event as "intercultural communication." We presume to understand each other. However, once in a while, we experience differences and conflicts in an opinion or a belief in a totally unexpected manner. Spouses think they knew each other well enough, but later become convinced otherwise. We are surprised by the fact we are not as familiar about each other as we expected. In a sense, we tend to easily forget we are different. We also forget people change as times go by. The essence of each individual has never been the same.

conflict of multiple logics appear through various phenomena. Particularly, any phenomena which manifest the conflict of different cultural logics are always already intercultural.

The above two scenarios make us recall we are always already different as well as similar. Not only are we not very different but also we are not very similar. Human communication is always already potentially intercultural. In short, a phenomenon of so called "intercultural communication" is the very experience which allows us to remember our latent human similarities and our latent human diversity. This dynamic mixture of human similarities and human diversity makes the human world always already unique, meaningful, vital, and above all intercultural. We do not have to be intercultural. Rather, **we are always already intercultural**. Living as a human being in a human world always already makes the essence of human existence in a state of being intercultural.

References

- Adler, P. S. (1975). The transition experience: An alternative view of culture shock. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15(4), 13-23.
- Adler, P. S. (1982). Beyond cultural identity: Reflections on cultural and multicultural man. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (pp. 389-408). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Adler, P. S. (1987). Culture shock and the cross-cultural learning experience. In L. F. Luce & E. C. Smith (Eds.), Toward Internationalism (pp. 24-35). Cambridge, MA: Newbury.
- Anonymous (1946). US Foreign Service. Fortune Magazine, 34, 81-86, 198-207.
- Asante, M. K., Newmark, E., & Blake, C. A. (Eds.). (1979). Handbook of intercultural communication. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Asante, M. K., & Gudykunst, W. B. (Eds.). (1989). Handbook of international and intercultural communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Barnes, W., & Morgan, J. H. (1961). The foreign service of the US: Origins, development and functions. Washiton, D.C.: Department of State.
- Barthes, R. (1972). Mythologies. (A. Lavers Trans.). New York, NY: Hill and Wang. (Original work published 1957)
- Benedict, R. (1941). Race problems in America. Annals of the American Academy of Political Sciences. 216.
- Berger, C., & Calabrese, R. (1975). Some explanations in initial interaction and beyond. Human Communication Research, 1, 99-112.
- Bernstein, R. J. (1976). The restructuring of social and political theory. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Bernstein, R. J. (1983). Beyond objectivism and relativism: Science, hermeneutics, and praxis. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Blanche, W. W. (1969). The foreign service of the United States. London, England: Praeger.
- Broome, B. J. (1991). Building shared meaning: Implications of a relational approach to empathy for teaching intercultural communication. Communication Education, 40, 235-249.
- Casimir, F. (Ed.). (1978). Intercultural and international communication. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Casimir, F. (1993). Third-culture Building: A paradigm shift for international and intercultural communication. In Communication Yearbook 16 (pp. 407-428). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Casimir, F., & Asuncion-Lande, N. C. (1989). Intercultural communication revised: Conceptualization, paradigm building, and methodological approaches. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 12 (pp. 278-309). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Collier, M. J., & Thomas, M. (1988). Cultural identity: An interpretive approach. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication (pp. 99-120). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Condon, J. (1981). Values and ethics in communication across cultures: Some notes on the north American case. Communication, 6, 255-265.
- Culler, J. D. (1982). On deconstruction. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Dance, F., & Larson, C. E. (1976). The functions of human communication: A theoretical approach. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Di Mare, L. (1994). The problematic of culture critique in communication studies. Paper presented at the Western State Communication Association, Albuquerque.
- Dodd, C. H. (1982). Dynamics of intercultural communication. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Company.
- Durant, W. (1961). The age of reason begins: A history of European civilization in the period of Shakespeare, Bacon, Montaigne, Rembrandt, Galileo, and Descartes: 1558-1648. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Ellingsworth, H. W. (1977). Conceptualizing intercultural communication. In B. Ruben (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 1. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Fisher, B. A. (1979). On building theory in communication: problems, polemics, and priorities. Paper presented at International Communication Association, Philadelphia.
- Foucault, M. (1970). The order of things. (Les Mots et les choses Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1966)
- Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge. (A. M. S. Smith Trans). New York, NY: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969)
- Freud, S. (1925). The uncanny (A. Strachey Trans.) in A. Strachey (Ed.), Complete psychological works, 4, 219-252. (Original work published 1919)
- Gadamer, H. (1989). Truth and method. (2nd rev. ed.). (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall Trans.). New York: The Continuum Publishing Company. (Original work published 1960)

- Gebser, J. (1985). The ever-present origin. (N. Barstad & A. Mickunas Trans.) Athens, OH: Ohio University Press. (Original work published 1949 and 1953)
- Gudykunst, W. B. (Ed.). (1983). Intercultural communication theory: Current perspectives. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1985). Intercultural communication: Current status and proposed directions. In B. Dervin & M. J. Voigt, (Eds.), Progress in communication sciences, Volume 6 (pp. 1-46). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Cooperation.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1986). Toward a theory of intergroup communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intergroup Communication. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1988). Uncertainty and anxiety. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication (pp. 123-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1991). Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1993). Toward a theory of effective interpersonal and intergroup communication: An anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) perspective. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), Intercultural Communication Competence, (pp. 33-72). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1995). Anxiety/Uncertainty management (AUM) theory: Current status. In R. L. Wisemen (Ed.), Intercultural Communication Theory, (pp. 8-58). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M. R. (1988). Strangers and hosts. In Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Cross-cultural adaptation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1984) Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication. New York: Random House.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1992). Communicating with strangers (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1981). Constructing a theory of intercultural communication: The promise and paradox. In T. Nishida & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Readings in intercultural communication. Tokyo, Japan: Geirin-Shobo Publishing Co.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1989). Theoretical perspectives for studying intercultural communication. In M. K Asante & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Handbook of international and intercultural communication (pp. 17-46). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Wiseman, R., & Hammer, M. (1977). Determinants of a sojourner's attitudinal satisfaction. In B. Ruben (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 1, New Brunswick, N. J.: Transaction.
- Gullahorn, J. T., & Gullahorn, J. E. (1963). An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. Journal of Social Issues, 19(3), 33-47.
- Habermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and human interests. (J. J. Shapiro Trans.) Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1968)
- Habermas, J. (1973). Theory and practice. (J. Viertel Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1971)

- Hall, B. J. (1992). Theories of culture and communication. Communication Theory, 2, 50-70.
- Hall, E. T. (1950). Military government on Truk. Human Organization, 9, 25-30.
- Hall, E. T. (1956). Orientation and training in government for work overseas. Human Organization, 15, 4-10.
- Hall, E. T. (1959). The silent language. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company.
- Hall, E. T. (1964). Adumbration in intercultural communication. American Anthropologist, 66, 154-163.
- Hall, E. T. (1966). The hidden dimension. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Hall, E. T. (1984). The dance of life: The other dimension of time. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company.
- Hall, E. T. (1992). An anthropology of everyday life: An autobiography. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T., & Whyte, W. F. (1960). Intercultural communication: A guide to men of action. Human Organization, 19, 5-12.
- Hamaguchi, E., & Kumon, S. (Eds.). (1982). *Nihonteki Shuudanshugi* (Japanese way of Collectivism) Tokyo: Yuuhikaku.
- Hammer, M. R. (1989). Intercultural communication competence. In M. K. Asante & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Handbook of international and intercultural communication (pp. 247-260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hashimoto, M. (1975). "Ukiyoe" no shisoo (Philosophy of "Floating World") Tokyo: Koodansha.

- Hawes, F., & Kealey, D. J. (1981). An empirical study of Canadian technical assistance: Adaptation and effectiveness on overseas assignment. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5, 239-259.
- Hertz, N. (1979). Freud and the sandman. In J. H. Ithaca (Ed.), Textual strategies (pp. 296-321). New York, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1985). History of the concept of time. (T. Kisiel Trans.) Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. (Original work published 1979)
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Cultures consequences. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions. In J. Deregowski, S. Dzuirawiec, & R. Annis (Eds.), Explications in cross-cultural psychology. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Hojoo, A. (1978). Nihon no dentoo kooqei (Japanese traditional arts). Tokyo: Koodansha.
- Horkheimer, M. (1974). Eclipse of reason. New York, NY: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Howell, W. S. (1979). Theoretical directions for intercultural communication. In M. Asante, E. Newmark, & C. E. Blake (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural communication. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Humboldt, W. von. (1971). Linguistic variability and intellectual development. (G. C. Buck & F. A. Raven Trans.). Coral Gables: University of Miami Press. (Original work published 1836)
- Husserl, E. (1962). Ideas: General introduction to a pure phenomenology. (W. R. B. Gibson Trans.). New York, NY: Collier Books. (Original work published 1913)

- Husserl, E. (1970). The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology: An introduction to phenomenological philosophy. (D. Carr Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1954)
- Husserl, E. (1973). Experience and judgment: Investigations in a genealogy of logic. (J. S. Churchill & K. Ameriks Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1948)
- Inoue, T. (1982). *Nihongo ni okeru shuudan no gainen* (The Conception of Group in Japanese Language) In E. Hamaguchi & S. Kumon (Eds.). Nihonteki Shuudanshugi (Japanese Way of Collectivism) (pp. 27-46) Tokyo: Yuuhikaku.
- Irvine, K. (1970). The rise of the colored races. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Jain, N. C., Prosser, M., & Miller, M. (1974). (Eds.). Intercultural communication: Proceeding of the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference. New York: Speech Communication Association.
- Kim, Y. (1984). Searching for creative integration. In W. B. Gudykunst & Y. Kim (Eds.), Methods for intercultural communication reseach (pp. 13-30). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kim, Y. (1988). Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Kim, Y. Y. (1991). Intercultural communication competence: A systems-theoretic view. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), Cross-cultural interpersonal communication (pp. 259-275). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Kim, Y. Y. (1993). Synchrony and intercultural communication: An exploration. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Washington, DC.
- Kim, Y. Y., & Ruben, B. (1988). Intercultural transformation: A system theory. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication (pp. 299-321). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kincaid, D. L. (1988). The convergence theory and intercultural communication. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication (pp. 280-298). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Klopf, D. W. (1987). Intercultural encounters: The fundamentals of intercultural communications. Englewood, NJ: Morton Publishing Company.
- Kramer, M. E. (1992). (Ed.). Consciousness and culture. Westport, CN: Greenwood.
- Kramer, M. E. (1993-3-16). Personal communication.
- Kramer, M. E., & Mickunas, A. (1992). Introduction: Gebser's new understanding. In M. E. Kramer (Ed.), Consciousness and culture. Westport, CN: Greenwood.
- Kramer, M. E., & Ikeda, R. (1994). Deficient perspectival consciousness and the American gun culture: The case of Yoshi Hattori. Paper presented at the annual convention of Japan Communication Association, Tama City, Tokyo.
- 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, 262-281.

- Levine, D. (1979). Simmel at a distance. In W. Shack & E. Skinner (Eds.), Strangers in African societies. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (1993). Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures. NY: Harper Collins.
- Lanigan, R. (1988). Phenomenology of communication. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Lanigan, R. (1992). The human science of communicology. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Lustig, M. W., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1993). Methodological issues in the study of intercultural communication competence. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), Intercultural Communication Competence, (pp. 3-16). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Maletzke, G. (1976). Intercultural and international communication. In H. D. Fischer & J. C. Merrill (Eds.), International and Intercultural Communication. New York, NY: Hastings House.
- Marden, C. F., & Meyer, G. (1968). Minorities in America. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Martin, L. J. (1976). The contradiction of intercultural communication. In H. D. Fisher & J. C. Merrill (Eds.), International and intercultural communication. New York, NY: Hastings House.
- Martin, J. N. (1987). The relationship between student sojourner perceptions of intercultural competencies and previous sojourner experience. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 11, 337-355.
- Martin, J. N. (Ed.). (1989). Intercultural communication competence. International and Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13.

- Martin, J. N. (1993). Intercultural communication competence: A review. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), Intercultural Communication Competence, (pp. 16-33). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McLuhan, M. (1962). The gutenber galaxy. Canada: The University of Toronto Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Phenomenology of perception. (C. Smith, Trsns.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. (Original work published 1962)
- Miller, J. H. (1976). Stevens' rock and criticism as cure. Georgia Review, 30, 5-33 (part I), 330-348.
- Murphy, J. W., & Min Choi, J. (1992). Jean Gebser, the commonweal, and the politics of difference. In E. M. Kramer (Ed.), Consciousness and culture (pp. 201-215). Westport, CN: Greenwood.
- Nadamitsu, Y. (1996). Similar or different: A cross-cultural communication study of the group consciousness of Chinese and Japanese. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Oklahoma, Norman.
- Nakayama, O. (1988). "Bokashi" no Shinri (Psychology of "Ambiguity") Osaka: Soogensha, INC.
- Nietzsche, F. (1974). The gay science (W. Kaufmann Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1887)
- Nishida, H. (1985). Japanese intercultural communication competence and cross-cultural adjustment. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 9, 247-269.
- Noth, W. (1995). Handbook of semiotics. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

- Nwanko, R. L. (1979). Intercultural communication: A critical review. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 65, 324-346.
- Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. Practical Anthropology, 7, 170-179.
- Okabe, R. (1983). Cultural assumptions of East and West: Japan and the United States. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intercultural communication theory: A current perspectives. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Okutsu, F. (1978). Eigono Kotowaza: Nihongo no Kotowaza to no Hikaku (English Proverbs: Comparison with Japanese Proverb
Hikaku Tokyo: The Simul Press, INC.
- Palmer, R. E. (1969). Hermeneutics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Partridge, E. (1958). Origins: A short etymological dictionary of modern English. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Parsons, T. (1953). The social system. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Popper, K. R. (1968). The logic of scientific discovery. New York, NY: Science Editions, Inc.
- Prosser, M. H. (1978). The cultural dialogue. Boston: houghton Mifflin Co.
- Redfield, R., Ralph, L., and Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Outline for the study of acculturation. American Anthoropologist, 38, 149-152.
- Roberts, J. M. (1995). A concise history of the world. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (1994). A history of communication study: A biographic approach. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Ruben, B. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. Group & Organization Studies, 1(3), 334-354.

- Ruben, B., & Kealey, D. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3, 15-47.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (1972). Intercultural communication: A reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (2nd rev. eds.). (1976). Intercultural communication: A reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.
- Saral, T. (1977). Intercultural communication: An overview. In B Ruben (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 1. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Sarbaugh, L. E. (1978). Intercultural communication. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden Book Company, INC.
- Schuetz, A. (1944). The stranger. American Journal of Sociology, 50, 369-376.
- Shibatani, T., & Kwan, K. M. (1965). Ethnic stratification: A comparative approach. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Shimode, S. (1975). Dookyoo to Nihonjin (Taoism and Japanese) Tokyo: Koodansha.
- Singer, M. R. (1987). Intercultural communication: A theoretical approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (1989). Issues in the development of a theory of interpersonal competence in the intercultural context. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13, 241-268.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). Interpersonal communication competence. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Stewart, E. C. (1974). Intercultural communication. In N. C. Jain & M. Schlow (Eds.), Intercultural Communication: Proceedings of the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference. New York, Speech Communication Association.
- Stewart, E. C. (1978). Outline of intercultural communication. In F. Casmir (Ed.), Intercultural and international communication. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Stewart, D., & Mickunas, A. (1990). Exploring phenomenology: A guide to the field and its literature. (2nd ed.). Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. Journal of Social Issues, 41(3), 157-176.
- Steigman, A. (1985). The foreign service of the United States: First line of defense. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Tagore, R. (1961). Toward universal man. New York: Asia Publishing House.
- Takarori, M. (1975). Nihontekishikoo no Genkei (Original Pattern of Japanese Thinking). Tokyo: Koodansha.
- Toynbee, A. (1957). A study of history. London: Oxford University Press.
- Useem, J., Useem, R. H., & Donoghue, J. D. (1963). Men in the middle of the third culture: The roles of American and non-western people in cross-cultural administration. Human Organization, 22, 169-179.
- Walsh, A. (1973), Intercultural education in the community of man. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Watabiki, H. (1993). Sekai no rekishi ga wakaru hon (A book for understanding world history). Tokyo. Mikasa.

- Williams, R. (1967). Culture and civilization. Encyclopedia of philosophy vol. II, pp. 273-276. New York: Macmillan.
- Williamson, J. (1978). Decoding advertisements: Ideology and meaning in advertising. Lacy Road, London: Marion Boyars Publishers Ltd.
- Wiseman, R. L., & Koester, J. (Eds.). (1993). Intercultural communication competence. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Zimmer, B. G. (1955). Participation of migrants in urban structure. American Sociological Review, 20, 218-224.

Appendix

Historical "Intercultural" Activities

The field of "intercultural communication" attempts to understand other cultures and the complex process of interaction among people from different cultures. Although this interactive process has not been problematized and studied in a scientific manner, people have been trying to understand other cultures since the dawn of human civilization with different motives. While some tried to understand other cultures because of a political motive such as a diplomatic activity, others did so because of a religious motive such as a missionary activity. Others were motivated to understand other cultures based on a commercial motive such as trading, while some were motivated to explore new worlds and new civilizations out of pure curiosity. The point is that people have long been making conscious efforts to understand and learn other cultures (e.g., languages and customs). They wrote chronicles about each other's habits and ways with various motives, not unlike modern anthropologists. In a way, the activities of the modern intercultural scholars are neither original nor new, although their way (and their motive) for investigating "intercultural" phenomena as a field may be somewhat new. Many people have been engaged in intercultural activities throughout the history of human civilization in various places in various historical epochs. Therefore, acknowledging intercultural activities which have been taken place throughout the history of human civilization is significant, although it is impossible to complete the task in an exhaustive manner. Therefore, this appendix attempts to acknowledge some of

these intercultural activities (e.g., diplomacy and missionary) which have taken place historically. The point is not to review the entire history of "intercultural" activities thoroughly, but to recognize how "intercultural communication" as a field has been a part of our history.

Diplomacy

Exploring new worlds and understanding other cultures might not be the primary motive for diplomacy. Nevertheless, diplomacy¹ means "the maintenance of official relations between tribes and people" (Numelin², 1950, p. 124). This activity necessarily involves minimum consideration toward others (e.g., other tribes, others from different cultures) which requires deliberate efforts to achieve its goal (i.e., to maintain peaceful relations with other tribes and nations). Its history, as Magalhaes³ (1988), Nicholson⁴ (1954, 1963), and Numelin (1950) argue, can be traced back to the dawn of history. Numelin (1950), for instance, in his profound and well documented study, The Beginnings of Diplomacy, contends that diplomatic activities began during the so-called Classic Antiquity, or even among the peoples of the Orient, such as China, or India. He even states that it can be traced back to primitive surroundings, and that its roots may be found among the the primitive peoples in Asia, the Negroes

1. A word "diplomacy" is etymologically derived from a French "diplomatie" which means the maintenance of external relations, or the art and manner of conducting international affair. This can be traced further back to a Greek word "diploma" which is adopted in Latin. "Diploma" was a paper folded double (Partridge, 1958) which was a document which conferred certain privileges upon the bearer and the name originally refers to the folding of the document. A word "ambassador" and "embassy" on the other hand have the same etymological origin which is a Latin "ambi" which means "on both side or all around" which implies the interactive nature of the word. Regarding etymology, see Eric Partridge's (1958) Origins: A short etymological dictionary of modern English. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

2. Numelin, R. (1950). The beginnings of diplomacy. London: Oxford University Press.

3. Magalhaes, J. C. D. (1988). The pure concept of diplomacy. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

4. Nicholson, H. (1954). The evolution of diplomatic method. London: Cassell.

Nicholson, H. (1963). Diplomacy. London: Oxford University Press.

of Africa, the Indians of North and South America, the stone age inhabitants of the Australian steppes, and the island-dwellers of Oceania. It appears that even among the most primitive peoples, there were certain complex patterns of mutual interest which are a condition of contact. As long as human communities existed side by side, not in a permanent state of enmity (and sometimes even then), certain rudimentary forms of diplomacy evolved. According to Numelin (1950), "it has been necessary for the leaders of primitive societies (kings, chiefs, councils of elders) to maintain some sort of mutual relations, first through occasional messengers, later through envoys and other suchlike representatives" (p. 13). Similarly, Phillipson⁵ (1911/1979) argues that more or less systematic interchange of embassies and the related diplomatic practices already took place among the peoples of the most distant antiquity. The earliest treaty of detailed record, for instance, is the settlement of a boundary dispute completed in 2850 BC between the city states of Lagash and Unna and of Shatt-el-Hai in Babylon (Numelin, 1950). The first international treaty of which a full text is preserved was completed in 1280 BC between Ramses II, king of Egypt and Chetasar (Hattushilish III), prince of Hittites (Magalhaes, 1988; Numelin, 1950). Historically Egypt seemed to make continuous deliberate efforts to maintain diplomatic relations with its neighbors (e.g., Babylon, Assyria, Hatti, Cyprus, et cetera). Baikie⁶ (1929) and Velikovskiy⁷ (1952) point out that especially during the days between Amenhotep III (1411-1375 BC, a king of Egypt) and Amenhotep IV (1375-1358 BC, a King of Egypt), the world around Egypt was marked by constant and well-regulated international relationships. In fact, the ruins of

⁵. Phillipson, C. (1979). The international law and custom of ancient Greek and Rome. (reprint edition, originally published in 1911). New York: Arno Press.

⁶. Baikie, J. (1929). A history of Egypt (vol. II). London.

⁷. Velikovskiy, I. (1952). Agas in chaos (vol. I). Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

Akhenaten's capital of Akhetaten (i.e., Amenhotep IV), including the library or muniment-room of his Foreign Office, were found in 1887. Baikie (1929) in his book, History of Egypt, argues that such findings imply that Egypt and her neighbors were in regular correspondence with one another, where diplomatic envoys were continually coming and going, where the issues of passports and safe conducts is part of the regular duty of the respective Foreign Offices, where commercial intercourse was shepherded by frontier-guards and was subject to the inspection of customs officials. Ancient Egyptians seems to have made a continuous effort to maintain diplomatic relations in a systematic manner; they even recognized the need of Foreign Offices. Diplomacy, as a form of "intercultural activities" has been taking place since the ancient time.

Missionary⁸ Activity

Diffusing culture also takes place through organized missionary activities. Missionaries have been diffusing their religions (e.g., Christianity, Buddhism, Islam, et cetera) and their cultures throughout the history of religion. It is no doubt that all the great religions of the world were spread by missionaries, but none of them seems to be completely dominated by the missionary idea with the exception of Christian religion. De Vaulx⁹ (1961) and Wissler¹⁰ (1923) similarly contend that conscious and organized missionary work is one of the dominating characters in cultures of the Euro-American type. Wissler (1923) also argues that missionaries have braved the greatest dangers to carry the missions (i.e., to

⁸. The word, "mission" has a Latin origin "mittere" which means to let go, cause to go, or to send. "Mittere" changed to another Latin "missio" (i.e., a sending, a release, discharge) which is the direct origin of mission (i.e., persons sent, especially on a religious duty). Mission, therefore, seems to connote deliberate movement toward certain direction. See Partridge (1958) for etymological information.

⁹. De Vaulx, B. (1961). History of the missions. New York: Hawthorn Books.

¹⁰. Wissler, C. (1923). Man and culture. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

teach men in the farthest corners of the earth about the universal democracy of the righteous life) of Christian belief to non-believing peoples. St. Paul's missionary journeys (4 different journeys) cover from Jerusalem to Rome during the first century.

Organized missionary activities¹¹ in non-Western regions, on the other hand, have also been popular especially between China and India. For instance, a Buddhist monk, Kumarajura, joined disseminators of Mahayanist Buddhist teachings in China in AD 386. Similarly, from the fifth century, Buddhist missionary efforts have existed in Ceylon, Kapila, and the Gupta kingdom through the exchange of embassies. The first recorded pilgrimage in China, on the other hand, was that of Fa Hsien. He reached India and spent 10 years there and visited Ceylon before returning to Tsung-chou by sea in 414. Such pilgrimages were very popular in the late 7th century in China. This religious activity is best exemplified by Hsuan Tsang who began 16 years of travel to India in 671 AD only for the sake of searching for religious truth not for wealth or fame. When he returned to China with other monks, they brought 75 Buddhist texts from India. This was an organized and conscious effort to learn from other cultures.

Other Forms of Intercultural Activities¹²

There are many other forms of intercultural activities besides diplomacy and missionary activity. Geographical exploration is one example. Historically, people have tried to explore new worlds out of pure curiosity. The Chinese, for example, were successful explorers with deliberate and conscious efforts until the

¹¹The major source in this section is The Times Atlas of World Exploration (1991). Harper Collins Publishers.

¹²The major source of information in this section is The Times Atlas of World Exploration (1991). Harper Collins Publishers.

15th century AD. The exploration of Central Asia, for instance, began with the mission to Bactria of Chang Ch'ien in 138 BC. Chang Ch'ien, who was an ambassador of the Emperor at that time, reported situations in Central Asia, the Middle East, and even Egypt. His information about other worlds (and other cultures) stimulated Chinese imperial missions. Eventually, Chang Ch'ien's journey route became a "Silk Road," which is known for caravans journeying from China to Persia from 106 BC.

Map making activity is another example of intercultural activity relating to geographic exploration. People try to explore new worlds and make maps so that they can identify their spatial location in relation to others. In a sense, any kind of map making activity seems to be a conscious and systematic attempt to understand new worlds (and other cultures). Such map making (intercultural activities) activities took place in various places (e.g., China, India, Islamic world, the Greco-Roman World, etc.) and in different epochs (from the ancient till now). Islamic world, for example, tried to master such a geographic wisdom since the ancient days. The Babylonian map, which is a stone tablet, demonstrates the vast geographic knowledge of Islamic world around 400 BC including Babylon, Assyria, and Armenia in cuneiform script. Anyhow, understanding different kinds of map making activities in different epochs appears to be an interesting project in terms of understanding different cultures' world views.

Trading activity is another important form of intercultural communication. People have been interacting with each other for trading purposes across geographic regions in different epochs. Although trading activities have taken place since the dawn of human civilization (Numelin, 1950), the prime was reached in the 13th and 14th centuries when the Mongolian conquest of China,

Persia, Central Asia, much of Russia, and the Middle East directly linked Europe and eastern Asia for the first time in history. Foreign merchants sought Chinese goods (e.g., Asian silk, spices, etc.) anticipating great fortunes they might get from China through the famous "Silk Road." Such foreign merchants appeared to have kept chronicles about different cultures. These chronicles about new worlds probably stimulated many Europeans' interests in Asian silk, spices, and other luxury goods. Descriptions of the wealth of the East, whether real or imagined, in turn propelled many foreign merchants to travel to the new world (the East). Marco Polo's chronicles about foreign worlds, by far, is the most renowned one. With commercial interests, merchants historically have been "intercultural" explorers. They learned about other cultures, brought information about them, and stimulated others' interests in new and different worlds.

In summary, people have been exploring and learning about new and different cultures since the dawn of human civilization in different forms of activities (e.g., diplomacy, missionary, map making activity, trading activity, etc.) all over the world. Such activities are conscious, deliberate, and highly systematic efforts of "intercultural communication" rather than simple and random activities. Intercultural communication, in other words, has been taking place long before it was established as an academic field of study. Although this supplement only acknowledges some of the historical "intercultural" activities through several illustrations, obviously so called "intercultural communication" as an independent academic field owes a great deal to our history of various forms of "intercultural activities." Ignoring such a rich history of "historical intercultural"

activities only means a lack of our academic integrity and of self-understanding. History is, after all, ever-present as Gebser¹³ (1949/1985) contends.

¹³ Gebser, J. (1959/1985). Ever-present origin. (Original work published in 1949) Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.