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AMONG THE INTERCULTURALISTS
An Emergent Profession and its Packaging of Knowledge

Tommy Dahlén
Abstract
This study deals with a transnational occupational culture of consultants, who call themselves interculturalists, and who provide training and consulting in how to communicate with people from different cultures. In this endeavor they have produced a variety of products in order to convey an understanding of and sensitivity towards cultural differences, such as intercultural communication workshops, simulation games on culture clashes, videos and how-to books. There is also an international organization of interculturalists called SIETAR (Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research), which aims at providing a professional identity for the interculturalists.

The focus of this study is on the professionalization of the interculturalists and its relationship to the way they conceptualize and represent culture and cultural differences. The view put forward here is that the professionalization of the interculturalists takes place in the marketplace, since it is here that their professional status is displayed. It is through the packaging and marketing of their services and products that the interculturalists display their professional legitimacy. This has consequences for the ways in which they conceptualize and represent culture.

There is also a close proximity between the intercultural field and anthropology, which makes for some interesting observations with respect to the concept of culture. There is a strong tendency among the interculturalists to borrow notions of culture from American cultural anthropology from the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. A reason for this is that such a concept of culture is easy to package and market. The current study also focuses on this relationship.

Fieldwork was carried out from 1990 up until the completion of the book, in different locales in the West. The main methods used were participant observation, reading and viewing different media products circulating among the interculturalists, and interviews.
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Introduction: Interculturalist Scenes

A workshop

About twenty people, of different nationalities, are gathered together for a one-day workshop on managing cultural differences in international business. The workshop takes place in a room on the ground floor of a magnificent house, located just outside a European capital city. The house belongs to a consulting agency, specializing in different kinds of language courses, which has recently started offering courses on cross-cultural encounters as well. Most of the participants are business people, but there are also language teachers and high school students attending the workshop, which is held in English. The room is furnished with chairs in rows, facing a table and an overhead projector.

Jim Mullen, the workshop facilitator, is a middle-aged man with many years of experience as a language teacher. He welcomes his audience and says that this workshop is going to be cross-cultural. Then he asks from which countries the participants come. The answers he gets are: France, Sweden, Germany, South America, and the United States. To which Jim comments:

"The French and Germans and Americans don't act the same or think the same. It is hard to know what is going on inside. Culture is inside you, the only way to know about it is by seeing what people say and do. For example,
when a woman comes into a room the men rise, this displays cultural values... If I blow my nose here, would you be offended? No, but a Japanese would laugh if I blow my nose in public. They would leave the room and do that in the toilet. It is all kept very secret. It is a cultural rule.

The members of the audience agree with Jim, saying yes, yes.

Later on Jim defines culture as "collective mental programming," and shows an overhead picture with the headline "human mental programming." The picture shows a triangle, horizontally divided into three areas, with "USA" written above it. On the left side of the lowest area is written "common to mankind," and on its right side it says "inherited." On the left side of the middle area is written "American collective programming," and on the right side "learned." On the left side of the top area is written "individual," and on the right side "deviants." Each area is also filled in with text:

**Common to mankind:**

- love of young
- anger at injustice
- survival

- wants to be liked
- gratitude for favours
- procreation

Pointing at this area, Jim says, "all these things are natural feelings all humans have." He then points to the middle area and says it is here that we find culture:

**American collective programming:**

- frontier spirit
- individualism
- sense of speed

- democracy
- self-reliance
- future-orientation

- free trade
- pragmatism
- competitive spirit

The top area, "individual" is empty. Jim comments on the list of American "cultural traits:"
"They conquered this vast area. This lives on in America, and gave rise to pragmatism. You need to know how to cook over a fire, make a fire... Democracy, free trade, individualism, are all written into the Constitution... If you were not quick with your gun, someone would shoot you. This shows the sense of speed, and it goes with frontier spirit... These are characteristics that you see in business meetings with Americans."

Some of the workshop participants offer supporting evidence, telling anecdotes from their own experience of having done business with Americans. They say that Americans are individualistic, pragmatic and competitive. The workshop ends with the participants drawing and filling in similar diagrams for other cultures, and then discussing cultural differences.

**Bamga: a simulation game of culture clashes**

A deck of cards lies at the center of each of ten small tables, spread out in a big room. Four people sit around each table. They are about to play a simulation game of cultural clashes, called "Bamga." The setting is a workshop on using simulation games to encourage new management skills, held at one of the SIETAR International congresses. SIETAR (Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research) is an international organization of trainers, consultants, educators and researchers, who offer practical knowledge on how to interact and communicate with people from different cultures.

The game is run by Susan and Phyllis, two experienced trainers and consultants in intercultural communication. The participants are also all trainers and consultants in this field, but at different levels of experience. They are here to learn new techniques they can use in their own work.

Susan and Phyllis hand out sheets of paper stating the rules of the game. When all the participants have read the rules, Susan says, she
and her colleague will collect the sheets, and people can start playing.

"During the game you are not allowed to talk to each other. You are to play together with the person sitting opposite you. You can communicate by gesticulating or drawing pictures. Let's have a minute of practice."

People read the instructions for the game, which is called "Five Tricks," and start practising. Decks are shuffled and cards handed out. The purpose of the game is to win tricks. No one says a word, and the only sound in the room is the shuffling of cards. During the practice, Susan and Phyllis walk around and collect the instruction sheets.

After the participants have practiced for a while, Susan tells them that this is going to be a tournament. During the game, she says, she will stop it and ask two people from each table to move to an adjacent table. "Let the tournament begin." Decks are shuffled again, cards are handed out, and the game starts. There is no sound other then the shuffling of cards and the winning of tricks. After a while the game is stopped, and then two people from each table are told to move. When this is done the game continues.

This time one can hear how people start mumbling. No one says a word, but at some tables one can see people trying to communicate with each other by drawing pictures or gesticulating. It goes on until Susan once again asks people to change tables. The same thing happens again. People try to communicate with each other non-verbally. It becomes obvious that they are having trouble understanding each other.

When this has gone on for a while, and all have had a chance to change tables, the game is halted. Now people start talking loudly with each other, asking if they did not understand the rules, or what. Some show frustration, others anger, while some have figured out that each table has been given a different set of rules.

Now Susan and Phyllis ask the players how they felt. Responses are: "curious," "unsure," "frustrated when confronting new experiences," "conflict around power." Susan responds that "every reaction is legitimate." She also comments on the use of the game in training:
"When using this game it is important to let the participants share their thoughts and feelings. Then one moves from describing how it is to play this game, to how it is in reality. How one feels when confronting real foreign situations and events."

_Saudi Arabia on video_

Copeland Griggs is a company which develops training materials to help people understand foreign cultures. Their products, distributed worldwide, include video films. In one series called _Going International_, the second title is _Managing the Overseas Assignment_. This is the company’s summary description of the film:

"Dramatically portrays communication problems anyone can experience in foreign situations. Examples of U.S. travelers in countries as diverse as Japan, Saudi Arabia, England, India and Mexico illustrate how cultural taboos and accepted standards of behavior differ around the world. Nationals of the featured countries and cross-cultural experts explain how travelers can adapt their communication skills and personal conduct to be more effective abroad. 30 minutes."

The first foreign culture to be dealt with in this video is that of Saudi Arabia. We see an American businessman sitting on a pillow between two Saudi men drinking coffee. He does not seem to like the coffee, and finishes it in one gulp. Then he takes out what looks like a time manager and starts looking in it. The two Saudi men sip their coffee with a solemn expression on their faces. Another Saudi in a white robe passes by, to return shortly with more coffee to fill the cups. The American tries to say no, but gets a filling anyway. After this yet another white-robed man comes up to the visitor and says, "Come this way."
The American is shown into a room where another Saudi meets him. They shake hands and sit down on pillows. A third Saudi in white is also in the room. The American asks one of his hosts how his wife is. The two Saudis look at each other, saying nothing. A Saudi in white enters the room to offer coffee, and the American again tries without success to say no. Two of the hosts then leave, one after the other, to be replaced by another Saudi dressed in black. The American quickly gets down to business, handing one of the Saudis a piece of paper with his left hand (here the camera zooms in on a troubled expression on the Saudi's face). They have to do something about the hospital equipment being stalled in the harbor, he says, with visible anxiety; he has heard that Ramadan is coming up, and that things will slow down for a month.

Another Saudi, dressed in white, enters and signals with his hand to the Saudi in black, who rises and leaves. Here the American shifts his leg, so that he shows the sole of his shoe toward his Saudi counterpart. The camera zooms in for a close-up of the shoe for a few seconds. Then a close up of the Saudi's face; he looks disturbed. A telephone nearby rings, and another Saudi enters to answer it. He then says something in Arabic to the man talking with the American, who responds in Arabic. The American looks disturbed, and when the phone call is finished, he repeats to the Saudi how important it is to get things going fast. The Saudi responds: "My people have been living for many years without a hospital, we can wait two more weeks. There is no problem."

After this scene there is an interview with the Saudi, who says that "the American's behavior was very insulting. He first inquired about my wife, he then refuses the coffee that I offer him in hospitality, he shows me the sole of his foot, and to add insult to injury, he hands me a paper with his left hand." A person identified as an anthropologist comments on how American culture differs from foreign cultures, and how important it is to learn about cultural differences when doing business with foreigners: "We have to know where cultural differences are causing great barriers." He goes on to say that

"Every country has a heritage that has shaped the social system, the rules and the statuses that people understand."
And when modern business comes along, or other kinds of organizational forms that are modern, they are going to add on to those traditional social understandings."

This is followed by comments from different American business people, working for American companies in Saudi Arabia, on what can go wrong for visitors in Saudi Arabia if they do not know how to behave. Well-known intercultural trainers and consultants also comment on what can go wrong for visitors in foreign cultures.

From a how-to book

The growth of international business has created an increasing demand for books that inform about cultural differences in ways that are easy to understand. One such book is Fons Trompenaars' *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business* (1993), presented as follows on the back cover:

"Many managers understand that cultural differences affect the process of doing business, but many underestimate by just how much. This best-selling book aims to dispel the idea that there is only one way to manage and encourages readers to get to know their own culture before doing business with others."

One argument of the book is that most Northern European countries and the United States have individualist cultures, while Latin American countries and many Asian countries have collectivist cultures. This leads to some practical tips on how to recognize the differences between individualist and collectivist cultures, and how to do business in them:
**Individualism**

1 More frequent use of “I” form.
2 Decisions made on the spot by representatives.
3 People ideally achieve alone and assume personal responsibility.
4 Vacations taken in pairs, even alone.

**Collectivism**

1 More frequent use of “We” form.
2 Decisions referred back by delegate to organisation.
3 People ideally achieve in groups which assume joint responsibility.
4 Vacations in organised groups or with extended family.

**Tips for doing business with:**

**Individualists (for collectivists)**

1 Prepare for quick decisions and sudden offers not referred to HQ.
2 Negotiator can commit those who sent him or her and is very reluctant to go back on an undertaking.
3 The toughest negotiations were probably already done within the organisation while preparing for the meeting. You have a tough job selling them the solution to this meeting.
4 Conducting business alone means that this person is respected by his or her company and has its esteem.
5 The aim is to make a quick deal.

**Collectivists (for individualists)**

1 Show patience for time taken to consent and to consult.
2 Negotiator can only agree tentatively and may withdraw an undertaking after consulting with superiors.
3 The toughest negotiations are with the collectivists you face. You must somehow persuade them to cede to you points which the multiple interest in your company demand.
4 Conducting business when surrounded by helpers means that this person has high status in his or her company.
5 The aim is to build lasting relationships.

(Reprinted by kind permission from *Riding the waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business* by Fons Trompenaars; 1993; Published by Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 36 John Street, London WC 1N 2AT @ £12.99)

***
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The workshop, the game, the video and the guidebook offer glimpses from a fast-growing contemporary transnational industry. Hannerz (1992a:251), somewhat facetiously, has described it as the “culture-shock prevention industry,” and describes some of its features:

“Cross-cultural training programs are set up to inculcate sensitivity, basic rules of etiquette, and perhaps an appreciation of those other cultures which are of special strategic importance to one’s goals: for Westerners in recent times, as culture follows business, especially those of the Arab world and Japan. There is likewise a burgeoning do-it-yourself literature in the field.”

This study deals with the practitioners of this industry, and with the services and products they offer. In particular, I will focus on the professionalization of the practitioners, and its relationship to the way culture and cultural differences are conceptualized and represented among them.

Among the practitioners of the “culture-shock prevention industry,” Hannerz’ designation would be seen as too narrow. To them, preventing culture shock is just one of many services which are part of “the intercultural field”: diversity training, cross-cultural counseling, intercultural negotiation, intercultural communication training, cross-cultural sensitivity training. The collective term “interculturalists” is used to denote the people working in it. What the services have in common is that they are “institutionalized forms for preparing people to cope with other cultures than their own” (Hannerz, 1992a:251). And in conjunction with these services a wide variety of products exist, tools for bringing about an understanding of and sensitivity toward, culture and cultural differences. Examples of such products, as we have just seen, are videos, simulation games and role plays, intercultural communication workshops, and teach-yourself books.

In my sojourn among the interculturalists, I have focused on different cultural processes in the intercultural field - the flow of messages of professionalism; the sharing between interculturalists of experiences...
from work; and the exchange of ideas about intercultural training and consulting, about culture and cultural differences, and about the uses of different media products such as newsletters and videos. Together, these processes give rise to a sense of being part of a community of professional interculturalists. This imagined community takes on a new reality when one attends the SIETAR congresses. Here the interculturalists have a first hand experience of what it means to belong to a professional community. It is an experience which remains with them when they return home, and it is important in creating their professional identity as interculturalists, wherever they live and work in the world.

Globalization and the growth of cultural brokerage

The interculturalists are a heterogeneous group of people. They are scattered around the world, but most of them are found in the West. They look upon "intercultural communication" as a new professional field, emerging out of a practical need to understand what happens in cross-cultural encounters; a fact emphasized by one practitioner when he says that:

"Intercultural communication is one of those fields which emerged from immediate experience and was built upon practical need, rather then being the offspring of abstract intellectual inquiry." (Hoopes, 1979a:10)

Many of the interculturalists work as trainers and consultants. While the business environment has the greatest attraction for them, they are also found in a growing number of academic departments of intercultural communication, particularly in the United States. For many interculturalists a humanitarian ethos is also involved in their work; by promoting intercultural communication, they will help make the world a better place to live in.

Obviously, the growth of the interculturalist field is connected to globalization, in its recent form. In his attempt to periodize
globalization, Robertson (1992:59) has outlined an “uncertainty phase,” spanning the time from the 1960s until the early 1990s (when, he suggests, it began to display crisis tendencies). It was a period of heightened global consciousness; postmaterialist values; sharply accelerated global communication; problems of multiculturality and polyethnicity; and more complex conceptions of individuals, based on gender, ethnic and racial considerations. After the end of the Cold War and bipolarity, the international system became more fluid. Civil rights became a global issue, and notions developed of a world civil society and world citizenship. The number of global institutions and movements increased greatly, and a global media system was consolidated.

Although Robertson rather surprisingly does not include it in his list, the period, of course, also involved the quick growth of international business, which has certainly affected the speed of globalization (Lash and Urry, 1994). And beginning in the 1960s, this “uncertainty phase” was already a part of the postcolonial era.

It was in this period, with the cultural turmoil that began in the 1960s, that interculturalist ideas could flourish, not least in the United States. A greater concern with cultural diversity combined with ideological emphases on autonomy and equality, at home and internationally. People, organizations and states in the West began to develop new forms of relationships with former colonized states. As the United States increased economic and technical aid to what had come to be called Third World countries, this required the involvement of different categories of personnel: technicians, teachers, nurses, etc. Knowledge about cultural differences also became important for the establishment of international political and business relationships. Soon, the economic success of Japan and the OPEC countries also affected the Western market economies. The sense that the triumphs of Japanese corporations had something to do with culture inspired studies of “corporate culture,” and generally, as in times of war, it now became important for many Westerners to understand the mentality of “the other side.”

It was also in this period that the concept of culture shock exploded on the scene. The different events that took place in the 1960s made it possible for this concept to become established and spread
The interculturalists picked up the concept of culture shock and have subsequently elaborated upon it. Without culture shock, they argue, one does not get into a another culture. Different stages of culture shock have been identified. Hoopes (1979a), for example, describes them as Fight, Flight, Going Native and Adaptation. The Fight stage is the response of we-they: the foreign culture is seen in a negative light, while one's own is seen positively. The Flight stage is total rejection of the foreign culture and immersion in one's own, perhaps in local home-culture enclaves. Going Native is to superficially mimic the foreign culture and downgrade one's own culture. Adaptation is to confirm and adapt to the foreign culture, while affirming one's own cultural identity. It is also common to illustrate stages of culture shock in a diagram (see appendix A). Anthropologists may have coined the concept, then, with-
out making much use of it; in the hands of the interculturalists "culture shock" was further developed, divided into stages, and illustrated in diagrams to show clients what could happen in cross-cultural encounters. The concept is now used by everyone in society. (Recently "Culture Shock" has also been the name of a travel book series where each volume presents customs, rules of etiquette, food and drinking habits, educational system, business culture and other characteristics of a particular country. At the moment 28 countries are represented.)

The interculturalists' enterprise is situated in the context of varied connections between the local and the long-distance. Here they have come to occupy a niche where they can operate as cultural brokers, conveying understandings of, and sensitivity toward, cultural differences to various groups of clients - and, certainly, drawing some advantage for themselves from these acts of cultural mediation.

Robertson (1992:172), again, recognizes this new occupation as a manifestation of globalization. Suggesting that globalization has to be seen as the interdependence of homogenization and heterogenization, he finds this reflected in what the interculturalists (or what he calls the practitioners of intercultural communication) are doing: on one hand, they have to "display the universality of their insights, methodology, research results and advisory successes," but on the other hand, they have "a vested professional interest in accentuating difference, at least in the middle run; for if there occurs an attenuation of the perception of difference, their raison d'être is in doubt."

To repeat, many of those who came to the interculturalist field in the mid-1960s were undoubtedly also inspired by humanitarian motives. They supported the civil rights movement, the women's movement and the peace movement; and they saw intercultural communication as a way of bringing about changes in line with these new political forces. But with increasing international business, and with the establishment of the intercultural field as a context of a profitable career, the humanitarian motives with time came to mix more and more with concerns of professionalization and credentialism.
Professionalization and the packaging of cultural understanding

In this study, I do not aim at offering a comprehensive picture of the intercultural field, with its very diverse branches of knowledge and its entire range of services. My focus is on consulting, since it is here that we find most of the interculturalists, in a fast-growing market of consultants and consulting agencies. In particular, I will be concerned with professionalization. I will suggest that the legitimation of the professional status of the interculturalists working as trainers and consultants takes place in the market - it is here that their professional status is displayed and negotiated. This is in contrast with academic anthropology, where professionalization mostly takes place in the university.

Magali Sarfatti Larson (1977) says that the affiliation with the modern university is what constitutes contemporary professions. The university provides the setting for the “production of producers.” In my study I will draw upon Larson’s work on the development and establishment of what she calls “professional markets.” Here, professional knowledge is treated as “commodities,” bought and sold in accordance with market principles. The basis on which professional commodities are made distinct and recognizable is the standardization or codification of professional knowledge, which takes place at the university. Larson notes that this standardization also entails homogeneity in the production of producers; indispensable if professionals are to become an effective group.

For consulting professions, such as the interculturalists, it is the market potential that provides the basis on which professional commodities are produced. This takes me to the packaging and marketing of services and products in the intercultural field. I will argue that the interculturalists’ services and products are made to carry messages of professionalism. It is through these products that the professional status of the interculturalists is displayed, which in turn makes the market the context for the production of producers. The argument draws on a recognition of the growing tendency today of looking upon the market more as a flow of signs than as a flow of goods. That is to say, commodities are not only made to carry use-value, but to carry messages as
The importance of packaging and marketing in displaying the professional status of the interculturalists is related to the fact that there are few educational programs in intercultural training and consulting in the intercultural field.

In line with a characteristically anthropological preoccupation, I will also be concerned with how culture and cultural differences are conceptualized and represented among the interculturalists. Here I will discuss some commonly shared views of culture and the context in which they are based. In particular, I will be interested in finding out whether these conceptualizations of culture can be understood as related to the particular ways in which the interculturalists’ services and products are packaged and marketed.

Questions to be addressed in this study, then, are these: how are images of professionalism created and disseminated among the interculturalists? How is the interculturalists’ professional status legitimized? Is there a relationship between such legitimation and particular conceptions and representations of culture and cultural differences? And, on such grounds, in what ways do anthropologists and interculturalists differ? To begin with, let me briefly address some different perspectives on professionalization, and the analytical framework for the study of professionalization with which I will be working.

*Perspectives on professionalism*

In the literature on professionalization there has been a shift over the years from viewing professions as a group of experts that serve society in solving different kinds of problems, to seeing professions as groups of people involved in a struggle for control over specific kinds of labor. This shift can also be viewed in terms of moving from a functionalist to an interactionist perspective.

According to Macdonald (1995), until the late 1960s, the functionalist perspective was dominant in the sociology of professions. The common perception was that professions were a stabilizing factor in society, and that they were groupings of experts with specific knowl-
edge that society needed. Professions were seen as vocations, rather more than as enterprises. The functionalist perspective also entailed a "traits" approach, where the listing of characteristics became important in identifying an ideal-typical profession, against which other occupations could be compared as being more or less professional. Writers such as Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) emphasized practical problem-solving as a distinguishing mark of professions. Goode (1957) drew a list of characteristics such as sense of identity, shared values, a common language only partially understood by outsiders, the exercise of power by the professional community over its members, and the control of that community over the selection of professional trainees. Parsons (1954) wrote of professions as a cluster of occupational roles, where the incumbents performed certain functions valued in the society, and earned a living from this.

There were also writers such as Wilensky (1964) and Millerson (1964) who were more interested in the organizational nature of professions. Wilensky sketched what he called a "natural history" of professionalization, a sequence which he argued that an occupation has to pass through in order to become a profession: training school, university school, local professional association, national association, state license law, and formal code of ethics. He perceived professionalism as primarily a matter of technical competence: skills and knowledge. Millerson (1964), on the other hand, defined professions as providing specific services, based on well-defined fields of study. Here, advanced training and education were seen as important for the establishment of the profession; something Millerson saw as emerging especially with the establishment of "qualifying associations." Millerson came to delineate four different types of occupational organizations, where the "qualifying association" was the most important for the development of professionalism. This kind of association would try to raise an occupation to professional status by arranging regular lectures and discussions on subjects perceived to be relevant for the profession, in order to improve training and education, or by examining entrants and thereby qualifying them as recognized professionals.

By the early 1970s, the functionalist perspective was in large part
abandoned in professionalization research, in favor of an emphasis on
the ways professionals constructed their identities. The “traits” approach
was criticized for being a “folk” model of professionalism, only reflect­
ing those characteristics which the professionals themselves saw as dis­
tinctive of their professions. Increasingly, the focus was on the actions
and interactions of relevant groups. One theme was to view profes­
sions as constituting an integrated system, where the histories of pro­fessions depended on each other.10 Another theme was the educational
process. Here a variety of perspectives developed, where some placed
emphasis on the licensing to control work and the creation of “profes­sional power” (Freidson, 1970), while others looked at how the educa­
tional process would create a “right” attitude toward work - rather than
skills, which were seen to be acquired rather more in the actual work
situation (Collins, 1979). Yet another theme was to look upon educa­
tion as a way to monopolize knowledge, and to analyze the establish­
ment of professional markets. Larson (1977) became a strong advocate
of this perspective, and her work provides the framework for my analy­sis of the professionalization of the interculturalists.11

According to Larson, the development of modern professions is
related to the establishment of professional markets, in the historical
context of industrial capitalism. Professional work became a full-time
means for earning a livelihood, and thus entailed a concern with in­come and profit. For a modern professional market to come into exist­ence, then, a distinctive commodity had to be produced. In Larson’s
view this commodity is intrinsically bound up with the producer, since
professional work is a “fictitious” commodity. Here she quotes Karl
Polanyi, who says about this commodity that it “cannot be detached
from the rest of life, be stored or mobilized” (Polanyi, 1957; quoted in
Larson, 1977:14). Professions, this is to say, produce intangible goods,
unlike industrial labor which produces commodities with a distinctive
form. To Larson, this means that for professions there has to be a “pro­duction of producers” if their commodities are to be given a distinctive
form. “The professionals must be adequately trained and socialized so
as to provide recognizably distinct services for exchange on the profes­
sional market” (ibid.).
This makes the affiliation with the modern university important, for it is here that the "production of producers" takes place. The standardization of professional knowledge at the university makes it possible to differentiate the identities of various professions, thereby securing the monopoly of a professional market, and providing the basis from which professional commodities are made recognizable (ibid.:40). For a profession to gain a monopoly, it thus has to be affiliated with the university. This affiliation lends cognitive validation and legitimacy to the profession.

In the educational process, the role of the educators is enhanced by the profession's dependence on formal institutional training. Larson says that as these educators became concerned with professional autonomy and professional identity, their role within the profession increased. Future professionals would be exposed to their influences, and to their way of identifying what is considered to be professional knowledge. "A presumption of talent in later professional practice derives from the reputation of the institution where a professional has been trained" (ibid.:43). I will discuss this below in a chapter on different educational centers, where the teachers' reputation sets the tone for what is considered to be professional knowledge about intercultural training.

The picture of professionalism drawn by Larson is made to fit particularly the established professions, such as medicine and law. In the professional market of the scientists, the latter are themselves the producers and main consumers of the professional commodities. That is, scientific research and problem-solving take place within the profession, which makes this a closed market. Formal education is used as an instrument to guard access to professional knowledge, so that only those with a proper training are considered to be qualified to practice the profession.

As Larson compares the market of the scientific professions with the market of the consulting professions, a different picture emerges. The latter market is an open one, since it necessarily includes a lay clientele, the main consumers of the services and products of the consulting professions. There is also no instrument such as formal educa-
tion guarding access to professional knowledge, - all that is needed to become a professional consultant are services and products that claim to solve practical problems.

Berg and Poulfelt (1986:258) note that the most common expressions among experienced management consultants when discussing professional competence are: “The only way to learn about consultancy and how to consult is the hard way, i.e., by actually consulting;” or “It just takes a long time to be a good consultant.” The concern of these authors is with the professionalization of management consultants. They identify three steps in this process: the development of institutions and networks, creating a unified body of knowledge and concepts, and professional training and education. Here the educational process becomes most important, since it is conceived to foster firm professional values and norms (ibid.). What Berg and Poulfelt are trying to do here, then, is to turn the management consulting profession into a scientific profession, by emphasizing higher education as the instrument to accomplish this.

My argument is that the lack of formal education in the consultant professions makes it necessary for their professional commodities to be built on their market potential, rather than on a standardization of professional knowledge. According to Larson (ibid.:33), practitioners who carry the result of applied scientific research into everyday practice

“tacitly evaluate a new technology of work in terms of its market potential. The paradigmatic standards under which the research has been conducted are not important, if its practical effects are demonstrably valid.”

What makes the professional commodities of the consulting profession distinctive and recognizable to a potential public, then, is packaging and marketing. This involves a "commodity imaging process." Wernick (1991:15) suggests that commodity imaging is part of the production of commodities:
"Artificial semiosis is a multiple practice which occurs at all the points in production, distribution, and exchange at which commodity imaging process takes shape."

That is to say, commodities are not only made to carry use value and exchange value, but also sign value. Through the commodity imaging process, the professional commodities of the consultant professions are made to carry messages of professionalism.

This can be seen in the marketing of the interculturalists' services and products. Let me give an example. The following is an excerpt about Jim Mullen's cross-cultural workshop - the first of the scenes introducing this chapter - from one of his brochures:

"Britons, Americans, many Europeans and Asians will never fully understand each other. The aim of this workshop is to give participants an orientation regarding different ways of thinking, upon which they can base new strategies in the light of the knowledge gained. The workshop fosters interest of the communicators in each other's culture. The process also spotlights one's own self-identity and self-awareness. Once we have strategies to recognise the existence or absence of overlap in our basic communication codes and the codes of our colleagues and partners, the road towards empathy and effective long-term multicultural cooperation is open."

Next to this text, some pictures show people of varying physiognomy, and at the back of the brochure there is a list of customers who have already used Jim's services. These pictures can be read as lending credibility to the accompanying text; they accentuate the cultural differences that the text addresses. Together, then, the text and the pictures carry the message of cultures being so different that coping with these differences can only be successful with the aid of professional expertise. Thus the overall message of the brochure is that there is a need for professional expertise in order to understand and respond ef-
fectively to cultural differences, and that Jim has the professional credentials to provide that expertise.

Representations of culture

The conceptions and representations of culture and cultural differences among the interculturalists are another topic of my study. The interculturalists' enterprise can be said to have capitalized on the anthropological culture concept. Other anthropologists have commented on this fact. Some years ago, Serrie (1990) wrote in *Anthropology Newsletter* that anthropologists have ignored the opportunities to get involved in cross-cultural training, and with the study of corporate culture. In his comment, Serrie expressed a concern with the fact that many American anthropologists are unemployed and lack power. This concern can be said to be related to the identity crisis of anthropology that many contemporary anthropologists have noted. Here it has been said that anthropology might lose its status as a discipline of the study of culture to other fields which use its central concepts and knowledge to gain academic credibility, such as cultural studies. Or, as will be seen in this study, to gain profitable careers, such as intercultural trainers and consultants.¹²

The interculturalists have obviously seen new opportunities for the use of the culture concept. While anthropologists have scrutinized the production of ethnographic texts, the interculturalists have been "writing culture" in other ways, but also, as we have just seen, using simulation games, videos and diagrams as formats for portraying cultural differences. This has gained them a reputation outside Academia for presenting cultural understanding in an accessible form to non-academics, which in turn has allowed many of them lucrative careers.

Cultural studies is another area in which it has recently been said that anthropologists have missed the boat.¹³ According to Terence Turner (1993), in the United States, cultural studies and the closely related debate on multiculturalism have appeared under certain social and political conditions. The organization of capital is now taking place
on a global scale, and this has brought about a weakening of the power of states to control social and economic conditions within their boundaries. And with the intensification of

"transnational centralization of political-economic power and exploitation, people all over the world have turned to ethnic and cultural identity as means of mobilizing themselves for the defense of their social and political-economic interests." (Turner, 1993:423)

Turner argues that the increasing globalization has created a conjuncture of social, political, and economic conditions which provides the context for multiculturalism as a "cultural phenomenon and intellectual movement" (ibid:424), which is also the case with cultural studies. This context is different from that of classical anthropological thinking about culture, which was colonialism. And Turner suggests that this is why anthropological thinking about culture has little relevance to what culture has come to mean for many people who now define their cultural identity in relation to this new conjuncture. Cultural studies and multiculturalism attempt to express this new view of culture, focusing on the relation between culture and power, in a more successful way than anthropology does.

I would suggest that the treatment of culture in social and cultural anthropology, in cultural studies and in the intercultural field reflects different responses to that globalization which is now commonly said to have compressed the world into a single space, in which people from different parts of the world have come into closer contact with each other than ever before. This process has generated a broad debate over whether globalization will give rise to cultural heterogenization or homogenization (see Robertson, 1992, for a discussion about this). For many anthropologists, globalization created a crisis in anthropology, insofar as it made them aware that culture could not be looked upon as a closed coherent system of shared values and norms. Instead, cultures had to be represented in a way that would take full account of "intractable contradiction, paradox, irony, and uncertainty in the explanation
of human activities" (Marcus and Fischer 1986:15). This created a crisis of representation, and a debate over "anthropology as cultural critique" (ibid.).

Other responses to globalization, as we just have seen in Turner's discussion, were of a more directly political nature. The crisis of the nation-state in controlling its population gave rise to groups and movements who came to use the culture concept as an ideological vehicle for identity creation. And for others again, globalization became more of a practical problem, as it brought people into contact with each other on a greater scale than before. This created communication problems which were identified in terms of cultural differences, and led to the development of modes of cultural engineering and management.

Although interculturalism in its early days had a strong humanitarian motive, it soon became a question of culture as technique.

An interesting aspect of this is that in treating culture as technique, the interculturalists have appropriated an anthropological view of culture from an era in which the notion of globalization had not yet had much impact. In a very popular book called *Survival Kit for Overseas Living*, to take one example, the author, Robert Kohls (1984:17) writes:

"Culture = an integrated system of learned behavior patterns that are characteristic of the members of any given society. Culture refers to the total way of life of particular groups of people... Culture is learned and transmitted from generation to generation."

Such a culture concept was shaped by the old "island experience" of anthropologists, where each culture had come to be defined as a bounded entity with properties of its own. In more recent times, the tendency within the discipline has been stronger to look at social life not primarily in terms of face-to-face interactions, but also with regard to relationships between the local and the long-distance. Cultural processes are not always confined to a particular geographic place but occur across borders. And as this is taken into account, one moves
away from treating culture as a closed, coherent, shared system (see, for example, Appadurai, 1996; Hannerz, 1992a, 1996).

The allegiance of the interculturalists to a culture concept which may remind anthropologists of understandings prevalent in their own discipline in the 1940s or 1950s can perhaps be understood partly in historical terms, and I will note this in the concluding chapter. But I will also argue that a major reason why the interculturalists have drawn upon such a conception of culture is that it has a market potential. The reification of culture into a homogeneous entity with properties of its own, believed to influence human behavior, perception and attitudes, is a view which is easy to package and market. It allows for a perception of cultural differences as self-evident, and it can be presented in tables and lists of cultural characteristics, as we saw in that opening vignette to this chapter which was called “From a how-to book.”

This tendency among interculturalists toward accentuating cultural differences has also been identified among anthropologists. Roger Keesing (1989), for example, has discussed the inclination to exoticize other cultures in anthropological writings. He offers an anecdote about a distinguished anthropologist who did not finish his paper on the spatial orientation system of a non-Western people he had worked with when he found out that it was actually similar to our own. Like the interculturalists, it seems, the anthropologists have had a professional vested interest in accentuating cultural differences. Yet in anthropology, this interest has recently come under increasing critical scrutiny.

Fieldwork among the interculturalists

Finally, some comments on my personal sojourn in the intercultural field. My first introduction to it was a book called Managing Cultural Differences: High-Performance Strategies for Today’s Global Manager, by two psychologists, Philip R. Harris and Robert T. Moran (1987). What struck me, reading this book, was how the authors conceptualized culture, and the way in which they presented information about cultural differences in diagrams and lists. In the latter they compared different
cultures with each other in terms of "cultural dimensions," using concepts and theories of culture that they referred to as coming from anthropology. Yet it soon became clear that it was not current anthropology that was in use, but one reminiscent of American anthropology from the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. This recycling of anthropology contributed to drawing my attention to the intercultural field.

I soon discovered the existence of a large market of intercultural trainers and consultants who worked mainly in the business environment, but I also learned more about intercultural communication as a field of scholarship. Through some initial contacts with a few consultants, I became aware of the existence of an international organization of trainers and consultants, called SIETAR. Attending its annual congress in Ireland in 1990, I got a clearer sense of the vast field of intercultural communication. As I decided to focus on the consulting area, since it is here that most interculturalists are found, I began contacting consultants in Sweden, and asking them for permission to attend their workshops. In most cases, my requests were turned down. The most common reason for not having me in their workshops was that I might disturb the group dynamics, since I was not there to receive intercultural training. Yet there were also those who said I could not participate because of company secrets. When hired by a company, they said, they had had to sign a document in which they promised not to reveal any company secrets, and therefore they could not bring with them a person who was not part of the training program.

Some of the consultants I spoke to were also invited to give workshops on culture clashes at places outside the business environment, events which were advertised in the local press. These workshops was not identical with those given for businessmen, but contained some of the same elements. When I attended these, I always interviewed the consultant afterwards about similarities and differences, as compared to workshops offered to businesspeople. There were also some consultants who publicized their enterprises in different business papers and magazines, inviting businesspeople to attend their workshops. I contacted them and presented myself and my research, asking if I could attend their workshops. They did not object to this, as long as
I paid the fee. Another way to get a view of what goes on in intercultural communication workshops was to attend the annual SIETAR International congresses. Here trainers presented their workshops to the congress participants, and in the discussions that followed I could take note of certain concepts, metaphors, models and products used by the interculturalists - such as "high context culture," the iceberg metaphor of culture, and simulation games like Barnga.

My field research among the interculturalists has taken place in several geographically separate locales; multi-locale field work, as Marcus (e.g. 1986:171) has recently put it. Instead of spending all my time in one setting, I have moved around in different ones.¹⁴ The time spent in each one of them has been dependent on the activities going on there. These locales have been week-long annual SIETAR conferences, of both SIETAR International and SIETAR Europa, held in Canada, Jamaica, and different countries in Europe; and courses in intercultural communication, of different duration, for both experienced and inexperienced interculturalists, given at two different educational centers in the United States: Lesley College in Cambridge, Massachusetts and the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication in Portland, Oregon. These institutions are considered important for lending professional credibility to the interculturalists. I have also attended intercultural communication workshops and lectures held by consultants, like the one with Jim at the beginning of this chapter, and I have conducted interviews with both practitioners and researchers of intercultural communication, on the history of intercultural communication, and about their own work. Altogether, it has been a field extending through different countries in Europe and North America. The interculturalist field is not a place, that is to say, but rather more like a network.¹⁵

I have also gone through different kinds of published materials circulating among the interculturalists: videos, simulation games and role plays, textbooks and "how-to" books, the kinds of publications described in the introductory examples above. What I have focused on here is the packaging and marketing of these materials, especially in order to see how culture and cultural differences are conceptualized
and represented in them. Reading other kinds of texts, such as newsletters and award statements, has been useful in seeing how images of professionalism are created and disseminated.

There is a continuous interplay in the intercultural field between printed matter, meetings, and individual consultant activities. To take one example, the concepts and diagrams of culture and cultural differences in the published work of Geert Hofstede have become interculturalist common knowledge. Jim Mullen, in his workshop, uses both Hofstede's definition of culture as "collective mental programming" and his triangle for illustrating "human mental programming." An important place for the spread of concepts and models is the annual SIETAR congress. Here people present their training models, concepts, and research data on different kinds of cross-cultural encounters, share experiences from work, exchange addresses, and engage in networking. Returning home from a SIETAR congress, people are loaded with notes taken at lectures and in workshops, handouts, brochures, and order forms for books, videos and simulation games.

And these treasures are then used in their work, as in the case of Sara, a Swedish consultant, who has had her own consultancy for ten years. Her way of making people sensitive to culture and cultural differences consists mostly of lecturing. During a lecture on culture clashes that I attended, she showed an overhead picture she had drawn herself. It depicted two eyes, each attached to a separate box and looking at each other. The content of each box was said to be a person's life experiences, and to colour the way one perceives reality. This was to illustrate that these persons' life experiences was different due to different cultural upbringings, and that this could cause misunderstandings in the communication between them. In a parenthesis, at the lower right corner of the overhead sheet, was written a quote "I will not judge until I have understood." I immediately recognized this picture and quote from a workshop I had attended at a SIETAR International congress. When I asked Sara about this picture, she acknowledged that she had found it at the same workshop.

Mostly my fieldwork concerns the intercultural industry in the United States and Sweden. Even though this industry originated in the
United States, which is also where most of the products are made, there are a manifold of variations of interculturalism practiced in different parts of the world. What takes place in Sweden is one example of this. Drawn into the same historical period designated by Robertson as the "uncertainty phase," as most Western countries were, Sweden as a small country developed its own reaction to it. The issues surrounding multiculturalism raised in the 1960s in the United States were imported to Sweden, and transformed into arguments over cultural pluralism in the Swedish politics of immigration. During this period, Sweden also began engaging in development programs in different parts of the world, particularly in the newly de-colonized states in Africa, and in 1965 the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA) was established - which, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, also invited some Swedish anthropologists to help prepare Swedish development workers for their foreign assignments. And in the early 1970s, the internationalization of Swedish business enterprises became an important issue. In 1972, the Swedish Trade Council was set up, to help Swedish companies establish themselves abroad.

Taken together, these developments have provided much of the market for intercultural training and consulting in Sweden. They were slightly different from those in the United States where, as we will see in the next chapter, the establishment of the Peace Corps and the huge influx of foreign students provided the basis for the early growth of intercultural training and consulting.

The proximity of the interculturalist field to anthropology has led to some interesting observations and reflections concerning the contrast between insider and outsider. I have found myself involved in discussing anthropological conceptions of culture with interculturalists, at the same time as I have been taking notes of the discussion. At the SIETAR congress in Munich, in June, 1996, I organized a panel featuring myself as the main speaker. I gave a paper called "Among the Interculturalists: Professional Identity and Representations of Culture." I invited four of my informants to respond to this paper, which they had received three weeks in advance. Here I was a member of the panel, while at the same time I was recording the event and taking
notes: the insider-outsider contrast was inevitably blurred. This feeling of being at the same time an insider and outsider has been with me constantly during fieldwork. I have also been nominated for membership of the SIETAR Europa Board of Directors and in the SIETAR International Nomination Committee, but have declined. The person who nominated me to the Nomination Committee argued that I had the best overview of the field and therefore would be suited for this mission.

The intercultural field also intrudes on my identity as an anthropologist. It is sometimes difficult to know where the interculturalist field ends and anthropology begins, particularly in situations where I am supposed to bring my anthropological perspective to bear on phenomena of intercultural communication. Here, I and the interculturalists in large part use the same vocabulary, and a situation is created where the insider becomes the outsider, and the outsider the insider. When I am with interculturalists as at SIETAR congresses, and we meet other interculturalists whom I do not know, I am presented to them as doing a study of “the culture of the interculturalists.” This, of course, leads to a discussion of what I have found out about them. In the discussion I become an insider and provide them with information about the intercultural field, which they have no knowledge about. The next moment they will almost always talk about themselves and what they are doing, and this again turns me into an outsider, taking notes. This switching between perspectives has been with me during the entire fieldwork process.

The ambiguity in my role as an anthropologist studying an area that borders on anthropology is also somewhat evident in this book. On one hand, I try to look upon the interculturalists as if they were “a tribe,” and present an ethnography which is in principle similar to those produced in anthropology about a wide variety of human groups; including, for example, fairly extensive quotations which can convey some “cultural flavor.” On the other hand, precisely because the interculturalists are so close to anthropology, being likewise interested in culture and cultural differences, I also want to examine their way of life and thought in a manner which relates more immediately to anthropology and its
comparable concerns. In most of the following chapters, consequently, I will be occupied with presenting the interculturalists more on their own terms, but in the concluding chapter, I will shift my perspective to an anthropological critique of the culture of the interculturalists. This is not intended to be condemnatory. It is more of an analysis of the particular premises of the interculturalist industry, as a practical occupation, where the objective is not to give a quick course in anthropology, but an understanding of what people need to know in order to handle typical, recurrent intercultural situations. Here a main difference between anthropology and the interculturalist enterprise is in the time dimension. Intercultural training and consulting cannot be allowed to become too time-consuming. The clients most often want half-day courses, but sometimes courses are held extending over two or three days. In light of these practical conditions, it hardly helps to say that cultural understanding can only be gained by several years of anthropological study. Instead, one has to see what can be done in an afternoon, or during that three-day workshop.

Some would probably say that it is better to do nothing at all, but I disagree with that. This then becomes a question about selection. What kind of goals are plausible when considering the time disposable for intercultural training? It is in this light that one has to understand intercultural training and consulting. Here the focus tends to be on training where the purpose is to learn about cultural differences in general, rather than about a specific culture. Cultural understanding usually focuses on the feeling of confusion when experiencing alien rules of conduct.

Outline of the chapters

In what follows, Chapter 2 gives a historical sketch of the development of the intercultural field, and especially of the establishment of SIETAR International as a professional organization of interculturalists. In Chapter 3, I will address the organizational forms of the “culture-shock prevention industry.” Here I describe consultant agencies and publishing
companies, and also how consultants work. Chapter 4 focuses on the different kinds of intercultural merchandise offered by the interculturalists. This continues into Chapter 5, where I discuss some of the writing on cultural differences in the intercultural field. Chapter 6 deals with the making of professional interculturalists and takes us to two educational centers: Lesley College in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication in Portland, Oregon. Here interculturalists are provided with formal credentials, overt signs of professionalism. In Chapter 7, I will discuss the notion of culture among the interculturalists and trace its intellectual sources. And this, then, will lead to some remarks about the relationship between intercultural communication and anthropology. Through most of the chapters, in one way or other, I will address the professionalization of the interculturalists, and its link to the market.

So, the stage is set. Let us go and mingle with the interculturalists.
Organizing Interculturalists

This chapter will give a brief history of the emergence of the intercultural field, in particular of SIETAR, the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, as an organization especially of trainers and consultants in intercultural communication. In the historical account I will depend on published materials, such as newsletters, and interviews with people who were involved in the creation and development of SIETAR. I will also describe the annual congresses of SIETAR as organizational vehicles of professionalism, sites for learning how to become a professional interculturalist. It is at the annual SIETAR congresses that most interculturalists for the first time come into contact with the multitude of services and products that make up the intercultural field. It is here they will be addressed as "interculturalists," but most important, it is also here that they will learn about insights, technology, methodology, research results and advisory successes in order, as Robertson (1992:172) puts it, to "claim academic, professional and advisory legitimacy."

The emergence of the intercultural field

As we have seen in the preceding chapter, the concern with intercultural issues developed in the United States during the particular historical circumstances of the 1960s. This was, where people doing intercul-
tural training started organizing themselves, and developing a body of common concepts, models and vocabulary. “Intercultural communication” became a research area, and also a niche for the professional careers of interculturalist practitioners.

It was part of the international activism of the period that the Peace Corps was established in 1961, on the initiative of President Kennedy, who saw this as part of a new frontier, spreading the goodwill of America to different parts of the world. Under the auspices of the Peace Corps - a type of organization which was soon widely copied by other western countries - large numbers of young American volunteers were dispatched to different parts of the world, to help in various development programs. Before going abroad, the volunteers went through preparatory training. Different universities around the United States were contracted to provide training programs for these volunteers.

The usual way of preparing the volunteers was to have professors from different disciplines, with area-specific knowledge, lecture about the geography, history, politics, culture and religion of the area to which the volunteers were to be sent. By the mid-1960s, complaints about this kind of training (now referred to in the intercultural communication literature as “the university model”) became increasingly common. It was considered insufficient in preparing the volunteers for functioning in everyday life situations in foreign cultures. In an article which many intercultural trainers now consider seminal in promoting more experience-based training, it was argued that:

“When returned Peace Corps volunteers talk about their training, they do not complain about incompetent professors; they complain about the sense in which their experiences in training, however interesting or well presented they may have been, simply did not prepare them for the total life they had to lead overseas.” (Harrison and Hopkins, 1967:431-432)
To change this state of affairs, people started to experiment with different kinds of training models. What was identified early as missing in the training programs was experiential learning. It was considered that experience-based cross-cultural training would make the volunteers more effective interpersonally. Instead of being lectured to, the volunteer should learn - in the words of two Peace Corps trainers - how to “cope with his feelings and reactions in the kinds of frustrating, ambiguous, and perplexing situations he is likely to encounter in his assignment” (Wight and Hammons, 1970:11). Many people became involved, in trying to identify what this experience-based training should be like. It is in this context that we can find traces leading to the development of the intercultural field and SIETAR.

In October 1968, a small group of people met in Estes Park, Colorado, to discuss the development of a handbook and guidelines for Peace Corps trainers. This was the site of the Center for Research and Education (CRE), which had been contracted to provide many of the training programs for the Peace Corps. The initiator of the meeting was Albert Wight, who had been involved with Peace Corps training since 1964. He brought together a group of people whom he found had contributed to the development of new methods to prepare people for cross-cultural encounters, and one item on the agenda was a discussion of the publication of a handbook on the theory and methods of cross-cultural training for the Peace Corps. They had never met each other before but had worked independently with the same issues, which made the meeting very exciting for them. This was the first time they had had an opportunity to exchange experiences with others involved in the same kind of work.

During that meeting they decided to start an organization, which was to have regular meetings where issues pertaining to cross-cultural training were to be discussed. They came up with the name SITAR for the organization. Albert Wight became the executive director, and the first conference was held in December 1968 in Estes Park, followed by a second in late February 1969, in Capahosic, Virginia, and a third in November the same year in Estes Park. After that, however, nothing more happened with SITAR. There were financial problems, as well as
problems of getting a base somewhere to establish it officially.

In 1971, Wight left the Center for Research and Education at Colorado for a different assignment. This made it impossible for him to continue his involvement as the executive director of SITAR. At the end of December 1971 he therefore met with Steven Rhinesmith, who had been involved with the inception of SITAR, to discuss other alternatives. Rhinesmith mentioned David Hoopes and his work with cross-cultural training at the University of Pittsburgh, and pointed out that Hoopes had a grant from the State Department which might allow him to take on SITAR.

Steven Rhinesmith was at the University of Pittsburgh and knew David Hoopes well. They had worked together on developing what came to be called the Intercultural Communication Workshop (ICW). The participants of the workshop were foreign and American students on the campus. With the political and economic changes in the 1960s, the doors opened for many people to enter higher education. Many Afro-Americans were now drawn into universities and colleges, and the United States also saw a huge influx of foreign students. It soon became obvious that many of these latter students had problems in adjusting to the educational system, and to American society. At universities and colleges around the United States, foreign student advisors increasingly had to confront these problems, which they interpreted as having to do with cultural differences. This was another important track leading to the development of the intercultural field and the establishment of SIETAR.

To come to terms with the problems of foreign students, a network of foreign student advisors was developed. This network became known as the Intercultural Communication Network, and responsible for its inception were David Hoopes and Toby Frank, who both worked with international exchange programs and foreign student affairs at the University of Pittsburgh. Through this network, foreign student advisors in different parts of the United States came into contact with each other. Here they had a forum for exchanging experiences and thoughts about the problems that foreign students had in adjusting to American society. David Hoopes gave me the following reason for his interest in
these problems:

"I got into the field because I wondered what was happening to the people who were involved in intercultural experiences, particularly foreign students. It occurred to me very early on, when I became involved with foreign students in 1965, I guess, or ’64. There was something involved in the dynamics of the relationships, or some issues, relative to the adaptation and adjustment of foreign students, that nobody knew very much about. That there were factors involved that went beyond what was generally known and practiced by the foreign student advising profession at that time, that had to do with the cultural background and cultural differences of the people involved. I wanted to find out what those dynamics were, and started to explore them, and read, and see if I could find ways to create useful devices, training education devices and a newsletter, to begin that process."

At the University of Pittsburgh, David Hoopes met Steven Rhinesmith, and together they developed the “Intercultural Communication Workshop” (ICW). The first ICW took place in the summer of 1966. It was decided to hold the workshop off-campus, on neutral ground, in a mountain cottage. It was a very unstructured affair, and as Steven Rhinesmith described it for me:

“We called these groups “New Culture Groups.” The idea was that a group of people came together and they created a new culture, because every new group is a new culture...We allowed people to hide behind culture. People could say, why did you do that, and they said, well, that’s my culture, rather than that’s my personality. We allowed culture to be used as an excuse for personality differences, because we didn’t want to push people. And at the same time they learned about cultural differences, which was
fine with us. We weren't trying to do therapy, we were just trying to help people understand culture."

The "Intercultural Communication Workshop" came to be known as the "Pittsburgh model," and during the late 1960s and early 1970s, the University of Pittsburgh was considered to be the mecca of intercultural training. "The ICW became a framework that was used all over the United States by all sorts of people" (David Hoopes, personal communication). It was through a grant from NAFSA (National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, today known as the Association of International Educators), that David Hoopes could develop his Intercultural Communication Workshop, together with publishing a newsletter that was distributed through the Intercultural Communication Network. This newsletter was called Communiqué and became important in spreading information and knowledge about what was going on in intercultural communication training and research, at different places in the United States and abroad. It was also important in creating small networks. The first issue came out in October 1970, and after the first year of publication over a thousand persons, in the United States and other countries, were on the mailing list. The topics covered in Communiqué were most often various intercultural communication workshops taking place at colleges and universities in the United States and abroad, but the newsletter also carried information on courses, seminars, books and articles on intercultural communication, sometimes with short reviews. As David Hoopes reminisced to me:

"You see, when we first started talking about this we got the response by people who were sitting there saying 'thank God, somebody is addressing these issues, somebody is providing, or beginning to provide, some answers to questions I have had so long but there have been no answers, there have been no guidelines on what to do about it'. Well, the person who said that was cloned all over the country, and in fact I'm sure all over the world."
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Coincidences move many professional fields and movements forwards. In the case of the intercultural field, one can see that it was the connection between individuals at the University of Pittsburgh and the staff at the training centers for the Peace Corps that laid the foundation for the establishment of the intercultural field and SIETAR. Steven Rhinesmith’s involvement with Peace Corps training brought Albert Wight into contact with David Hoopes, who had the time and funding to take on and launch SIETAR. Both Wight and Hoopes had their own mailing lists, which brought people from different areas in contact with each other, particularly through *Communique*. This network of people then grew into the intercultural field, and SIETAR.

From the early 1970s and onwards, it becomes more difficult to keep track of the multifaceted development of the intercultural field. Several universities, colleges and institutes started offering courses in intercultural communication. There were also some academic conferences devoted to the field, including a major gathering at the International Christian University in Tokyo, in July 1972. Some “readers in intercultural communication” started circulating in the early 1970s, and people began developing workshops on the Pittsburgh model. In the autumn of 1973, David Hoopes, as editor of *Communique*, enthusiastically summed up what had happened so far in the intercultural field:

“A new association (SITAR) is being formed to bring together academicians and professionals in the field. The first substantive training (syllabus-building) conference on the subject has been conducted by the University of Virginia. The intercultural communication workshop has become a firmly rooted program format in international education exchange. The International Communication Association devoted a major portion of its last annual conference to intercultural communication and the Speech Communication Association is giving it increasing attention. The Washington, D.C. chapter of the American Society for Training and Development will sponsor a three-day conference on Intercultural Training in November.
Intercultural communication workshops have been conducted in Germany and a proposal for a major workshop/conference on intercultural communication and intercultural relations training is planned in Japan for the summer of 1974. Several projects awarded grants under the Office of Education's new Program for Strengthening the International Dimensions of General Education at the Undergraduate Level include intercultural communication as a major component. Two (the first two) anthologies of writings on the subject have been published commercially (Samovar and Porter, *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*; Prosser, *Intercommunication Among Nations and Peoples*). Courses are appearing throughout the academic world to the degree that soon most major institutions and a large number of smaller institutions will offer one or more courses on the subject. A graduate degree program is in the planning stages at at least two universities. The U.S. Navy has just awarded a half-million dollar contract to improve and expand its intercultural relations training. The first major bibliography on the subject is in the final stages of preparation.

In the Spring of 1975, SIETAR was established, which then became a focal point for all the issues Hoopes addressed (It was at this time that an E for “Education” was added to the name). Under its auspices, intercultural education, training and research were identified as belonging to a new profession. During its twenty years of existence, the organization has been instrumental in giving its members a professional identity as interculturalists.

Larson (1977:44) argues that professional societies create unified professional fields by subordinating individual talent to the unity of the field. Berg and Poulfelt (1986:269) are of a similar opinion about professional associations, which they see as crucial for the establishment of professional status for the consulting occupations. And according to Millerson (1964:47), as we have seen in the preceding chapter, “qualify-
ing associations” attempt to raise the status of an occupation to that of a profession by having regular meetings, in which relevant knowledge and practices are discussed, - in order to be identified with a certain profession, individuals have to submit to a body of knowledge and practice.

That SIETAR is an organization of this type can be seen from the following statement of its aims, published in the April, 1974, issue of *Communique*:

“The aims of SIETAR are to foster international and intercultural communication and cooperation through the promotion of intercultural education, training and research. It will promote the education and training of people to better understand and function in international, intercultural, inter-racial or inter-ethnic situations. It will bring together multidisciplinary and multiprofessional groups for fruitful communication and collaboration. It will assist in the professional development of educators, trainers and scholars in this field and facilitate the dissemination and exchange of information and ideas. It will distribute this newsletter to all members; publish and distribute other articles, monographs, and teaching or training materials; and publish a directory. It will sponsor conferences, workshops, and other kinds of meetings. It will provide opportunities for specialists in the field to explore theories, develop training models, and conduct training programs. It will promote research and provide a vehicle through which guidelines for proper professional and ethical conduct in the field may be developed.”

In the early days of the organization’s existence, the SIETAR annual congresses were a forum for sharing experiences of training, and discussing theory and method, but it also gave the opportunity for people to meet socially and thereby strengthen bonds of trust between them. Most of the people involved in SIETAR at that time knew each
other, and there was a shared feeling of belonging to a big family: something which, it is sometimes said, is missing in SIETAR today, because of its expansion.

I have often come across the view that interculturalists have a mission to fulfill; spreading the word of intercultural communication in order to make the world a better place to live in. By now, however, this humanitarian ethos is somewhat less prominent among the interculturalists. Instead, as I have suggested above, they are becoming more concerned with their professional identity. Professionalization has now become a major issue in SIETAR. In the spring of 1995, a task force was formed to examine if SIETAR International should try to establish a process to certify people as intercultural trainers and/or consultants. Underlying this is a concern for excluding incompetent trainers and "charlatans." 8

Today SIETAR International has about 1600 members from 65 different countries, and since 1991, it has been affiliated with the United Nations as a non-government organization. SIETAR International has also developed local chapters, such as SIETAR Deutschland, SIETAR Europa, SIETAR Finland, SIETAR France, SIETAR Japan, SIETAR Netherlands, SIETAR Norway and SIETAR USA. New local chapters are in the making, both inside and outside the United States. This has led to a new phase in the history of the association. Strong voices within SIETAR now want it to evolve into what is called "The SIETAR Global Network." By this is meant that the local chapters should take on more responsibility for their members. This transformation has been discussed for a long time, and, in particular, with respect to a commonly held opinion that SIETAR International is not really an international organization. It has been argued that the organizational structure of SIETAR International has been too American, and consequently not meeting the needs of members living outside of the United States. The SIETAR Global Network, it is said, would move away from that, and instead take on a more administrative role. The international congresses are instead to be organized by local chapters, with administrative help from the Network. In this way, SIETAR could become more international than before. The first SIETAR Global Network congress
will be held in Tokyo, in November 1998, and it will be organized by SIETAR Japan.

In this brief historical sketch, I have focused on the development of intercultural training and on the circumstances leading up to the establishment of SIETAR. This has inevitably left out people, institutes and organizations that independently of each other did similar kinds of training, both inside and outside the United States. Again in the American context, one could mentioned here, for example, the training conducted by Edward T. Hall, of the Point Four technicians at the Foreign Service Institute in the early 1950s. I will return to Hall in a later chapter, but suffice it to say here is that the intercultural training programs Hall developed focused on micro-behavior, such as space and time perceptions in different cultures, and that there was a concern that programs had to be experiential. This was done in response to the training programs available at that time, which were of a didactic nature. As we have just seen, the early training programs for the Peace Corps were also didactic, which suggests that the intercultural trainers who developed experiential learning methods for Peace Corps training were to a degree reinventing Hall’s intercultural training programs.

The reason for my focus on SIETAR is that as a professional organization for intercultural trainers and consultants, it has played a major part in creating a unified professional field of intercultural training. Through the annual SIETAR congresses, a unified body of knowledge and practice of intercultural communication training has come into existence, to which people have submitted in order to be identified as professional trainers and consultants. And it is in SIETAR that people have been identified as “interculturalists,” and their work as belonging to “the intercultural field.”

During the history of the field, there have been several off-shoots leading to the establishment of intercultural communication as an academic subject. This has most often taken place in communication departments. Scholars interested in research have shown only a mild interest in SIETAR. Many interculturalist academics with whom I have talked do not attend the SIETAR annual congresses to gain new knowledge. They go there to meet old friends, and to have a good time. Their
academic discourse takes place elsewhere; for example, at the annual conferences of the International Communication Association (ICA), and in particular in the sessions organized by the Intercultural/Development Communication Division of ICA. This division was created in 1970 to promote, among other things, research on intercultural interaction, to develop intercultural communication theory, but also to "help develop training and education in methods of intercultural communication based on scientifically derived theories of communication" (Communique, 1971). K.S. Sitaram and Edward C. Stewart were responsible for its inception. According to Sitaram and Cogdell (1976:7), early attempts at systematic academic research in intercultural communication were conducted at the University of Hawaii.

**Organizational forms of professionalism**

Along with membership in SIETAR International comes the bimonthly newsletter *Communique* and a quarterly journal called *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* (IJIR). *Communique* has been the newsletter of SIETAR International since its inception in 1975, although we have seen that it started earlier (in 1970) as the newsletter of the Intercultural Communication Network.

*Communique* offers a forum for exchanging information about different types of resources, such as workshops, videos, publications, events and work opportunities. The first page, however, is reserved for the president of the association; here he or she informs readers about the recent achievements of SIETAR, using the words "interculturalists" or "SIETARians." SIETAR is depicted as a growing professional organization, attracting attention from different quarters in society. When it was recognized as a Non-Governmental Organization at the United Nations in July 1991, for example, the first page headline of *Communique* was: "SIETAR International Granted NGO Status at the United Nations." An enthusiastic comment followed:
"Being associated with the UN gives SIETAR International tremendous credibility in the international arena as a contributor and shaper of a new global era. Specifically, NGO status through the Department of Public Information allows SIETAR members throughout the world to learn of and educate others about UN sponsored initiatives. By the same token, after inclusion in ECOSOC, it creates the opportunity for SI members to educate the United Nations about the field of intercultural relations through writing, training, development work and other venues that might assist this unique planetary governance organism to incorporate intercultural competence in its activities and resolutions" (Communique, 1991:1).

Such messages of professionalism become important for many interculturalists, since they can draw upon them in the marketing of their services and products.

The International Journal of Intercultural Relations (IJIR) became the official publication of SIETAR in 1977. Its aim, as editor Dan Landis (1977:7) described it at that time, was "to improve the efficiency and pleasantness of the interactions between persons of differing cultural backgrounds." Twenty years later these aims were described in a more formal way as: "advancing knowledge and understanding of theory, practice, and research in intergroup relations" (IJIR, 1996). The editor-in-chief and the members of the editorial board are affiliated with different universities, most of them in the United States. Authors whose writings are published are also most often affiliated with higher education. This makes the journal a powerful instrument in connecting SIETAR with academia, a link further accentuated in the journal by a page devoted to information about the organization:

"SIETAR International is an interdisciplinary professional and service organization whose purpose is to implement and promote cooperative interactions and effective communication among peoples of diverse cultures, races, and
ethnic groups. Its objective is to encourage the development and application of knowledge, values, and skills which enable effective intercultural, interracial, and interethnic actions at the individual, group, organization and community level."

Yet it is perhaps especially through the annual SIETAR congresses that messages of professionalism and SIETAR ideology are conveyed. Here methods, concepts, ideas, and products relating to intercultural communication are presented in workshops and lectures. There is also a keynote lecture, an award luncheon, a banquet, a Newcomers’ Session, an Opening Session, and a General Assembly. An exhibition hall is set up in which people and companies display merchandise for sale: simulation games, handbooks, textbooks, and manuals for teaching intercultural communication. The registration desk also functions as a message center, where people leave messages, brochures about their work or company, or copies of presented workshop materials.

During the congress week, the members of SIETAR share experiences and knowledge from work and travel. They are also exposed to a stream of messages of professionalism. At one of the annual conferences, the participants got one such message almost on their doorstep, on a huge poster at the entrance to the Exhibition Hall:

"In Nineteenth Century America, there were certain professions which were judged to represent the most ‘noble calling’ a person could have... professions such as medicine, law or the ministry. There is no doubt in my mind that in this last quarter of the Twentieth Century, the intercultural field has become the most important calling to which anyone can respond. For it provides the means of understanding and drawing together the disparate and often antagonistic peoples of the world" (L. Robert Kohls)

A similar rhetoric could be found in a display of “multilingual buttons for sale,” at another one of the SIETAR congresses. On but-
tons with a picture of Earth, there was the text “One World” above the picture, and “One People” below it. With the same message in different languages, the buttons were displayed together on a sheet of card board, set up near the registration desk. Standing close to the display was a map of the world. On its top was written “Where are we from?” A box of pins with colored heads was placed close to the map, and people came by and put a pin on the map to show where they came from.

Together with the map, the display signified diversity as well as communion within SIETAR. Although, the members come from different countries and speak different languages, they share the same planet, and the same cause, - making the world a better place to live in by encouraging intercultural communication. This message was intensified by the fact that the congress took place in Jamaica: the national motto, “Out of Many, One People,” was ever present.

Messages of professionalism are also conveyed in the opening speech of the SIETAR congresses. Here sentiments are invoked of belonging to a community with a mission to make the world a better place to live in. At the opening of the fourth SIETAR Europa Congress in 1994, Mieke Janssen-Matthes from the Netherlands, president of SIETAR Europa, said:

“Let me ask you a question. What, if anything, is a zebra? Is it a white animal with black stripes, which is the European answer, or is it a black animal with white stripes, which is the African version, or what kind of animal is it? Here biologists strain to find answers. This question “What, if anything, is a Zebra?” reminded me of SIETAR Europa. What, if anything is SIETAR Europa? A white organization with black stripes, because the belly is white, or a black organization with white stripes, highly unlikely. So, then what kind of organization are we? Let me explain: SIETAR is the international Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, a non-profit, antiracist, an organization not affiliated to governments or politics, treasuring the declaration of human rights. A society of pro-
fessionals working with specialization in the intercultural field, in various disciplines, on different levels, colleagues who are interested and knowledgeable in a wide range of aspects. So, we are multidisciplinary and intercultural. But how striped are we? How diverse, if black stands for diversity here, are we? Diversity in countries? Yes. Culture, intellectual styles? Mores and methodology? And in people? This diversity needs the continuous attention of all our members, as part of an ongoing intercultural learning process. We emphasise diversity, while we grow in unity, and grow we do. The value of diversity in our society is also a necessity, for we want to be judged by our deeds, not just by our words.”

Again, similar views are expressed in the opening speech of one of the annual SIETAR International congresses. Here is Wendy, one of the organizers and an intercultural trainer and consultant affiliated with higher education:

“The task that in my view is most significant is to see to what extent we can eliminate some of the barriers that have separated us. I remember talking to an astronaut at the Smithsonian Institution, and he commented that the strangest experience, looking down on the earth, was noticing that there are no barriers. And that the barriers, indeed, are in our minds. So, it's our hope that through our minds and our strategies for communicating with each other, and empowering others, we can eliminate some of those barriers that really are not necessary.”

In more informal settings, such as the Newcomers’ Session, with perhaps seventy persons attending, images of professionalism are conveyed in other ways. The president, members of the Governing Council, and others who have been in the field for a long time, speak about what it means to be a “SIETARian.” They portray SIETAR as their
professional home, where they will meet fellow professionals to share experiences with:

“To participate in SIETAR is like coming to a professional home. We do not need to explain what we are doing. For outsiders it is difficult to understand what we are doing. SIETAR exists in order for us to get together and exchange ideas and experiences without having to explain ourselves. It is the spirit of shared interests. People who work at the hotels where we have our congresses often come up and wonder who we are. We seem to have such fun together. This is part of the spirit of SIETAR. We are not only a profession, we are also involved as persons. Many members have made bonds of friendship in SIETAR.”

At the Newcomers’ Session, old members are also invited to share their experiences of being members of SIETAR. They can reminisce, for example, about their first meeting with SIETAR and its members, how easy it was to get in contact with them, and how veterans showed an interest in sharing their concerns and struggles, but also how they guided the new members toward becoming professional interculturalists.

The first person to speak is a woman who describes how she got into the intercultural field by attending the first SIETAR conference in 1975, and how easy it had been to meet people, who had encouraged her to start working with intercultural communication. Another woman says that she is working as a consultant, and that SIETAR has given her many contacts with people with whom she has been able to share experiences from work. He has been a member only for a year now, says a man, but it has been very fruitful to him to meet all these famous people in the field, and easy to get in contact with them. The last person to speak is a woman who has long been a member of SIETAR. A certain memory of her first SIETAR congress stands out, she says, when some of the more famous people in the field came up to her and asked her if she wanted to join them for lunch. “It’s that kind of spirit that keeps SIETAR going,” she points out.
The message of what membership means is further enhanced in an exercise which is a recurrent part of the Newcomers’ Sessions. The format varies depending upon who is running the exercise, but the purpose is the same, to create a sense of belonging, and to open up a dialogue between new members. A member of the Governing Council might say: “In the spirit of SIETAR you will now have five minutes to get to know a person who sits close to you. Talk about what drew you into the intercultural field.” People start talking to each other for about ten minutes, and then they are interrupted:

“Silence, please. This is what is happening in SIETAR. People talk with each other and exchange experiences. The new members are the new blood in SIETAR, those who continue the spirit. You are SIETARians.”

So far we have looked at how professional identity is conveyed in speeches and exercises. Messages of professionalism, however, also take other forms. Every year at the SIETAR International congress, there is an award ceremony. Here, particular outstanding individuals and their work are given recognition and honor. The awards began in 1985, introduced by the SIETAR president at that time, Michael Prosser, who is affiliated with higher education.

There are different categories of awards. The most common are “Outstanding Senior Interculturalist,” “Outstanding Junior Interculturalist,” “Outstanding Student Interculturalist,” and “Outstanding Article in the International Journal of Intercultural Relations.” Other awards are not given so often: “Primus Inter Pares”¹⁰, “Special Award,” “Executive Director Recognition,” “Ten Year Award” and “Twenty Year Award.” The ceremony is scheduled in the congress program as the “Award Luncheon,” and is included in the conference fee, so that all participants will attend. Each award recipient is presented by a SIETAR functionary who before disclosing the recipient’s name gives a brief description of the award motivation. As the recipients step up to receive the award, they give short speeches, thanking the Award Committee as well as persons who have been of importance in their careers.
The awards are perceived to set the standard for different stages in people's careers, to celebrate the maturity of the field, to be inspirational and motivational, to help in defining who is an interculturalist, and to recognize personal merit. Awards can therefore be said to entail a quality control which screens people, and thereby to serve as a part of the "professional project." This, then, turns SIETAR into a site for the "production of producers."

Yet this kind of identifying professionalism stands in contrast with the experience of many interculturalists working as trainers and consultants. For them, professional credibility is established through the reputation they gain in their work. If their services and products have a market potential, which includes the way they perform their work - if it is entertaining, easy to understand, and not too time-consuming for the customers - they will gain a good reputation.

Within the intercultural field, and SIETAR, there is an ongoing debate over professional credentials. Some are in favor of more formalization, arguing that this gives recognition to the intercultural field as a profession, and that people outside the field will have a better understanding of what the interculturalists have to offer. Others are against it, saying that it will screen out people who could have something important to contribute to the field, or that it is unnecessary, since professional credentials are gained through reputation anyway.

Two prominent writers in the intercultural field, Michael Paige and Judith Martin (1983:38), both from academia, suggest that the eclecticism of the field may be a source of vitality, at the same time as it reflects a serious problem; "the lack of professional requisites for entry." Thereby, they argue, the intercultural field is subject to abuse.

As I said before, in 1995 a task force was established to see if SIETAR International should make an effort to establish a certification program so that people could become certified intercultural trainers and/or consultants. At the 1996 SIETAR International Congress, some of the members of the task force invited participants for a round table discussion on this. Most of the responses were in favor. This stands in contrast to the eclecticism otherwise encouraged in SIETAR.

In the 1997 Spring issue of Communiqué a final report from the
task force was published. A vote had been taken on whether SIETAR International should develop a certification program; the result was an even split. Those who were in favor of a certification program said that it would:

"help the field by controlling the body of knowledge and bringing more rigor to becoming an interculturalist; help the clients by providing a benchmark of quality and creating an atmosphere of trust between trainers and clients; and, help the intercultural practitioner by establishing a set of standard requirements for being able to designate oneself as an intercultural trainer."

This shows a concern among many interculturalists of having a certification program in order to raise the status of the intercultural training and consulting to that of a profession. But the results of the vote reveal a tension within the field. Many interculturalists I have spoken to, who were involved with the inception of the field, are sceptical and oppose credentials. They say it will block the opportunity of many people to enter the field. They want it to be eclectic. Others, in favor of credentials, say, as we have seen above, that it will help to identify the field. Most of the people in favor of credentials have completed, or are taking part in, educational programs in intercultural communication. They want their investment to be recognized.

Learning the trade

It is at SIETAR congresses that people learn how to package and market their service and products. The exhibition hall and the workshops, which constitute the main part of the congress activities, are important sites for picking up such information. In the exhibition hall, publishing companies, schools and consultant agencies display their services and products. Here the congress participants walk around and look at different simulation games, handbooks or textbooks, and different kinds
of intercultural communication training manuals on display at tables and stands. They can also enter into discussions with publishers and producers of these products on how to use them, or exchange experiences from having used them. One cannot purchase anything here, only place orders. Schools such as the Lesley College Intercultural Relations Program or the School for International Training also have representatives presenting their programs.11

Business people and development workers also attend the congresses. They are looking for services and products that can help them in their work, and this makes them an important target for many consultants, as can be seen in the intensive exchange of business cards.

The workshops are good places to learn how to package and market services and products and comprise the main part of congress activities. Each congress is organized around a theme. From 1990 to 1996 these have been “Changing Intercultural Partnerships: The Four Worlds and the New Europe,” “Creating Global Synergy: The Intercultural Perspective,” “Strategies for Cross-Cultural Communication in the New Information Age: Continuity, Change and Innovation,” “Honoring Diversity Through Multicultural Action,” “Interculturalists: Coming of Age,” “Changing Frontiers: Intercultural Perspectives in Theory and Practice” and “Meeting the Intercultural Challenge.” These themes are perceived to address current issues in the world. For the 1996 congress, the theme “Meeting the Intercultural Challenge” was said to address “the need to identify and develop effective approaches in those areas where cultures of all kinds intermingle.” The different congress tracks, such as Research, Education, Community Interaction and Business, were all expected to address this theme.

In the program for one of the SIETAR International congresses, a workshop called “Cross-Cultural Conflict Resolution: a Comparative Approach” was described as follows:

“Current models for conflict resolution generally do not take into consideration differences in culture. This workshop will examine the issue of conflict in a cultural context and move to different viewpoints for various societies and value systems.”
The description was followed by a presentation of the workshop facilitator:

"Patricia has twelve years’ overseas experience in a variety of cultures, and has worked as a consultant for private industry, non-profit organizations, and government... Additionally, she has trained international business people from a variety of countries, including the Soviet Union, Japan, China, Korea, Taiwan, Morocco, Egypt, and Latin America, in the ways of American business and general orientation to the U.S."

It is from such descriptions that the participants of the congress choose which workshops they want to attend: mostly depending on what kind of work they are doing themselves. Those who attended the workshop just described were working with conflicts between ethnic minorities and nationals. They expected to learn new ways of doing cross-cultural conflict resolution, and to exchange experiences from work.

The workshop began with all participants presenting themselves, their name and what kind of intercultural work they are involved in, and then Patricia described the agenda. She would not use models that describe how to solve a conflict. Instead, she would present a model that she used herself, and which she said could be adjusted to every culture. The crux is not to help solving problems in a conflict, she said, since problems are always part of cooperation, but to help people reach their goals. She then gave a brief presentation of how she works with grievances between persons in a multicultural organization or company.

Patricia taped up a piece of paper on one of the walls in the room, on which was written, “open space,” and said: “This white wall is our open space today. By this concept we can identify grievances and make them visible.” She then asked the participants to think about a conflict, write it down on a piece of paper and then tape it on the wall: “The wall then becomes our negotiating room.”
Everyone wrote down a conflict on a piece of paper, stood up and announced what it was, and then went up to the wall and taped it there. Most of the conflicts were taken from work experiences. Patricia then divided these different conflicts into five different themes, and the whole group was divided into these five themes. Each group was asked to create a scenario out of their given theme. This also meant that each group member had to develop a role according to the chosen scenario, and then act that role in the group. When that was done the group was to act out the role play in front of the other groups.

I found myself in a group of five persons. The conflict scenario we chose was presented by Miguel, one of the group members, who said it came from his recent work. It depicted conflicts between Americans and Chicanos working at an art gallery. He said that the Chicanos were complaining that the Americans did not listen to them when they where working together on preparing art exhibitions at the gallery. Three of us were to play the Americans, while he and another participant played the Chicanos. We tried to adjust to our roles, but it was not easy. Most of the time we were silent or laughing. Those who played the Chicanos looked down at the floor, since, according to Miguel, this is the way the Chicanos behave when in conflict with the Americans.

We were interrupted by Patricia, who told each group to present their role plays to the other groups. The groups then put on their performances, to applause from the others. When all the groups had made their presentations, Patricia commented that the meaning of the exercise was to grasp the problems in a conflict. She asked what the participants saw in the different group presentations. People answered by dropping words, such as “agreement,” “defense,” “listening,” which Patricia wrote on a flip chart. “Did you feel that the problems could be solved?” she asked. Everyone said no. Here Patricia moved into showing her model of conflict resolution.

This model consisted of the following headlines: Framing: time, place, people; Preparation; Agreement; Team building. There is no conflict resolution formula for every situation, she argued; we all live with conflict because of cultural differences, gender differences, etc. The question was rather how to come to an agreement when there is a
conflict. “When we have to do with cultural differences, it is important to understand behavior in order to reach an agreement.” She also said that by knowing oneself and one’s own cultural values, one can reach agreement, and a first step toward this is to divide persons working in a company into their respective cultural groups. Then one can ask questions about why people behave in a certain manner. Does it depend on cultural differences, gender differences, or what? These questions were left unanswered, as the workshop drew to a close. All the participants were pleased with the workshop.

Among the most popular sessions during a SIETAR congress, attracting most participants, are those demonstrating simulation games. These games are perceived as entertaining. They “break the ice,” as many interculturalists say, creating a comfortable atmosphere in the training program.12

In one session which I attended on the use of simulation games to encourage new management skills, the room becam crowded quickly, and many people had to leave. This caused the congress organizers to repeat this session the following evening as well. Here we were introduced to simulation games such as Barnga, Bafã Bafã and Clues and Challenges, by playing short versions of them. Many participants attended the session to see if they could use the games in their own training programs. The Barnga scene of Chapter 1 comes from this session.

The session began with Susan and Phyllis introducing themselves and presenting their goals for the session: to familiarize participants with the three simulation games, and to explore problems in using simulation games in business settings: are they too time-consuming, too experiential, too emotionally challenging, not serious enough, even childish? It is important, they said, that you fashion your training program in accordance with the client’s wishes. The advantage of using simulation games is that it lets you experience foreign situations.

After this brief introduction we were to play Barnga, then continue with Bafã Bafã and finish with Clues and Challenges. Since the time for the whole session was three hours, there would not be much time for each game. At the end of each of them, there is time for discus-
sion and reflection on use in the business environment. Here Susan and Phyllis shared their experiences from using these games with business people, and described how a game could give rise to a discussion among managers about different problems at work. This, they argued, would not have happened without using these games.

It is in the interplay between the way services and products are displayed and presented at SIETAR congresses, and the messages of professionalism conveyed here, that the members of SIETAR learn how to package and market themselves as professional interculturalists. They could learn something from the way that, for example, Patricia's workshop on cross-cultural conflict resolution and her personal background were described in the congress program, as well as from their experience of how the workshop was organized and conducted. The mere fact that it was part of the congress program also helped lend credibility to Patricia's professional status and to the way she conducted her work. And especially since most of the participants were not affiliated with higher education but operated in the market place, they could learn something about how to promote their own workshops among prospective clients.
The main organizational feature of the interculturalist complex is the existence of a wide range of small and large consultant agencies. The background of these entrepreneurs is very diverse. Some have a business education and previous experience of working with international companies, some have lived and worked abroad, others are (or have been) married to someone of a different nationality; or there may be a combination of such background factors. There are also some large agencies which have been involved in foreign language training, and which have added intercultural training as another line of business.

**Interculturalist big business**

Some of the major agencies have branches in several countries, or have licensees who use their training models in other countries. Richard Lewis Communication is an example. Primarily an international language school, operating in 30 locations around the world, such as in Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden and Hong Kong, it has its main office in Hampshire, England. In 1988, Richard Lewis founded the Institute of Cross-Cultural Communication, a division of Richard Lewis Communication. The institute describes itself as specializing in the "analysis of cross-cultural problems and helping managers and staff of corporations and government
departments to develop the skills necessary to function effectively in multinational teams."

In a brochure advertising Richard Lewis Communication, the following information about Richard Lewis himself can be found, which is also available on Internet where the company has a home page. He is portrayed as having a background in languages, with a B.A. in French, Spanish and Italian, a Diploma in Education, and a Diplome de Culture et Civilisation from the Sorbonne. In the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s, he was involved in establishing several Berlitz schools in different parts of the world, and between 1958 and 1963 he lived in Portugal, where he founded the Cambridge School of Languages. From 1967 to 1970 he was private tutor to Empress Michiko and five other members of the Japanese imperial family. He also lived in Finland for seven years. In 1971 he founded Linguarama, a language school, at Riversdown House, England. In 1988 he left Linguarama, and two years later he founded Richard Lewis Communication. He has also travelled extensively in South America and was involved in the management of a Brazilian company for ten years. He is said to speak Finnish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and Swedish fluently.

The brochures advertising Richard Lewis Communication show pictures of the different sites where courses are held. Some of the places, such as Riversdown, England, and Domaine de Nesvres, France, are beautifully located in buildings from the middle ages. Here the clients are offered intense language courses and cross-cultural courses on an individual basis, and also have access to individual study rooms and to interactive video and computer-aided learning systems. Riversdown, it is moreover pointed out, also offers leisure facilities such as a nine-hole golf course and two all-weather tennis courts, to which the clients have free access. This information is also available on internet.

The Institute of Cross-Cultural Communication offers seminars consisting of five modules: Introduction to intercultural communication; Cross-culture in depth - area specific; Functioning interculturally; Psychology and language; and Changing perspectives in international management. Examinations are held at two levels: First Certificate in Cross-Cultural Communication, attained after the three first modules;
and the Certificate of Proficiency in Cross-Cultural Communication, which is awarded after the five modules. These examinations take place twice a year, in June and December, and can be taken at the Richard Lewis Communication centres in Copenhagen, Gothenburg, Helsinki, Hong Kong, London, Lyon, Malmo, Paris, Singapore, Stockholm, Taipei, Tallinn and Volgograd, or at associated centers in Buenos Aires, Madrid, San Diego, Sydney, Tokyo and Turin.

Since 1994 the Institute also issues a monthly 4 to 6 page information sheet, “Cross-cultural letter to international managers,” which belongs to a series called “Insights into intercultural interaction.” Lately it has changed its name to “Insights into global competence,” reflecting the contemporary fashion in the business environment of using the concept of globalization in discussing international business. The content of the letters address various themes such as “What is culture?”, “Cultural factors in international negotiation,” “The Ocean-loving Portuguese,” “Concepts of time” and “Language and thought.” The contents of the letters are protected by copyright.

The seminars of the Institute of Cross-Cultural Communication are offered periodically, on an open basis, or can be booked by companies or organizations. Each module runs for one day. They are held either at the locations of the Richard Lewis Communication centers or at the client’s own sites. A “Cross-Culture Distance Learning Programme” is also offered, where examinations take place at the above-mentioned sites. Lately, the Institute has also begun to offer “Language and Culture courses,” advertised as a new concept in business training, combining language and cross-cultural communication courses.

Two other consultant agencies operating in several countries are the Centre for International Business Studies (CIBS), and the Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation (IRIC). Both have their main location in the Netherlands, CIBS in Amstelveen and IRIC in Maastricht. Their founders are well-known in the intercultural field, and we have already come across their names in earlier chapters.

CIBS was founded in 1987 by Fons Trompenaars, the managing director. In a brochure advertising the Centre, its purpose is said to be to “help improve the global effectiveness of organisations through best
practice training, consultancy and publishing in cross-cultural management.” Trompenaars described the purpose of his business-oriented courses to me as follows:

“Our courses are not on how to deal better with the Koreans or how to deal better with the French. It is more about basic attitudes of being an international person, trying to be more aware, and taking advantage of cultural differences. That is our main goal in life.”

The Centre has now expanded into a network with branch offices and licensees, and in 1991 Intercultural Management Publishing was founded, which produces and distributes books, videos, training materials and interactive media. Some of the programs offered at CIBS are: “Managing across cultures,” “Multicultural management,” “International teambuilding,” “The management of strategic dilemmas,” and “Culture compass country briefings.”

According to company information, Fons Trompenaars received a Ph.D. in 1985 from the Wharton School of Management at the University of Pennsylvania. His Ph.D. is in Social Psychology, but this is not mentioned in the company information. It was here that he developed his method for understanding cultural differences. This is the “7D-Model” and “Culture Mapping,” both registered as trademarks. The “7D-Model” and “Culture Mapping” are said to diagnose cultural differences and corporate culture, respectively. It is the business environment that Trompenaars has in mind with his method, which can be seen from the reviews of his best-selling book Riding the Waves of Culture, published in 1993 (and encountered here in Chapter 1). He is identified by the Financial Times as the “new star of the world’s management seminar circuit.” Different people associated with international business are also quoted as praising the book’s applicability to international business: Mort Topfer, Executive Vice President of Motorola Inc., says that the book “reinforces the importances of understanding cultural diversity in business in a way that is clear, powerful and compelling,” and David Wigglesworth, of the management consultant agency
D.C.W. Associates International, describes it as

“a must reader for all international/intercultural managers... a powerful pioneering work that has gained the respect of corporate leaders around the world. It has direct application not only in international management but also for managers working with culturally diverse work forces within one particular country.”

The book has been translated into six languages: French, German, Dutch, Korean, Portuguese and Italian, and has sold 80,000 copies of which more than half in English-speaking countries. The Open University, for example, ordered a couple of thousand copies of the book. In 1993, together with Charles Hampden-Turner (an internationally known cross-cultural management consultant affiliated with the Cambridge University, Judge Institute of Management, and with the Erasmus University in the Netherlands), Trompenaars also published a book named *The Seven Cultures of Capitalism*. This book has not had the same impact on the intercultural field as Trompenaar’s own book, but it deals with similar issues focusing on business culture in United States, Britain, France, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands and Japan. It has been translated into Dutch, Turkish, Chinese, and Spanish, and is said to be very popular in Mexico. In *Svenska Dagbladet* (May 21, 1995), a major Swedish daily newspaper, an entire page was devoted to a review of a seminar given by Trompenaars for Swedish export sales personnel, arranged by the Swedish Trade Council, on cultural differences in business.

CIBS also offers a program that authorizes people to use Trompenaars’ specific method for understanding cultural differences. In a letter I received from CIBS describing the program, it is said to be divided into two stages, where the first is focused on theory, and the second on practice. The person who has completed this program is then evaluated, and a decision is taken whether he or she will be granted a two-year license. This program has created a considerable network of people using Trompenaars’ method, and has resulted in the establish-
ment of CIBS branches in several countries; one branch is in Singapore. To my question about the purpose of having a licensing program, Trompenaars responded:

"We don't do it to increase our markets, it is to serve the existant markets better. Why we are setting this up is because there are many global companies, internationally operating companies, who say, 'Listen, thank you for training our people in Europe, but what about Asia?'. In the past I and Oscar [van Weerdenburg] went all over the world, while now we say, 'Hey, why not have Asian people in Asia to do this and American people in America to do this?' In fact it is born out of a necessity of existing markets."

At the moment CIBS is in the process of reorganization. The new organization will consist of three parts: The Trompenaars Team, which will be a link between research and practice, developing questionnaires and adding data to their database; United Notions, which will be occupied with the training of trainers and linking them to an international network of licensees (this will also be the new name of CIBS, which will have three main offices, in Europe, in the United States and in Asia); and Intercultural Management Publishers, which will publish different kinds of materials on intercultural communication and also build up a library of case histories and "critical incidents."

The Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation (IRIC) was founded in 1980 by Geert Hofstede, as a non-profit foundation. Since April 1, 1995, it is affiliated with the University of Limburg and Tilburg University in the Netherlands. In a brochure about the Institute, it is described as providing basic and applied research on intercultural cooperation, which is identified as being of importance for coming to terms with the problems of mankind today. The solution to these problems, according to the brochure, "will depend largely on the effective cooperation of people who think differently, because they were brought up in different cultures."
Geert Hofstede received a Ph.D. in social psychology in 1980, and in the mid-1980s he was appointed professor of business administration in Maastricht. At present he refers to himself as an organizational anthropologist, and his book *Culture’s Consequences* has gained a wide reputation among many interculturalists, some of which consider him a “guru” in intercultural communication. The reputation of the book has also spread to other academic disciplines, such as social psychology and business management.¹

In *Culture’s Consequences*, Hofstede presents four cultural dimensions which can be used to distinguish between different cultures: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and masculinity. These concepts have become part of the vocabulary of interculturalists, despite the fact that many of them have not read Hofstede’s book. They know about the concepts from reading other people’s books and articles about them, or from having them presented by different speakers at SIETAR congresses.

IRIC is also involved in publishing, and has a network of licensees who provide training and consulting, using IRIC’s research results and diagnostic tools. The diagnostic tools are called the “Values Survey Module,” and in a letter I received from IRIC this VSM is said to be designed for “measuring culture-determined differences between matched samples of respondents from different countries or regions.” The VSM is copyrighted, so when purchasing one copy of the manual, one obtains the right to use the questionnaire for only one research project. Consultants who want to use it several times can make special arrangements with IRIC; for example, ITAP International, a consultant agency in the United States offering information about cultural differences to companies with international business relations, has such an agreement. Hofstede has also come to offer his research method as a commercial standard package to Dutch companies, but in this variant his four dimensions have been expanded into six. In the marketing of the program, the offer is to “investigate your [corporate] culture so that you can see how your position stands vis-à-vis your rivals on these 6 dimensions” (quoted in Koot, 1991:110).

Hofstede and Trompenaars have also been invited as keynote
speakers at SIETAR congresses. For example, at the SIETAR Congress in 1996 in Munich, Germany, people could sign up in advance for a “Conversation Hour with Geert Hofstede,” and for a lunch talk on “Reconciliation of Cultural Differences” by Fons Trompenaars. These events drew large audiences, evidence of the high status of these two speakers in the intercultural field.

Lately, a tension has developed between Hofstede and Trompenaars, where they accuse each other of superficiality in their analyses of cultural differences, and of being too commercial. For example, Hofstede (1996:198) wrote a critique recently in the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* (the SIETAR journal) focusing on the way Trompenaars draws his conclusions from his data base. According to Hofstede, there is little correlation between the data gained through Trompenaars’ questionnaire and his seven cultural dimensions. He also requests access to the scores of the countries in Trompenaars’ database. Hofstede bases his critique on a statistical study of data presented in Trompenaars’ book, and goes on to accuse Trompenaars of “riding the waves of commerce,” in that he “tunes his message to what he thinks the customers like to hear”: “The result is a fast food approach to intercultural diversity and communication” (Hofstede 1996:198). Trompenaars has answered these accusations, saying that

“If Hofstede ‘knows’ that we are in this business for the money and are ready to practice intellectual dishonesty to this end, then we leave him to this immaculate perception.” (Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1997:149)

*Two women entrepreneurs*

In contrast to the large-scale entrepreneurship of Lewis, Trompenaars and Hofstede there are people like Jean Phillips-Martinsson, the best-known interculturalist in Sweden. (Many of the entrepreneurs in the intercultural field are women, working on their own as intercultural trainers and consultants.) Born in England, she moved to Sweden in
1962, and began working as a public relations consultant to Gumaelius, an advertising agency in Gothenburg. After four years there, she began her own consultant agency in public relations. Before coming to Sweden, she had been an information officer at the OECD in Paris, as well as a simultaneous interpreter between French and English. She had also worked as a freelance public relations consultant and radio correspondent in Britain.

Jean Phillips-Martinsson is a typical example of a small-scale entrepreneur, working on her own, with a wide transnational network of business people and diplomats who seek her expertise. When in need of certain culture-specific knowledge, Jean sometimes asks these people to participate in her workshops, or she interviews them about their culture (sometimes while taking them out for dinner). She also has a network of other intercultural trainers and consultants in various countries, who send her articles or reviews concerning intercultural communication training and consulting. She usually meets with them at SIETAR congresses.

In 1975, Jean founded the Cross-Cultural Relations Centre outside Stockholm and began giving courses entitled "Communicating with Confidence," which were three-day in-plant courses for middle and top management people dealing with international business. In the beginning, she told me, it was difficult to sell the course. Most companies were reluctant to admit that they had problems with their intercultural contacts. But this changed in 1976, when an interview with her was published in a Swedish weekly business magazine, Veckans Affärer. Here it was noted that the Swedish Trade Council, KemaNord, SAAB-Scania and the Swedish Tobacco Company had been her clients. Jean said that this article gave her work for the following two years. She was flooded by requests from businesses who wanted her services. Later, she also gained recognition in different media from a seminar that she organized in Stockholm in November 1982, in which she invited business people from different parts of the world to come and discuss their impressions of dealing with Swedish businessmen.

Her course was the first of its kind in Sweden, and it was marketed for the Swedish business environment. Swedish business people
were told that they were good speakers of English, but had little confidence in how to behave when communicating with foreigners. In one of her course descriptions, Jean says that the goal of the course is two-fold:

"to raise the awareness of cultural differences in business and social behavior, and what effects these have; to help the participants develop their personal skills in communicating more effectively and affectively with their foreign contacts."

The course is limited to five participants - to guarantee efficiency and individual analysis, she suggests. It became very popular, and Jean Phillips-Martinsson gained a strong reputation for, as several customers said, "blending theory and practice with personal commitment and charm." This is an important quality in gaining professional status in the consultant profession. With such a reputation, many consultants do not need to make much of an effort to market themselves. Future clients will know about their qualities from others who have used their services.

In 1981, Jean Phillips-Martinsson published a book called *Swedes as Others See Them*, to which I will return in a later chapter. This book increased people's awareness of her work. She writes about this in the introduction to the second edition, which appeared in 1991:

"When the first edition of this book was published, I anticipated flowers and champagne, or even rotten eggs. I did not expect the deathly silence which ensued when 190 Swedish friends and clients received their free copies. No slap on the back, no hugs and kisses - in fact, no spontaneous reaction whatsoever for two whole weeks. Then, God bless him, the King of Sweden returned from a visit to Saudi Arabia. At a gathering of businessmen he stressed the importance of understanding the Arab mind, customs and traditions. The TV reporter, commenting on this, then
linked His Majesty’s message with that in my book. Overnight my book and I became public property!... Suddenly I was drowned by invitations from government, industry, educational and charity organisations wanting me to give them a ‘quick fix’. Newspaper reporters and radio producers fell over themselves to interview me” (Phillips-Martinsson, 1991:10).

The second edition had a foreword by His Royal Highness, Prince Bertil of Sweden, in which he emphasized the importance of understanding and respecting cultural differences as key factors for success in international business. He noted that he found Jean’s book a valuable source in this respect, but also enjoyable reading.

I have heard Swedish trainers and consultants referring to the book as having given the intercultural field a bad reputation. They say that it simplifies what is going on in intercultural interactions, that it ridicules the Swedes, and that there is a patronizing tone in the book. But books are means for competition between consultants, and it is in this light one has to evaluate such comments.

On the Swedish interculturalist scene, Jean Phillips-Martinsson has been a conspicuous actor. There are other consultants, many of them also women, who are less visible, but still quite active. This is Sara, describing her own first approach to the field:

“What we share, who work with intercultural communication, are the experiences. Either one has lived abroad for a couple of years, or one comes from another country, and Sweden is the foreign country. Or one is married to a person from another country. It is often one’s own intercultural experiences, which have gone deep, that makes one interested... I went through all that which is called culture shock. Nobody had told me before what it was. I recognize all that has been written on culture shock, and reverse culture shock. It took a year to learn to come home... Culture shock is the psychological fatigue from all that
which is new. The first euphoria dies down, after a while it's no fun anymore. One loses one's whole social network and it takes time to create a new one. One cannot speak the language, and gets irritated on small things, things one ordinarily can handle. To go shopping was difficult before I learned how. I felt tiredness and apathy and sudden aggression towards the rest of the family. This is all typical, and at that time I felt I had had enough and wanted to go home... I recognize all the stages of culture shock. The most difficult thing is to come home.”

Sara told me how she began working as an interculturalist. She is married to a foreigner and lived for four years in a foreign country, when her husband was working there. Some years after returning home, she began her own consultancy in intercultural communication.

“During the years [abroad] I thought a lot about culture clashes. Sometime after I returned home, I read in a newspaper about Jean’s [Phillips-Martinsson] book on culture clashes. I recognized what she said in the book and thought that this is what I have been thinking of doing. I contacted her, and she told me about this subject called intercultural communication. Her advice to me was to get going. You have a lot of experiences, she told me, so read and read a lot. Get going on your own. The first time I did a lecture on this was at the school I was working at. When I returned home I started to teach in primary school. When I was leaving the school, to start working on my own, I proposed a whole-day workshop on intercultural communication. The Principal of the school found it interesting, so I put together a program, in which I was to lecture on intercultural communication. I used Jean’s book as a reference and took her rubrics, but filled in examples from my own experiences. The rubrics were: body language, time, values, attitudes and where they come from. Out of
this I created my own lectures and started to market myself... I also went for a two-day seminar with Philip Harris and his wife, and we were about thirty people. I was enthusiastic about this afterwards. It was so fantastic to get confirmation of all this, to get a structure for it, and to understand that there existed a subject. Here was what I wanted to do. I remember I could not sleep the night between these two seminar days. My head was just spinning.”2

*Interculturalist publishing*

The interculturalist industry is also organized around companies and publishers which produce different kinds of training materials, such as the know-how books, training manuals, simulation games and videos to be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. A major publishing company in the field is Intercultural Press, which publishes its own materials but also keeps materials from other publishers in stock. Trainers and consultants make up its main audience, but it also provides reading materials for academic courses, such as those at the Intercultural Relations Program at Lesley College.

Intercultural Press only sells its products by mail order, and has a mailing list of about 50,000 recipients all over the world, who receive its catalogue three times a year. The press grew out of the Intercultural Network, which was abandoned when SIETAR was established. In 1976, SIETAR moved from the University of Pittsburgh, where it had first been based, to Georgetown University in Washington, DC. In the process of that transition, David Hoopes resigned as Executive Director and instead, together with two close friends of his, Peggy Pusch and George Renwick, with whom he had conducted intercultural communication workshops, decided to keep the Network alive as a training development organization. During this time SIETAR was struggling with maintaining their publishing program, which had started in Pittsburgh. When David Hoopes left SIETAR, he and his two colleagues contin-
uded the publishing program as part of the Intercultural Network.

Between 1976 and 1979, this enterprise operated out of the basement of Pusch's house in Chicago. With the aid of the SIETAR membership directory and other mailing lists, the three distributed information about their publications. By 1979, they needed to decide whether they should become a full-time publishing company or not. They hired a publishing consultant, who told them they were viable as a publishing company, filling a niche, and that they could operate advantageously by mail order. So in May 1980, they reincorporated the Intercultural Network as the Intercultural Press. Their first publication was Robert Kohls' book *Survival Kit for Overseas Living*, which has been a best-seller ever since. Today, Intercultural Press is located in Yarmouth, Maine, with a paid staff taking care of the orders. David Hoopes is the editor-in-chief, while Peggy Pusch recently left the post as President in which she also worked as an editor. Toby Frank is now the President of the Intercultural Press. George Renwick is a well-known intercultural trainer and consultant and works as the associate editor and edits a series called InterActs published by the Press. The series focuses on analyzing differences between the way Americans and people from different countries see and do things, and how these differences affect relationships. The countries represented so far are Mexico, Japan, The Philippines, Spain, Greece, Israel, Russia, Australia and China.

Most of what Intercultural Press publishes is practically oriented, addressing different areas such as training, exchange, education, diversity and international business. Some of its titles are: *Experiential Activities for Intercultural Learning, Intercultural Sourcebook, Developing Intercultural Awareness, The Art of Crossing Cultures, The Handbook of Foreign Student Advising, American Cultural Patterns, Toward Multiculturalism, The Whole World Guide to Culture Learning, Understanding Cultural Differences, Intercultural Marriage, and Management in Two Cultures*. They also keep in stock for example Edward T. Hall's well-known books: *The Silent Language, The Hidden Dimension, Beyond Culture,* and *The Dance of Life*. These can only be ordered as a unit, treated as one book to cut shipping costs. It is designated "The Basic Works of Edward T. Hall," showing his enormous influence on the intercultural field. Representa-
tives of the Intercultural Press market their products at different congresses, such as the annual NAFSA and SIETAR congresses, where they always have booths. The press also has representatives in other countries who are authorized to sell its products.

Other publishing companies also issue books on intercultural communication, but often with other audiences in mind than that of Intercultural Press. Two such companies are Nicholas Brealey Publishing and SAGE Publications. Nicholas Brealey has published two commercially successful books in this area: Mind Your Manners by John Mole, and Fons Trompenaars' Riding the Waves of Culture. One of their later books is When Cultures Collide, by Richard Lewis.

These books obviously have their audiences in business circles. Their colorful covers show that they are aimed at a commercial market. For example, Trompenaars' book has a many-colored cover showing waves on which four different geometrical figures float. SAGE Publications, on the other hand, is geared toward a more scholarly market, where covers presumably matter less. The cover of Geert Hofstede's Culture's Consequences has a simple brown and white design, making a more scholarly impression.

Doing business with business

It is in the business environment that most of the interculturalists are found, since it gives the greatest cash turnover. In the marketing of their services and products, they primarily focus on addressing the importance of intercultural training for different business areas, such as the management of multicultural work forces, or negotiating with people of different cultures. A recurrent theme is to suggest that companies can save considerable amounts of money by preparing their overseas personnel through intercultural training. But several interculturalists that I have spoken to warn against such claims, saying that there is no instrument available to measure the effectiveness of intercultural training. This issue has been discussed for a long time in sessions at the SIETAR congresses as well as in the scholarly literature (see, e.g., Kealey and
The preoccupation with the business environment can be exemplified with how Jean Phillips-Martinsson advertised her services in the beginning of her career:

“Much of the success of international operations today depends upon your ability to get along with your overseas workforce, customers and suppliers. Learning to understand and respect their ways of doing business and behaving socially will enable you to function better in the marketplace, and to build up and maintain a long-term relationship.”

Many intercultural trainers and consultants produce brochures, leaflets or notebooks which describe their training methods, philosophical approaches, the history of the company, and why intercultural training is important. Two conspicuous features here are the accentuation of cultural differences, and information on the consultant’s intercultural experiences. Most often these brochures use illustrations to accentuate cultural differences: pictures of business negotiations, for example, where people of different nationalities are shown sitting around a table, or a white person dressed in a dark suit is talking to an Arab dressed in a white robe. Together with the accompanying text, this creates a strong image of cultural differences being self-evident. This is then accompanied by a list of cultures that the trainer have had personal experiences of, as well as a list of previous clients.

Such lists provide professional credentials for the interculturalists. If educational backgrounds are referred to at all, this comes after mentioning the intercultural experiences. For example, Sara mentions her intercultural experiences in her publicity materials before referring to her academic qualifications in several languages: she is married to a man from Asia and has visited his home country several times. This, it is emphasized, has given her extensive knowledge of Asian customs and values. She has also lived in a foreign country for several years. This is then followed by a statement of her academic credentials, in
two European languages, with a focus on business. There is also a list of clients she has worked with, consisting of public organizations as well as business corporations.

The same tendencies can be seen in the marketing of Richard Lewis' cross-cultural workshops. In a brochure advertising his workshops, there are lists of countries that Lewis has visited, and of the different assignments he has had with business organizations, government officials and departments in different countries. Such lists do not only display credentials, they are also means for competing with other interculturalists. The more intercultural experiences one can display, the more authentic is the professional expertise.

As we noted earlier in this chapter, however, reputation often matters most. Most of the intercultural trainers I have spoken to seldom need to advertise themselves. People phone them to say that they have heard from someone else about the quality of their services, and that they want to engage them. We have seen this in Jean Phillips-Martinsson's case. Karin, another Swedish consultant, similarly told me that after an article in a daily newspaper about her work and her company, she was contacted by several business companies. After some time she did not need to advertise herself; she got her assignments from the reputation she had gained. It is striking that the importance of reputation for gaining professional status in the consultant professions is seldom addressed in the literature on professionalization.

Many interculturalists travel a great deal in their work, most often within their own country, but sometimes abroad. Peter, an American consultant, described his coming work week to me, and commented that it was typical:

"Tomorrow I will meet a person who is responsible for 50,000 persons in different countries. He asked me, 'What leadership style do I need to have?' I will work with him on that. The American code of conduct doesn't work outside USA. On Wednesday I will meet 25 persons who have contacts with Mexicans. On Thursday I will meet with a couple who have been in England for four years. This is
reentry. How will the employee be integrated back into a company that has changed since he left? People who before were under him are now equal to him. This will be a combination of consulting and training. On Sunday I fly to Malaysia, to meet with a person born in China by English and Chinese parents. It will be an issue of how to do transition in leadership. He will be working in Korea with Koreans, who can't speak English, and with Americans. The American company is represented by Australians and Canadians. The Koreans wants to expand, while the Westerners want quality, and they also want to compete with the Japanese. After this I will go for a two-day seminar in Hong Kong. There I will meet a Chinese couple who are going to San Francisco. The wife is reluctant to leave, but the husband wants to go. The company wants me to persuade them to go. I then go to China to try and introduce Western technology to people with a different academic background than ours. How is it going to be presented so that they will understand it?"

In the constant travel of the interculturalists between different work places, it sometimes becomes important for them that these places have a similar setup. Several practitioners have told me about settings which made them insecure in how to fullfil their assignment. For example, Marilyn told me about her painful experience of having some of the participants located in another city and taking part in her workshop by way of a huge TV screen. She had to manage the technology by herself, without previous experience of it, at the same time she was conducting her workshop. It was a very stressful and confusing moment, she said, which made her insecure in what she was doing. And Sara told me about her experience of not having access to an overhead projector. She uses a lot of overhead pictures in her lectures and one time she came to a place that did not have an overhead projector. Her overhead pictures structure her presentation, and when she could not use them she felt insecure in her performance, and thereby in her pro-
Big consultant agencies, on the other hand, who can afford large work spaces, do not need to change places constantly. They offer their training programs in their own surroundings and are therefore able to build up an institutional sense of professional identity. For example, a company specializing in language courses and intercultural communication training is housed in a huge flat in central Stockholm. All teachers have their own rooms, and there are also common rooms where customers are brought in and trained, and where teachers can meet and exchange experiences. These rooms are furnished with sofas and chairs, bookshelves containing books and video tapes on language and intercultural communication, as well as a TV set. Such a place constitutes an institution in which fellow workers build up a common professional identity, through close interaction with each other.

*Teaching cultural understanding*

As we shall see in the following chapters, interculturalists package their understandings of culture and cultural differences in diverse ways. The amount of time that the trainers or consultants have at their disposal influences the content of a training program. There are interculturalists, such as Jean Phillips-Martinsson, who have developed training programs which run for three or four days, allowing them to use a blend of lectures, simulation games, videos, and video taping of the participants' performance. For example, Jean's three-day workshop consists of six hours per day, with lectures followed by exercises, in which she uses simulation games and role play. There is also a session where she films the participants and shows them the results; this is followed by a discussion of their behavior.

But the average timespan for intercultural training programs is half a day to one day. Here lectures and short exercises are the most common method. This is the way Richard Lewis conducts his workshops, as well as Sara.

Sara's method is mainly lecturing. The issues she addresses most
often focus on proxemics, kinesics, time perception, body language and non-verbal behavior. In a lecture on culture clashes which I attended, at a center for Swedish and immigrant youths in Stockholm, she began by giving a brief description of her own intercultural experiences while travelling and living in different cultures, and telling her listeners how she came in contact with “intercultural communication” and started to read about it. It was then that she found a structure for her intercultural experiences, she says. “I hope that during this evening you will also get some structure for what happens in the meeting between cultures.”

As a way of introducing the concept of “culture clash” she tells an anecdote that has become part of many interculturalists’ repertoire: a medical company planned to sell a brand of headache pills in North Africa. To do that they hired an advertising agency which prepared a three-picture strip, since most of the consumers were assumed to be illiterate. The first picture showed a man with a sad face, the next picture showed him taking a pill, and the last picture showed him with a smile on his face. But while the agency had made the strip to be read from left to right, in North Africa it would be read in the opposite direction, giving the strip quite another meaning than had been intended. The story gets a lot of laughter from the audience, and a humorous tone is set for the evening; something which frequently characterizes the atmosphere of intercultural training programs. This entertainment element is important in gaining a good reputation for an interculturalist. Without it, no matter how good their formal credentials are, trainers and consultants will not get many assignments.

Sara’s comment on the story is that it is a good example of how people only see things from their own perspective, and forget that other perspectives exist. This leads her into the theme for the evening - viewing things from different perspectives. As she suggests,

“Experience gives glasses through which we see reality, and all people have different individual experiences. When we talk about culture we talk about common experiences.”
From this she moves into talking about cultural traits. She dis­
plays an overhead picture with the headline, "Some Swedish cultural
traits," some of which are as follows:

- soft spoken
- conflict avoidance
- independent
- pragmatic instead of emotional

The traits are illustrated by anecdotes. For example, as an illus­
tration of the Swedish cultural trait “soft spoken,” Sara tells the story of
a Lebanese woman, living in Stockholm, who went to see a doctor
because she thought something was wrong with her hearing. When
she travelled by subway, or on the bus, or moved around in the city,
she got the impression that she could not hear what people said. The
doctor examined her but could not find anything wrong with her. The
reason, Sara says, why the Lebanese woman doubted her hearing was
that Swedes do not talk loudly or vividly. The Lebanese woman, she
suggests, is used to people talking loudly, since that is what people in
her culture do.

Here she receives confirmations on the anecdote from people in
the audience who give examples of their own experiences of Swedes as
being soft spoken. The interaction with clients, and getting confirma­
tions on anecdotes and information about cultural differences, is an
important way for interculturalists to gain professional credibility. For
example, at one moment in her lecture Sara referred to an episode
when she had lectured to a group of home language teachers:

“I said sssh, sssh, to make them silent. And then laughed a
man from Syria, or I don’t remember from which country
he came, somewhere from the Middle East. He laughed
and said, ‘Sssh, sssh you can’t say, because that is what we
say to donkeys at home.’”
This story drew a lot of laughter from the audience, and a man confirmed what Sara said. She smiled at him and said, "You recognize that?" "Yes," he said. Sara continued, with more emphasis, saying, "You recognize that, don't you, sssh, sssh." The man nods his head, and Sara is pleased. His confirmation assures Sara of her professional role as an interculturalist.

But the use of anecdotes about cultural differences is not enough to assure one's professional expertise. These anecdotes have to be put into a conceptual framework which will explain them in a more generic way. Cross-cultural research data are drawn upon here. At one time in her lecture, Sara shows an overhead picture with the headline "Non-verbal Behavior":

- body space  
- eye contact  
- gestures  
- body posture  
- time  
- body contact  
- facial expressions  
- silence  
- status symbols  
- dressing

To illustrate how cultural differences in non-verbal behavior can cause misunderstandings in intercultural communication, Sara refers to the research of an unnamed psychologist, and then relates this research to an anecdote about cultural misunderstanding that a teacher told her in one of her workshops:

"A psychologist measured how often people in different countries touched each other when they where waiting at the airport. He measured this for one hour. In San Juan, Puerto Rico, in the West Indies, people touched each other more then 150 times during one hour, when they sat talking to each other. This is the manner in which they discuss. One emphasizes what is said by touching the other's hand or holding the other's collar. In Paris 48 times during one hour, and in London 2 times. This is like the Swedes. Nordic people do not touch each other while they are
talking. Women do that somewhat more then men, but they are not used to it. But in the West Indies people touch each other a lot during conversations. Then there is this difference between men and women. In the Middle East, Northern Africa and Southern Asia men and women do not touch each other, unless they are relatives.”

Sara then juxtaposes this “research” with a story of cultural misunderstanding between a male teacher from Sweden, who teaches Swedish for immigrants, and one of his students, a girl from Iran.

“He made a girl from Iran embarrassed, he didn’t reflect on what he did. He was going to help her with an exercise that she was doing. And as people do in Sweden, in a friendly manner, because we are like brothers and sisters, and the relationship between men and women is not so dramatic, he put his hand on her shoulder. This made her shrink away. She became embarrassed, a male stranger touching her like that.”

In the two following chapters we will look at how cultural understanding is packaged in different kinds of merchandise. In Chapter 5 I will focus on the way culture is presented in the work of some prominent writers in the field.
Intercultural Merchandise

When returning home after a SIETAR congress, participants are loaded with addresses of new colleagues as well as with brochures and fliers advertising new technologies and companies dealing with intercultural communication, and book order forms and catalogues from different publishers. In this and the following chapter, I will discuss a range of the central artifacts of the intercultural field, and the techniques and activities connected to them.

The services and products that the interculturalists offer to people in the public and private sector can be looked upon as "professional commodities" in Larson’s (1977:14) sense. They provide the means for identifying the interculturalists as professionals. According to Larson, as we have seen, it is through the professional commodities that a professional market is made distinct and recognizable to the potential public. But as I also noted earlier, for the consulting professions, it is the market potential of knowledge that provides the basis from which professional commodities are made. In describing the commodities of the intercultural field I will draw upon my own experiences, as well as published materials. I will begin with the general notion of intercultural training.
Intercultural training

There is now a very extensive literature on the design of intercultural training. Several kinds of training models have been identified, the most common ones being the university model, the area training model, the self-awareness model, and the cultural awareness model. The differences between these reflect the historical development of the intercultural field. What lies at the heart of the discussion about the design of intercultural training is the contrast between experiential versus didactic, or affective versus cognitive, approaches to instruction. In the early days of intercultural training, as we have seen, didactic instructions were the common method used in preparing people for their cross-cultural encounters. This was, for example, the method first used in Peace Corps training.

In the literature on intercultural training, again, it is argued that this method does not prepare people for their everyday life interaction with those from other cultures. It was to come to terms with this problem that people started experimenting with different learning methods. This was during the 1960s, when sensitivity training was at its peak. Sensitivity training had been used extensively in business, and was reaching into education as well. It was therefore natural for many trainers and educators to look into this kind of training for alternatives to the university model. But it was soon abandoned, since many trainers felt that it failed to deal with what they considered to be central cross-cultural issues, such as cultural values, cultural differences in perceptions, and cultural awareness. The pedagogy of sensitivity training was to have the participants confront their own beliefs and values. This was done to promote personal growth, not to acquire information about others. It was also perceived to be so experientially oriented that it left the participants without any conceptual framework to cognitively understand their emotions and perceptions. Hoopes (1979b:4) notes that a strong reason for abandoning sensitivity training in intercultural training was that
“Such qualities as openness, directness, confrontiveness, which tend to become norms in sensitivity training, translate into biases and stumbling blocks in the encounter with contrasting cultures.”

Since the beginning of the intercultural field, experiential learning has been perceived to be the most important element in intercultural training. In their important article quoted in Chapter 2, Harrison and Hopkins (1967:432) showed that this learning method was best suited in preparing Peace Corps volunteers “to adapt to or to act in unfamiliar and ambiguous social situations.” Experiential learning was considered to bring about a translation of foreign cultural values and ideas into direct action. In a handbook on intercultural training published fifteen years later, this kind of learning method is still considered to be most important when preparing people to cope with members from different cultures:

“the goal of experiential learning is to introduce the nature of life in another culture by actively experiencing that culture or a functional simulation of it” (Brislin, et.al., 1983:16; my emphasis).

In looking at the history of intercultural training, one can see that this history is related to the development of different experiential learning methods. When Albert Wight organized the meeting in Estes Park, Colorado in 1968, he wanted to draw together various people who had experimented with different such methods, in order to publish a handbook and guidelines for Peace Corps training. These also found an audience outside the Peace Corps, and became an important source for many trainers. And when SIETAR became established as a professional organization, many of its members had wide experience from using and developing these methods of teaching and learning. SIETAR then provided a forum for them to discuss the design of intercultural training programs, and experiential learning methods. Today most of these discussions take place in books and journals which are mainly consumed by interculturalists affiliated with higher education.
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Many of these interculturalists also conduct courses for people who intend to become intercultural trainers.

To most of the interculturalists working full-time as intercultural trainers and consultants, the academic discussion about intercultural training is irrelevant. Those I have met are vaguely aware of it, or pay little attention to it. They say that they do not have the time to read the literature on intercultural training, since they have other kinds of literature to read, such as journals on immigration and minority affairs, newspapers, and culture-specific information with a more direct bearing on their work. They know that the books and articles on the design of intercultural training might give them some new ideas about their own training design, but since they are hired regularly they do not have the time, nor sometimes the will, to reflect on their own training design. The only time that they are exposed to this discussion is when they attend the annual SIETAR congresses.

The form and content of intercultural training programs differ greatly between trainers. But they have some overall characteristics corresponding to the literature on the design of intercultural training. They are organized into lectures and exercises. Jim Mullen’s workshop, as also sketched in Chapter 1, is a good example. He begins by lecturing on culture and cultural differences, where he presents some concepts and models used in the field. Secondly, he gives anecdotes from personal experiences of different cultures, and encourages the participants to share their own experiences with each other. This provides the basis for more discussion of culture and cultural differences. Thirdly, Mullen places these anecdotes and stories into a framework that will explain them in a generic way. Here more concepts and models are introduced. Mullen uses Hofstede’s concepts and models; shared, I have already noted, by the entire community of interculturalists. He then introduces some exercises in which the participants involve themselves.

At a general level, it is this blend of experience and instruction that provides the basis from which intercultural training programs are made distinct and recognizable as a professional commodity of the intercultural field. But experiential learning is also involved, we shall see, in a range of more specific commodities in the intercultural field.
Experiential learning methods

The idea of experiential learning is to have the participants experience situations which are similar or analogous to those encountered in real life. This learning method is considered to be both emotional and intellectual, and to involve behavior analysis and the practice of skills. It is said that the difference between experiential and traditional approaches to training is that the former shifts the focus of attention to

“creative thinking and problem-solving rather than memorization, and responsibility for initiative and exploration rather than conformity” (Wight and Hammons, 1970:12).

This has been expressed as “learning how to learn,” a commonly heard phrasing among intercultural trainers affiliated with higher education; such learning is said to be the objective of intercultural training.3

Over the years different kinds of exercises have been developed to facilitate experiential learning. Some of these have been collected in books and training manuals, but many have no doubt been lost. Examples of such exercises are role plays, simulation games, cultural assimilators and case studies. Exercises that have been considered particularly successful have been turned into commercial products, such as the very popular and well-known simulation game Bāfā Bāfā. This has been used by many interculturalists since its development in the early 1970s for the US Navy. Today it is sold as a commercial product, and marketed particularly for the business environment. The main consumers of these products, obviously, are interculturalists who use them in their own training programs.

The purpose of the products is to help the participants of an intercultural training program to experience “the nature of life in another culture” (Brislin et al. 1983:16). To understand what this experience is perceived to be, we have to look again at the concept of culture in the intercultural field. As I noted in Chapter 1, what emerges is a picture of culture as a closed coherent system of shared values, learned
in childhood and transmitted from one generation to the next. Cultural values are seen as basic building blocks of culture, influencing behavior, attitudes and perceptions. At another level, interculturalists tend to focus attention on some specific areas such as proxemics, kinesics, time perception, body language, and non-verbal communication. There is a commonly held opinion that "misunderstandings" between individuals of different cultures often center on differences in these areas. Consequently, the exercises intended to offer experiences of "the nature of life in another culture," or of seeing things "from the native's point of view," in large part concentrate on these areas.

In the early days of intercultural training, trainers often produced their own materials. Jean Phillips-Martinsson told me that when she began in the mid-1970s, she created cases and simulation games before she even knew that such materials already existed; something she became aware of when attending a SIETAR congress. Today, people borrow these products from each other, modifying them to suit their own training programs. Or they acquire them from the entrepreneurs and organizations involved with the commercial production, for example, of simulation games, videos and how-to books. In inspecting some of these commodities, we will begin with a very popular exercise, the cultural assimilator, and turn thereafter to simulation games and videos.

The cultural assimilator

The "Cultural Assimilator," also known as "critical incidents" or "the intercultural sensitizer," exposes trainees to a collection of written incidents of culture clashes between people from different cultures. The trainees read scripted accounts of situations in which people from different cultures interact. At the end of the incident there is a culture clash caused by misinterpretation or misunderstanding. The trainees are then presented with different alternatives to explain what went wrong and are asked to select the one "that best explains the problem from the other's point of view" (Cushner and Landis, 1996:186, emphasis by the
In the large literature on cultural assimilators, their purpose is described as teaching people to see things from "the native's point of view," or as one commentator put it:

"The idea is that individuals can learn to make attributions that are appropriate to a different cultural environment. Just as a person who is bilingual can switch from one language to another, depending on whom he or she is talking with, so a culturally sophisticated individual should be able to switch to a different attribution system when interacting with persons from a different culture" (Albert, 1983:189).

Wight (1995:135) notes that there is a difference between "cultural assimilators" and "critical incidents" as learning methodologies, even though both are based on critical incidents: the preferred solution to a cultural assimilator has been selected out of research by the people designing the assimilator. Wight calls this type of learning "programmed-learning methodology," and the trainees often work on their own. In contrast, there are no interpretations presented in advance in the "critical incidents exercise" (CIE). The trainees have to come up with it by themselves. He calls this "experiential-learning methodology," and the trainees are encouraged to work in groups and discuss their different interpretations.

The cultural assimilator originated at the University of Illinois in 1962, where Fred Fiedler, Charles Osgood, Larry Stolurow and Harry Triandis had a grant to study communication and negotiation in culturally heterogeneous groups. At one point during their regular meetings, Stolurow thought of designing a computer program to give foreign students culture training. Osgood called these programs "cultural assimilators," and the first one was an Arab assimilator. Arab students in the United States were asked to give examples of cultural conflict situations that occurred when they interacted with their American peers, and to explain them from their own perspective. The situations were
then presented to the American students, who in turn were to explain them from their perspective. Out of this emerged the idea of what would be the most important information to include in an assimilator (see Albert, 1983; Cushner and Landis, 1996; Triandis, 1995).

Over the years two forms of cultural assimilators have been developed: the culture-general and the culture-specific assimilators. The former are said to be designed "to prepare people for experiences that are common in a variety of cross-cultural encounters," while the latter are said to be designed to "prepare people for experiences in highly specific settings" (Cushner and Landis, 1996:187).

Many trainers make their own cultural assimilators, while others are published in books, thereby gaining a wide distribution. One example is the book Intercultural Interactions (Brislin, et al, 1986), consisting of one hundred cultural assimilators, or what the authors call "critical incidents." These assimilators are constructed out of the authors' experiences of foreign cultures, and from interviews with foreign students. The focus in these assimilators is on differences in values, attitudes and perceptions.5

**Simulation games and role plays**

In the intercultural training literature on simulation games, the concepts "simulation game" and "role play" are used somewhat synonymously. But role play is often considered to take place between two or a few participants, who will enact fictitious roles, and be observed by other participants who are not active in the role play. Simulation games, on the other hand, involve all participants who are given specific roles to act:

"In fact, one way to view some simulations is to see them as giant role plays, where everybody is assigned a role of some sort" (McCaffery, 1995:24).
But the purpose of role plays and simulation games is held to be similar. It will allow people to experience cultural differences and thus to cultivate sensibility toward foreign cultures:

"The participants in a role-play improvise their script as they go along and the 'make-believe' situation is acted out as if it were 'real'" (Barnak, 1979:7).

Most of the simulation games and role plays are not about any one specific culture, but deal rather with cultural differences in general. One might argue that these games create sensibility toward the unknown, rather then toward any identifiable foreign cultures. This undoubtedly affects their market potential: they may reach out more widely if they can be taken to illustrate any intercultural encounter. The idea seems to be that there are certain parameters of culture by which people orient themselves in their everyday life. In the simulation games and role plays, it is these parameters that are simulated, similar to the way a flight simulator is constructed: certain parameters are of importance for take-off, navigation and landing. In the flight simulator it is important to pay attention to these parameters, otherwise the plane might crash. The same goes for the interculturalist simulation games. If one does not pay attention to the cultural parameters, things will go wrong.

The experiences that people have playing simulation games and role plays can be very stressful and emotional. On several occasions I have talked to interculturalists who use simulation games in their training program, and who say that these games can be threatening to the participants. They reported that during simulation games participants have been crying or showing anxiety and anger, which is why they consider it important to have a debriefing after playing such games, in order to take the participants out of their roles and to discuss their experiences.

Here I will describe two simulation games and a role play which are meant to be culture-general: 

-Barna: A Simulation Game on Cultural Clashes,
-Bafá Bafá, and
-The Contrast American Technique.

The two games are very popular commercial products, used by many interculturalists.
The role play has not found as large an audience and is more difficult to conduct than the other two. But it is very well known, particularly through a video called *Intercultural Awareness*, which has had a wide circulation (in large part through illegal copying). The video is used by many trainers and consultants in their training programs, where they show some part of it for discussion. The role play has also been described extensively in the literature (for recent discussions see Stewart, 1995; DeMello, 1995; and Kimmel, 1995).

*Borga: A Simulation Game on Cultural Clashes* is the simulation game in one of the scenes at the beginning of Chapter 1. In the marketing of the game it is described as follows:

"Borga simulates the effect of cultural differences on human interaction. Participants play a simple card game in small groups where conflicts begin to occur as participants move from group to group. This simulates real cross-cultural encounters where people initially believe they share the same understanding of basic rules. In discovering that the rules are different, players undergo a mini culture-shock similar to actual experiences when entering a different culture. They then must struggle to understand and reconcile these differences to function effectively in a cross-cultural group."

The designer, Sivasailam Thiagarajan, says the following about the game:

"At the heart of BARNGA’s design is the premise that cultural differences exist in more or less subtle forms, often swamped by obvious similarities. The game helps its players understand that unless they recognize and respect the different assumptions underlying their interactions, they run into interpersonal conflicts. This insight - that cultural differences may bring more of a ‘clash’ when hidden amidst apparent similarities and therefore unexpected and unpre-
pared for - is a source of the rich follow-up discussion the
game generates among its players.” (Thiagarajan and
Steinwachs, 1990:5)

The idea for the game came from the designer’s experience in a
West African town called Bamga:

“I was working with some West African counterparts in
preparing primary health education booklets. We shared
the same basic principles and procedures related to in-
structional development. Or at least it seemed so during
our analysis of the curriculum and preparation of the ma-
terials. However, when I came down with a bout of ma-
laria, my counterparts suggested that squeezing the juice
of a tobacco leaf into my left nostril would relieve my
symptoms. I never did check out this cure, but my percep-
tion of the other person’s perception of the world under-
went a major change. I had to understand and accept our
cultural differences before we could function as a collabo-
rative team” (ibid.:4-5).

As was shown in the scene in Chapter 1, the game consists of
ordinary playing cards, and the purpose of the game is to win as many
tricks as possible. The participants are divided into groups and given
written instructions on how to play the game. It is a tournament, so
they will have to change tables during the game. They are not allowed
to use verbal communication. The facilitator decides when participants
are to change table, and it is through these transfers that the “culture
clash” is considered to take place. At the outset of the game, each table
gets a different set of rules, and when people change tables they will
encounter different ways of playing the game.

Bafá Bafá is another kind of simulation game, developed in the
early 1970s for the U.S. Navy. It began as a study of selection processes
for people getting overseas assignments, and a first version of it was as
a culture-specific simulation game with Greece and Japan as the par-
ticular cultures. In a brochure for the game its designer, Garry Shirts, describes it in this way:

“Participants live and cope in a ‘foreign’ culture and then discuss and analyze the experience. There are two cultures in the simulation. The Alpha culture is a warm, friendly, patriarchal society with strong in-group, out-group identity. The Beta culture is a foreign-speaking, task-oriented culture. Once the participants learn the rules, customs and values of ‘their’ culture, they visit the other culture. The visitor is generally bewildered and confused by the strangeness of the foreign culture. Bewilderment often turns to intolerance and hostility once the visitor returns home. ‘They’re strange, real strange, that’s all I can say. They’re making funny sounds and weird gestures. Just be careful when you go over there.’ But in the post-simulation discussion they come to understand that there were reasons behind the behavior they observed. With the realization their attitudes change from one of hostility to understanding. Through discussion this experience is then generalized to attitudes towards other groups in the real world.”

As a commercial product Bafá Bafá has found a vast market outside the area in which it was originally produced. In the marketing of the game, the business environment is given particular emphasis:

“Persons in business who must work with people from other corporations, other departments or other cultures. For example, salespersons who must interact with other companies; marketing people who must work with engineers; or managers, students or volunteers who work in foreign countries. In other words, it is useful for any situation which requires an experiential understanding of another culture, corporation, or department.”
Bafá Bafá, it is also pointed out, can be successfully played with a minimum of 12 people, 6 in each culture, and with a maximum of 40 in each culture. It takes between 50 minutes to two hours to play, depending on how much time is set aside for discussion.

The Contrast-American Technique is a specialized role play, not often used by interculturalists. It grew out of a research project in the early to mid 1960s, to develop cross-cultural communication training for Americans living and working in foreign countries, at the Human Resources Research Office (HumRRO) at George Washington University. According to Stewart (1995:47), the first phase of the project was research on the experiences of American army personnel sent to Laos in the 1950s. The designers state the following about the purpose of the Contrast American Technique:

“The essential feature of the exercises is a representation of the social-psychological aspects of interaction between people who hold differing values and assumptions; the key function of the exercises is to induce a cognitive confrontation, with accompanying emotional investment and behavioral confrontation.” (Stewart, et.al., 1979:44)

Several commentators on this game have pointed to its accuracy in depicting types of situations which many people will encounter in their assignments abroad. For example, Janet Bennett (1986:127) makes the following comment:

“The perplexity of relating to seemingly gracious individuals who seem to be foiling every attempt to accomplish something is a highly accurate depiction of what trainees will sometimes face overseas.”

The effect of this role game on conveying intercultural communication skills has been the subject of several articles and a few doctoral dissertations (see, for example, J. Bennett 1985).

The actual role game takes place between two persons, where
one person, a man, is trained by the game designer to play a member from an unspecified foreign culture. In the game he goes by the name of Mr. Khan. He is part of the game, and when trainers want to use it, they contact the person who plays Mr. Khan. This prevents a widespread adoption of the game. The other person to play the game will be instructed by the game facilitator about the role he or she is to play in the game. For example:

“You are Mr. Smith, an American business manager. Your company has signed a contract with the Ministry of Public Works of a non-Western country to provide materials and aid in the development of a major construction project. You are in the position of advising and assisting indigenous officials in the project. Your predecessor in this position, a Mr. Jones, was the first advisor from your company to be connected with the project. He was in his position for eight months. In your capacity, you will be advising and consulting with the local project director for the area, Mr. Khan, who is also the leading official of the nearby village and surrounding areas. Mr. Khan speaks English quite well, but his only previous experience with Americans was with your predecessor, Mr. Jones.”

This instruction was given to a person who was to play Mr. Smith at a showing of the role-play, at one of the SIETAR International Summer Institutes in Washington, D.C. that I attended. What follows here is an excerpt from the video *Intercultural Awareness*, transcribed by Lundberg (1991:222-224). The scene is at the office of Mr. Khan; entering the room is Mr. Smith. The dialogue here is similar to the one that developed during the showing of the game I attended.

Mr. Khan: Ah. Mr. Smith! Will you please come in. May I welcome you!
Mr. Smith: Pleased to meet you.
K: Sit down here, please.
S: Thank you very much.
K: May I welcome you to our place here and to our country also.
S: I am happy to be here.
K: Yes, Yes...You came so quickly. You did not give me the opportunity to welcome you at the airport.
S: I am sorry, is 9 o'clock too early for you?
K: No, I would like to receive you at the airport when you arrived.
S: I appreciate that. Everything is fine. No, I am fine. I am here safe and sound.
K: You had no difficulty?
S: Little problem from the airport to the hotel on the shuttle. But, when that was behind...
K: Problems?
S: Very crowded. Lots of people. I think maybe that was rush hour at your airport. 5:30 pm to quarter to six.
K: You are not used to long journeys? You had problems, you say?
S: Strange airport. Little different scene.
K: You should rest well in that case, Mr. Smith. Have you rested well, since?
S: I have rested reasonably well - just a little tad queasy this morning. But I am fine now, no problems - ready to do business. Ready to talk about your plans, your goals and objectives, and what you see for the future.
K: Yes, rest is important. You have undertaken a long journey from America to our country.
S: It's a long journey for sure.
K: A journey like this of course disorganizes the rhythm of body life a little bit. It is good to restore it to its proper harmony, as you know.
S: I am restored.
K: Only when the body and mind are at rest are they also at peace with one another.
S: Agreed!
K: And you said you had problems - resting.
S: Well, you have always a little problem with the jet-lag.
But really I am fine now, that’s all behind me - and I am looking forward to a good day with you and...
K: You came by airplane from America?
S: I came by airplane.
K: Yes, these airplanes, even though it’s a wonderful man-made invention, it’s also a very scary invention.
S: To some people, yes.
K: When you are in a plane, you are in a way hanging in the air all the time - not knowing where you are going or where you are coming from. Everything around you is emptiness.
S: Like you are in a little capsule.
K: Man likes to walk on the solid ground. When he walks on the solid ground he can look at the beautiful beauty of nature around him. See the children at play and perhaps farmers working in their fields also.
S: There are some who say that being that high in altitude for that long period of time you tend to dehydrate. I had some of your good local ale last night so I have all my liquids back and I am in good shape.
K: Yes, yes, you have felt good.
S: I feel fine.
K: Yes, yes... How is your family?
S: My family is very well, thank you.
K: Is your family travelling with you also?
S: No, they are not, not this time.
K: But they are all well, you said.
S: Everyone is fine, that I know of.
K: Yes, your beloved father is well and other persons in your family.
S: My father is fine, I spoke with him not too long ago by telephone.
K: Oh, you spoke to your father from here by telephone.
S: From where I live in the U.S. - he lives quite a way from where I live.
K: Oh, you don’t live together with your father, as a whole family.
S: No, my mother and father are in New England, which
is a part of the U.S., several hundreds of miles away from where we live.
K: It must be very hard for you to be away from your beloved father sometimes. You might be the firstborn son of your beloved father.
S: I happen to be the first son. First and only. I have a younger sister.
K: Of course the firstborn son has a duty to do what pleases his father. He likes to follow in his father's footsteps.
S: Yes...Are we going to be able to spend most of the day together? I know I telexed you that I would like to do that.
K: Yes, we will be together the whole day. I have set aside all other matters just to receive you and to speak to you.
S: That's good. Because, you see, I will be leaving tomorrow morning. I have a 9:45 flight and maybe you can help me to get confirmation on that flight. That would be very helpful.
K: Confirmation. Of course, the secretary will do it. But you are leaving tomorrow morning?
S: Lots of more stops to make. Four more stops in the next eight days.
K: You are going to some other places from here?
S: Yes, it's kind of a tour. First time tour.
K: Tomorrow is hardly time enough for me to come to know you, Mr. Smith.
S: Hopefully we will have some more opportunities to do that.
K: You did not permit me to come and welcome you at the airport. At least you have to give me a chance to express my hospitality to you.

In the video the dialogue is interrupted here, and Edward Stewart comments on it. It then continues for a while and is once again interrupted. During the role play at the SIETAR International Summer Institute there were no interruptions. When the play was finished there was only time for a short discussion, since it took place in the evening and the time was late. The next morning several people wanted to
continue the discussion, and talk about how they had started to think about their own cultural values.

*Videos*

A wide variety of other interculturalist video films depict social situations in which people from different cultures interact with each other. These films are produced in order to develop, as one producer suggests, "cross-cultural skills required for a successful, enjoyable international experience" - this is from a brochure advertising the Copeland Griggs series of video films called *Going International*, which we already encountered in Chapter 1, in the troubled meeting of an American businessman with his Saudi associates. The company has more to say about the uses of the series:

"*Going International* is a series of films/videotapes and training guides which help traveler and expatriate develop the cross-cultural skills required for global effectiveness. Traveling business people, students, missionaries, professionals, government and military personnel and all those who have contact with other cultures will benefit from the series. Even the 'arm chair traveler' can benefit from an awareness of the importance of culture. Whether developing educational curricula, making staffing plans, or designing products, services or marketing campaigns, decision-makers must be aware of the international context."

The intercultural trainers and consultants I have talked to said that they use video films to open discussions on cultural differences. The films can depict foreign students sharing their experiences in United States, as in *Cold Water*, or deal with ethnicity in the work place, as in *Cultural Diversity*, or describe how to recognize individual differences among employees and to turn them into an advantage, as in *Managing Differences*, a film in a series called *Valuing Diversity*, or show contrast-
ing cultural values and habits of some different cultures, as in *Bridging the Culture Gap*, another part of the series *Going International*.

In these films culture is perceived as an identifiable entity with properties of its own. For example, at the end of the video *Bridging the Cultural Gap*, anthropologist Thomas P. Rohlen says that:

"The fact is that cultures on the surface are changing everyday and in momentous ways. People are wearing different kinds of clothes, buying different kinds of products, watching all kinds of new communication media, and so forth. On the other hand, deep down fundamentals of culture are moving at a glacier pace. They are fundamental to the way people think and the way they feel."

This is accompanied by a sequence of pictures. While hearing about changes, we see a Saudi in his car talking to someone on the cellphone, people wearing different clothes walking on the street, and some Saudi men with a TV camera. When hearing about deep down fundamentals, we see people slowly doing Tai Chi.

These "fundamentals of culture" to which the attention of the viewer is drawn often concern space and time perception, body language, and non-verbal communication. In the video these are said to be important clues to the rules of culture, and the viewer is admonished to take note of the way people of importance (such as those in government) use their hands, eyes, and feet. This is said to convey information about what is appropriate behavior in different cultures.

In most of the interculturalist products depicting cultural differences, it is remarkable how frequently Saudi Arabia and Japan provide the examples. In the United States, many consultants also specialize in selling intercultural training focusing only on Japanese culture. People from these countries are evidently considered to be difficult to interact and communicate with. But no doubt the reason for giving so much attention to these cultures is also that there is more profit in doing business with people from these countries than with others.

One such consultant agency which advertises itself as providing
intercultural training for Americans interacting with the Japanese is Nipporica, with staff in several cities in the United States and in Tokyo. The name of the agency, the mix of Nippon and America, reveals its focus on the relationship between Americans and Japanese. It has also developed the simulation game *Ecotones* and provides training programs in intercultural team productivity.

With the *Going International* video series goes a book called *Going International: How to Make Friends and Deal Effectively in the Global Marketplace*. This book is said to “give rules for developing the strategy, style and sensitivity needed to succeed in business anywhere in the world,” and to be “full of marvelous anecdotes and straight-forward advice...” A review on the back of the book by Tom Peters, author of the business-world bestseller *In Search of Excellence*, provides additional professional credibility. Let us turn now to what else may be on the interculturalist bookshelf.
Writing Cultural Difference

Geertz (1973:19) sees writing as central to the anthropological enterprise: "What does the ethnographer do? - he writes." But in a footnote he adds that "scribes" would perhaps be more exact. Even in the books and articles there are photographs, drawings, diagrams, and tables; and apart from that, there are the films, the records, the museum displays, and whatever. "Self-consciousness about modes of representation (not to speak of experiments with them) has been very lacking in anthropology," Geertz notes; but again, that was in 1973. For more than a decade now, anthropologists have indeed been occupied with scrutinizing their own writings. An awareness has grown among anthropologists about the influence of the writing process on their conceptualization of culture.

Interculturalists, as we have seen, make videos, and lecture, and play games, and represent cultural difference in a number of ways. But they also write. In this chapter, I will present a selection of books considered to be central in the intercultural field. They are talked about at SIETAR congresses, and often named in lists of recommended readings handed out to clients during workshops.

In some of these books, as I have noted, one can also find references to anthropological conceptions of culture; and one important link between intercultural training and anthropology, and between academia and practice, is in the writings of the American anthropologist Edward T. Hall. To many interculturalists, Hall is the founding
father of intercultural communication. In the early days of the field, his work was a primary source for conceptualizing culture and intercultural training (see Hoopes, 1979a:11). This, then, is where I will begin.

Hall and microcultural analysis

In a lecture on the history of intercultural communication, delivered at one of the annual SIETAR Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication in Washington, D.C., Mitchell Hammer, a well-known intercultural trainer and researcher affiliated with higher education, said the following about Hall’s contribution to the inception of the intercultural field:

“In the U.S. context the intercultural field began with Edward Hall. We trace that back to his book *The Silent Language* in 1959. That book actually was the culmination of what Hall was doing between 1946 and 1956, at the Foreign Service Institute here in Washington, D.C... They started out by talking about things we still do today in terms of cross-cultural training. They brought in a historian and other area studies people in terms of the government structure, the geography and the climate of the region that people were going to, to talk about those kinds of factors. And that type of cross-cultural training is what we would call the intellectual model, in terms of its derivative, because most of the people who did the training were university professors in specialist departments who had an area studies expertise. Then we sent the diplomats overseas, and guess what happened? They still weren’t able to interact or communicate very effectively, but they knew a lot about the political system, etc., etc. So Edward Hall came in and brought these anthropologists in, and Träger was more of an anthropological linguist, and started talking about differences in terms of words, language and cul-
ture. They went through the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck definition of culture, and they went through a few others and they talked about culture as a way of life for a group of people. And they talked about family structure and kinship systems in the culture, and at the Foreign Service Institute people were sitting there and they folded their arms and they said, but that is not what we want to know either. And now Edward Hall was stuck, and he began to think, what am I going to do about this? I am trying to give training for people who are going overseas and they are telling me that what I am telling them is not what they feel they need to know. They want to know how do I interact effectively with somebody in that foreign environment. So, what Hall did between 1946 and 1956, is that he began to move in from a macro-cultural perspective, which is an anthropological view, to a micro-cultural analysis of interactive behavior. And he called it micro-behavior. He began to pay attention to differences in space, in the way people use space, and differences in time, in terms of our orientations towards time. He began to use concepts that would talk about layers of polychronic and monochronic time. And when he began talking about that, the Foreign Service Institute trainees perked up and said, 'Oh, that's what we are interested in.' That applied, user-centered approach is what Edward Hall developed in terms of the US context. If we had to trace it back to somebody, it would primarily be him. That micro-behavior interactive framework is what Edward Hall developed at that particular time. And it is not anthropology. Anthropology describes patterns of human interaction as it exists within a particular group of people, and within another group. But what happens when this person comes in contact with this person? That is the interactive focus, and that is the crux of this field. This field predicated upon that very basic idea, that's what intercultural communication is about.
It's the interactive context. And that's what Edward Hall brought us.¹

Hammer also refers to Hall's book *The Silent Language*, which was published in 1959. This book describes the kind of training Hall was doing at the Foreign Service Institute in the early 1950s, and his notion of culture as communication. Hall saw his book as a pioneering work in intercultural communication, which makes him a bridge between anthropology and the intercultural field. The anthropological culture concept that he brought with him, from his anthropology studies at the Columbia University, where he got his Ph.D. in anthropology in 1942, became a cornerstone in the development of the intercultural field. His supervisor had been Ralph Linton, who together with other scholars connected to Columbia University at that time - Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, and Abram Kardiner - came to influence Hall's conception of culture (see Hall, 1993:158).

Hall's autobiography *An Anthropology of Everyday Life* (1993) offers some background for his interest in intercultural communication training and his conceptualization of culture and cultural differences. Born in 1914 in Webster Groves, Missouri, Hall moved in his early years to Santa Fe, New Mexico. He attended two ranch schools, and a painting school. He went to college at Pomona in southern California and at the University of Denver, where his interest for anthropology began. Under the supervision of Professor Renaud, Hall made a study of southwestern Anasazi indented cooking pottery. He discovered that there were different patterns among different groups. Later on he came to look upon this as "frozen motor habits." One of the major emphases in Hall's writings is to link culture to biology: during human evolution, he suggests, some universal biological functions were developed by man into cultural patterns which are different between cultures.

In 1933, toward the end of Hall's second year at the University of Denver, John Collier, commissioner of Indian affairs, asked him if he was interested in working on Indian reservations. Hall says that this came to change his life: "I would learn firsthand about the details and complexities of one of the world's most significant problems: intercul-
tural relations" (Hall, 1993:76). For the next four years, Hall lived and worked on Hopi and Navajo reservations. While engaged in organizing road and dam construction, he developed an interest in micro-behavior. Various people at the Hopi and Navajo reservations became his teachers. They provided him with information on Hopi and Navajo Indians that allowed him to implement his programs. One man in particular is mentioned in Hall's autobiography. Lorenzo Hubbell owned and operated a chain of trading stores in Arizona. To Hall, Lorenzo's kitchen, in the trading post in Oraibi, was a classroom where he gained an understanding "on the unstated dimensions of culture - the culture of everyday life, the culture of real life as distinguished from theory and classroom anthropology... It was at our coffee meetings that Lorenzo would brief me on the ins and outs of trading with the Navajo and the Hopi" (ibid.:102).

Hall brought his experiences of the Navajo and the Hopi with him when he later enrolled in the doctoral program in anthropology at Columbia University. In 1942, he received his PhD in anthropology and then volunteered as a private in World War II. After the war, Hall went back to Columbia University and enrolled in sociology courses. When he was offered a job as assistant professor in anthropology at the University of Denver, he moved there. In 1948, he took a teaching position in anthropology at Bennington College in Vermont. Here he came to know the psychoanalyst Erich Fromm, with whom he developed a life-long friendship.

In 1950, Hall moved to Washington, D.C., to work for the State Department. Between 1950 and 1955, he was employed at the Foreign Service Institute to design and conduct training programs for the Point IV technicians, who were to implement the development programs for undeveloped countries that President Truman announced in 1949, and which the United States Congress enacted into law in 1950. The Foreign Service Institute was established in 1946, to provide training for technicians and Foreign Service Officers. During World War II, linguists had been involved in language training for army personnel. This kind of training involved reading and writing foreign languages, but also natural speech situations: asking directions, how to shop, how to
find a house, etc. The classroom teacher had been a native speaker, who worked closely with a linguist. With the establishment of the Foreign Service Institute, this kind of training was further developed. Anthropologists and linguists came to work together in establishing a training program focusing on everyday life situations that the Foreign Service Officers faced in their overseas work. In addition to language training and general linguistics, they learned how to analyze human societies. It was in this kind of work that Hall came to be involved (see Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990).

At the Foreign Service Institute, Hall met George L. Träger (a student of Edward Sapir), and together they developed cross-cultural training programs. In his autobiography, Hall (1993:201) describes these training programs as concentrating more on what people took for granted and did not say. His inspiration for this came from the program on Research on Contemporary Cultures, which had been initiated during World War II by Ruth Benedict. It was the program's concern with understanding the mentality of cultures from a configurational perspective that attracted Hall. The concept of configurations was borrowed from psychological theories on basic personality configurations. During the development of the training programs, Hall was in contact with one of the members of Benedict's project, Rhoda Metraux, with whom he exchanged notes (ibid.:201).

The problems which the Foreign Service Officers faced in their overseas work came to shape the way Hall and Träger conceptualized culture.

“Much to the astonishment of the anthropologists many participants in the seminars [at the Foreign Service Institute] viewed the [culture] concept as vague and discussing it as a waste of time; instead, they wanted concrete information on how to interact with persons in the specific culture to which they were being sent... Faced with this reaction, Hall resolved to focus on what he termed microcultural analysis: on tone of voice, gestures, time, and spatial relationships as aspects of communication” (Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990:268).
What Hall decided, then, was that one does not need to know all about a foreign culture in order to function in everyday life situations in that culture; something which he had learned from his time at the Hopi and Navajo reservations. This meant that in the preparation training for people going overseas, Hall came to focus only on certain aspects of communication. These aspects came to be known as proxemics, kinesics, time perception, body language, and non-verbal behavior, which were said to differ between cultures. In the early days of intercultural training, these notions were picked up by the interculturalists, mainly through reading Hall’s books *The Silent Language* and *The Hidden Dimension*, and then used in intercultural training programs to educate others about cultural differences (see Hoopes, 1979a:11).

The micro-behavioral analysis of culture that Hall came to develop at the Foreign Service Institute was also built on his notion of culture as communication. He saw this as a radical departure from the dominant anthropological conception of culture at this time as a system of values and norms (see Hall, 1993:212). Instead, to him, culture was the different ways in which information flows between people, and his interest lay in how this information was “processed, reproduced, transmitted, and organized” (Hall, 1993:212). He delineated three different levels for culture as communication: formal, informal and technical. The technical level of culture was explicit and precise. It is the other two levels, however, that became the main focus for Hall, particularly what is learned and communicated in an informal way. His message to the reader of his book *The Silent Language* was that “We must never assume that we are fully aware of what we communicate to someone else” (Hall, 1973:29).

The purpose of this book, Hall has suggested, was to show the extent to which culture controls people’s lives. He grounded his culture theory in human biology insofar as he saw culture as an extension of certain universal inherited human traits, crucial for the survival of mankind. There are certain fundamental types of human behavior which had a biological basis, he noted, but which were later developed by man into culture. For these types of behavior he used the term infra-
culture, and identified ten such types of behavior which he called Primary Message Systems (PMS). Territoriality would be one example; according to Hall, it is rooted in human biology, which can be seen in the claims and defences of it by human beings, behavior which they also share with different kinds of animals. The development of nation-states, Hall said, can be understood as a human elaboration of territoriality.6

Hall has noted that he and Träger came to the conclusion of a tripartite theory of culture - formal, informal, technical - from their view of how Americans talk about and handle time:

“We discovered that there were three kinds of time: formal time, which everyone knows about and takes for granted and which is well worked into daily life; informal time, which has to do with situational and imprecise references like ‘awhile,’ ‘later,’ ‘in a minute,’ and so on; technical time, an entirely different system used by scientists and technicians, in which even the terminology may be unfamiliar to the non-specialist” (Hall, 1973:64).

Even though one of these modes may dominate a culture, Hall cautions, all three are present. These three modes are then discussed by Hall with respect to different human behavior, such as learning, awareness, affect and attitudes towards change, which thus are said to consist of formal, informal and technical aspects. The distinctions between the three allow Hall to make cultural comparisons. In his discussion of the formal aspect of attitudes towards change, for example, he argues that it is similar to instinct. It is the basis on which the rest of culture is built, and it changes slowly. This, he says, is something that American technicians have experienced abroad, when it has been difficult to introduce new technology to foreign cultures. Hall mentions an instance when Arab villagers resisted foreigners who came to clean their well and to install a pump, and he explains this by saying that the villagers liked the water they drank. It had a strong taste, and there is a perception among Arabs in general that it is water that makes them strong
and fertile. In certain parts of the Arab world, he says, it is considered to be sissy to drink only clean water. The villagers, then, did not see any connection between dirty water and illnesses. If the children die, it is God's will. This story is thus used to illustrate the importance of formal systems in different cultures; they influence perceptions and behavior. It is very important to accept these culturally different formal systems, concludes Hall, before one starts cooperating with people from other cultures.

In his book *The Hidden Dimension*, Hall develops his ideas about space into what he calls proxemics, dealing with people's use of space as a "specialized elaboration of culture" (Hall, 1966:1). Proxemic patterns differ between cultures, and "by examining them it is possible to reveal hidden cultural forms that determine the structure of a given people's perceptual world" (ibid.:153). Commenting on time perception, Hall says that the way time is dealt with is a consequence of how space is organized. He delineates two ways of dealing with time: "monochronic" and "polychronic." In monochronic time use, people divide time into separate units and do things one at a time. Polychronic time means that people are involved with each other and do several things at the same time. Northern Europeans are monochronic, Hall claims, and Southern Europeans polychronic. When they meet, the northerners say about the southerners that they interrupt all the time and that nothing happens, while the southerners do not consider order important. In The South, a person who is pushy can be treated first, even if he was last in line. A way to ease tensions between these people, according to Hall, is to restructure space. For example, monochronic people in polychronic societies should get rid of screens in offices, while polychronic people in monochronic societies should put up screens.

Hall is also concerned with context. Meaning is related to context, he points out, and contrasts two types of contexts, high and low, which can also be used to distinguish between cultures. In high context cultures such as that of Japan, the meaning of a message lies in the context; that is to say, most information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person. In low context cultures like that of the United States, on the other hand, the information is carried explic-
ily in the message. Equipped with these two binary oppositions, monochronic/polychronic and high context/low context, Hall sets out to show their importance in intercultural communication. In a book aiming at an audience of American business people and written with his wife, Mildred Reed Hall, these concepts are employed to understand the Americans, the Germans and the French. "Since most people don’t think about personal distance as something that is culturally patterned, foreign spatial cues are almost inevitably misinterpreted." (Hall and Hall, 1990:12) Context, proxemics, and time perception thus become prime constituents in Hall’s understanding of culture and cultural differences.

Culture’s dimensions: Hofstede and Trompenaars

Among the books by intercultural trainers and consultants on cultural differences, I will focus here on five which are written primarily with the business environment in mind. I have already mentioned two of them, Culture’s Consequences by Geert Hofstede, and Riding the Waves of Culture by Fons Trompenaars. The other three are Managing Cultural Differences by Richard Harris and Robert Moran, Jean Phillips-Martinsson’s Swedes as Others See Them, and Roger E. Axtell’s Do’s and Taboo’s of Hosting International Visitors. All of these books are well-known within the intercultural community, although some more then others.

I will begin with Hofstede’s book, which is written for a scholarly audience but has had a great impact on the intercultural field. It draws on data gathered from a survey on work-related values which Hofstede conducted between 1967 and 1973, of 88,000 employees of a multinational corporation. (In the book it went under the name Hermes, although it was soon known to be IBM.) The questionnaire focused on desirable values, and the data gathered were treated statistically through factor analysis. On this basis cultures were indexed, and presented in four-field diagrams.

Culture’s Consequences was published in 1980, but in 1984 an abridged edition was published in which source data and statistical
proofs for the arguments were excluded; the arguments and some of the statistics were left in. This is the edition that has found the widest circulation.

Hofstede begins his book with a quote by Blaise Pascal "Vérité en-deca des Pyrénées, erreur au-delà," which he translates as “There are truths on this side of the Pyrenees which are falsehoods on the other.” The first chapter is called “Values and Culture,” in which he defines culture as “collective mental programming.” There is a figure to illustrate this, showing a triangle horizontally divided into three areas, from the bottom up designated as universal, collective and individual. The figure is presented as three levels of “human mental programming” where culture is said to occupy the middle area, the collective. (It is such a figure we have seen Jim Mullen using in his workshop, in Chapter 1).

This provides the basis from which Hofstede introduces values as the building blocks of culture, to which human beings are programmed from infancy onwards. Hofstede (1984:18) defines values as “a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others.” These values are said to form hierarchical value systems, and to program human beings early in life. Hofstede is interested in identifying the value system which constitutes culture and which provides a “collective mental programming.”

To do this, he distinguishes between values as “the desired” and “the desirable,” and says that values which are desirable relate to a deontological ethic, that is, to what people think ought to be desired (ibid.:19). These values are perceived to be the collective values, and constitute the cultural value system. He places the origin of cultural value systems in ecological factors (geographic, economic, demographic, historic, genetic/hygienic, technological, and urbanization) and sees them as giving rise, on the one hand, to social institutions, such as family patterns, role differentiations, social stratification, education, religion, and political structure. When these become social facts, he suggests, they in turn strengthen the value system and the ecological factors which gave rise to them.

This is a systems approach to culture, and Hofstede even talks about the cultural value system as being homeostatic, that is, self-regu-
lating. Because of them, he notes, some groups, such as Jews, Gypsies, and Basques, have been able to sustain their identity over centuries and even millennia, even though changes have involved deportation, loss of language, or loss of independence. Societies that have disappeared, on the other hand, have done so because outside influences have been stronger than self-regulation.7

A chapter on data collection and treatment follows, and after this Hofstede introduces his four dimensions of national culture; one in each chapter, beginning with the concept of Power Distance, followed by Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism, and Masculinity.

The dimension of power distance is said to describe dependency relations in society.8 In order to establish his power distance index for different cultures, Hofstede asked the IBM employees a specific question: “How frequently, in your experience, does the following problem occur: employees being afraid to express disagreement with their managers?” (Hofstede, 1984:73). The answers to this question were ranked on a five-point scale from “very frequently” to “very seldom.” Hofstede says about this question that it yields the best data on cultural differences in power distance.

The next cultural dimension is uncertainty avoidance, which is said to refer to the anxiety people have towards the future, and that humans have tried to cope with it through technology, law and religion.9 Hofstede places the origin of uncertainty avoidance in Western society at the time of the Roman Empire:

“The Roman Empire, by establishing an effective system of formal control of its territories and a unified legal system, set an uncertainty-avoiding pattern which seems to have survived as a societal norm in the countries most affected by the empire’s inheritance” (Hofstede, 1984:135).

This pattern then became part of the value system shared by the majority of the middle class in these societies.

Hofstede’s third concept is individualism. This concept is widely used among contemporary social psychologists and cross-cultural psy-
chologists, who refer to Hofstede's research in their writings. It describes the relationship between the individual and the collective. Hofstede perceives this relationship to be a fundamental dimension on which societies differ, and exemplifies it with comparisons of family patterns in different societies. In some societies, he says, people live in nuclear families, while in others they live in tribal units based on kinship.\textsuperscript{10}

The relationship between the individual and the collective is also said to affect the social institutions, such as education, religion and politics. Hofstede says that the central element in "human mental programming" is people's self-concept. People living in a collectivistic society do not think of themselves as individuals. As an example of such a society Hofstede refers to the writings of the American anthropologist Francis Hsu and his study of the Chinese society. According to Hsu (1971), in Chinese society there is no word for "personality." Instead Chinese use the word \textit{jen} (man), which includes a person's social and cultural environment. Hsu says about the concept of "personality" that it is as a reflection of Western individualism.\textsuperscript{11} Hofstede takes this to show differences between collectivistic and individualistic cultures.\textsuperscript{12}

The fourth and last dimension is \textit{masculinity}, its opposite pole being femininity. Masculinity is said to refer to assertiveness, while femininity refers to nurturing. Hofstede says about this dimension that it is related to geographical latitude: "Countries closer to the equator tend to be more masculine, countries closer to the poles more feminine" (Hofstede, 1984:203). This is then related to survival and population growth, so that societies in colder climates are said to be more equal, since that it improves chances for survival and population growth, whereas in milder climates man's intervention with nature is not so important for survival and population growth. He also says that in societies showing a low masculinity index both parents are models for boys and girls, while in societies showing a high masculinity index, fathers are models for boys, and mothers are models for girls.

Hofstede describes the scoring of the forty cultures in the survey along these dimensions. The next following chapter deals with integrating them, with the purpose of showing that some of the di-
dimensions interact in their effects upon culture. It may suffice to say here that Hofstede sees these interactions of dimensions as explaining different social phenomena, such as organizational structures and functioning; but he also argues that they refute motivation theories such as Maslow's.

The book ends with a chapter on "Consequences for policy and research," in which he discusses such matters as practical solutions for motivation, leadership, management by objectives (MBO), organizational design, and the management of multicultural organizations, with respect to different cultures. For example, in discussing leadership styles he uses his concept of Power Distance, said to describe dependency relations in society. Having shown in an earlier chapter the Power Distance index for different cultures, Hofstede here emphasizes the importance of acknowledging these differences in the exporting of management techniques. In countries having a high degree of Power Distance, like France, he says, people from countries with low Power Distance will have little problem. It is not so difficult, he says, to adapt to an autocratic system in order to be effective. Many managers do that, and like it. But it is more difficult to go the other way. French and Latin managers, says Hofstede, have problems in Nordic countries, where Power Distance is low.

Hofstede ends the chapter by addressing some cross-cultural training programs, and his own, created in collaboration with André Laurent of INSEAD. This is a three-day course on "Managing in the multicultural organization." Its objective is to increase cross-cultural communication skills by making people aware of the extent to which their culture has "programmed" them. The course is intended for international staff members from multicultural organizations. This discussion is followed in the book by some proposals for areas of research on cultural differences between nations.

The influence of Hofstede's writings on the interculturalists can be exemplified with a recent book on intercultural training by Brislin and Yoshida (1994), who use his four dimensions of culture as a way of developing cultural skills. They draw on two tables by Hofstede (1986:312-313) which show differences in teacher/student and student/
student interactions - one in terms of collectivism-individualism, the other in terms of power distance. To Hofstede, these tables show possible interaction differences between teachers and students. For example, in collectivist societies “education is a way of gaining prestige in one’s social environment and of joining a higher status group,” while in individualist societies “education is a way of improving one’s economic worth and self-respect based on ability and competence.” But he notes that the patterns suggested are to be seen as extremes, and might not be found in reality: “The tables are meant to alert the teachers and the students to the role differences they may encounter” (ibid.:311, emphasis by Hofstede).

Brislin and Yoshida use the tables to identify the cause of cross-cultural problems between Japanese students and American college professors. The latter, they say, have problems with their Japanese students. They find them lazy, not interested in acquiring knowledge to become more competent. But to the Japanese student, education counts more in terms of the name of the university they attend and the contacts they make through it. When coming to America, they do not know that they themselves have to make contacts outside the university. Using Hofstede’s tables, Brislin and Yoshida provide some tips for how to overcome these problems. Professors at American universities should inform their Japanese students that networking through professional organizations and internships plays the same role as contacts with university alumni do in Japan.

Judging from a survey of SIETAR members on the contribution from other social sciences to the intercultural field, Hofstede is mentioned together with Hall, Harris and Moran, and some others, as having had a major impact (see Harman and Briggs, 1991). In the survey, Hall was considered to be the most influential writer. Hofstede’s use of statistics and factor analysis makes his book difficult to read for those who lack this kind of knowledge. Hall, who is more accessible than Hofstede, is mentioned 46 times in the SIETAR member survey, and Hofstede only 3 times. But despite the difficulties in reading Hofstede’s book, interculturalists refer to him, and his cultural dimensions, as often as to Hall, and his concepts of high-context and low-context cul-
In 1991, Hofstede published another book, *Cultures and Organizations*, which addresses the same issues as in his previous book, but in a more accessible way. *Cultures and Organizations* has been translated into Dutch, German, French, Danish, Swedish, Finnish, Norwegian, and Japanese. The earlier book, *Culture's Consequences*, has been translated into Japanese.

Fons Trompenaars' book *Riding the Waves of Culture*, from which I quoted in the first chapter, takes an approach somewhat similar to Hofstede's in identifying a set of cultural dimensions. On the back of the book it says:

"Many managers understand that cultural differences affect the process of doing business, but many underestimate by just how much. This bestselling book aims to dispel the idea that there is only one way to manage and encourages readers to get to know their own culture before doing business with others."

The author is described as a leading authority on cultural diversity, and it is noted that in 1991 he was awarded the International Professional Practice Area Research Award by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD).

Trompenaars' book is laced with diagrams, tables and examples that appeal to business people. The titles of the chapters of the book identify areas which are considered important for the understanding of cultural differences in business, such as "The meaning of culture," "Relationship and rules," "The group and the individual," "Feelings and relationships," "How we accord status," "How we manage time," and "National culture and corporate culture." He draws on responses to a questionnaire administered to about 15,000 people from 50 countries working in business corporations (75% of them are managers and 25% administrative staff). Running through the book is a case study which Trompenaars presents as authentic, although disguised, about a human resource manager at a successful multinational American company pro-
ducing medium-size and large computers. We follow this manager in his struggle to apply certain management techniques in the regional branches. On this basis, Trompenaars discusses different kinds of problems that the manager encounters in different cultures.

This is done by applying his seven cultural dimensions - universalism/particularism, individualism/collectivism, neutral/emotional, specific/diffuse, achievement/ascription, attitudes towards time, and attitudes to the environment - which he introduces in separate chapters. These dimensions make up his "7D-model," which, as I noted earlier, is a registered trademark. The dimensions are presented in separate tables and diagrams (see Appendix C for an example). Each chapter then ends with some hints for doing business in cultures identified in terms of these cultural dimensions, such as the "Practical tips for doing business in individualist and collectivist cultures" included among the examples introducing Chapter 1 here.

An American, a Scot, and an Englishman: managing cultural synergy

Another popular book in the intercultural field is Managing Cultural Differences: High-Performance Strategies for Today's Global Manager by Philip Harris and Robert Moran. It was published in 1979, with a second edition in 1987, a third in 1990 and a fourth in 1996. The authors' background is in psychology, and they have been working in the business environment for a long time, on questions of management and organizational behavior. Both have also given workshops at SIETAR conferences, and conducted intercultural training for business people.14

The overall purpose of their book is to convey the idea of cultural synergy. If the world is going to survive, Harris and Moran argue, people from all over the world have to cooperate. And the only way for this to happen is through synergetic organizations, the structure and management of which take into consideration the different cultural backgrounds of the employees. They argue for a holistic view of the world: "Synergy is separate parts functioning together to create a greater whole and to achieve a common goal. For such aggregate action to
occur, leaders require a new set of cross-cultural skills” (Harris and Moran, 1987:11). The development of these skills is said to involve knowledge about and sensitivity towards culture and cultural differences.

The book is considered a classic in the intercultural field and is often used in courses on international business and management at universities and colleges around the world. As I said in Chapter 1, it was this book that drew my own attention to the interculturalist field. And when I started to orient myself within this field, I soon found it on the syllabus of the Stockholm School of Economics course called “Culture, Business, Communication,” where it and Hofstede’s *Culture’s Consequences*, were the main texts. I have also seen these books used in courses in international management at Stockholm University.

Harris and Moran have the business community as the target for their book. This can be seen in the organization of its content, and in the many anecdotes told by the authors. The book is divided into four units:

- Cultural Impacts on Global Management
- Cultural Impacts on International Business
- Cultural Specifics and Business/Service Abroad
- Management Resources for Global Professionals

Each unit emphasizes the importance of culture on business and management. Anecdotes from real life are mentioned, for example, business negotiations going wrong due to lack of knowledge about cultural differences; but as we shall see, Harris and Moran also fabricate ethnographies about cross-cultural encounters. The chapters of the first unit have been turned into a series of six one-hour video tapes, produced by Gulf Publishing Company VIDEO and featuring the authors as lecturers.

Harris and Moran also provide the reader with a list of ten cultural categories, which they say are important for the global manager to understand, wherever he or she goes in the world. The categories they identify, which can be said to epitomize many interculturalists’
perception of what are the most important areas to address in intercultural training, are as follows:

- Sense of self and space
- Dress and appearance
- Time and time consciousness
- Values and norms
- Mental process and learning

- Communication and language
- Food and feeding habits
- Relationships
- Beliefs and attitudes
- Work habits and practices

The book is full of tips for managers on what to do in cross-cultural encounters. There is a section on cross-cultural training, in which the authors briefly go through some of the most common types of such training programs and provide information about consultants and agencies conducting intercultural training and consulting. SIETAR is mentioned as a global network of cross-cultural trainers organizing annual conferences on intercultural interaction.

It may be worth noting that in their discussion of culture, Harris and Moran refer to the study of national character by Abram Kardiner; their reference is to the 1981 edition of his and Ralph Linton's *The Psychological Frontiers of Society*, a book first published in 1945. I have found it usual within the intercultural field to refer to the most recent editions of old American anthropological texts. Since the interculturalists are mainly operating in the commercial market, such references may be an instance of the market's need for novelties. Or they may be used because these are the editions which have been most conveniently accessible to the authors, and which will also be available to their readers. It is, however, a practice which gives the impression that the views expressed - as in this case Kardiner’s and Linton’s on culture and personality - are current, and widely shared by contemporary anthropologists.

Harris and Moran end their book with a section on doing business in different continents: North America, Latin America, Asia, Europe, Middle East and Africa. Case studies are used as illustrations of cultural misunderstandings. A conspicuous feature of these case studies is that the ethnography presented in them is fictitious, created to show
cultural differences in areas considered to be important in order to un­
derstand intercultural communication. I will summarize such a case used by Harris and Moran to convey information about cultural differ­ences as they affect the relationship between an American company and its British subsidiary, and the interactions between three individu­als involved - Jeff Donovan of the United States, and Dudley Letts-Jones and Angus McKay from Britain.

Jeff Donovan was born in 1932 in Ebbensburg, Pennsylvania, U.S.A. and has a B.B.A. in finance from St. Francis College, and a Master’s degree from Pennsylvania State University. He then attended, on a corpo­rate scholarship, the Executive Institute of the Wharton School of Business, University of Pennsylvania, and is now working at Easting, Inc., as the corporate executive liaison officer for the British Isles. He is responsible for supervising the company’s subsidiary there, Aquaphone, Ltd. Jeff is said to be highly motivated “in the spirit that the ‘business of America is business’” (Harris and Moran, 1987:437).

The information given about Dudley and Angus is more thor­ough then for Jeff; as the book (despite its wide international circula­tion) aims at American business people, more information about Jeff is probably held unnecessary.

Dudley Letts-Jones, it is said, was born in Calcutta, India, in 1920, the son of an English colonel and a viscount’s daughter. He and his family returned to England when he was young, and he was raised in the Royal Mews, since his father had become the Royal Equerry. Dudley later attended public school at Eton, and graduated from Cam­bridge with a degree in the social sciences. He commanded a battery of anti-aircraft guns in World War II, and participated in the Battle of Britain. Today, he belongs to the Church of England and the Conser­vative Party. He is also member of an exclusive club in London, the Imperial Club.

Dudley is said to have gone into industry with the help of some old school friends and is now working at Aquaphone Ltd, where he was the managing director when Easting acquired the company. The Americans wanted him as president of their subsidiary, which is his position today. Dudley’s wife, Dolores, did not approve of this, since it
meant that her husband would have to work more than before. Dudley is described as being "typically British - generous, enterprising, inventive, loyal to the Crown... a perfect English gentleman" (ibid.:438). Recently Dudley has become frustrated with the devaluation of the pound and the taxes of the Labour government. (Remember, this book was first published in the 1970s.) He had to sell the country house, and could not afford to go for the usual family holiday to the Continent or Bermuda.

Angus McKay is a Scotsman, born in Dundee, the son of a craftsman. He attended state schools and later became a mechanic's apprentice. He participated in World War II, where he was decorated and became a sergeant-major. Before the war he had worked as a caddy in the summers, and thereby met a wealthy member of his clan. After the war, this man advised Angus to study engineering and lent him funds to do so at the University of Edinburgh. Angus was working for Aquaphone Ltd when Easting took it over, and is now the general manager of the Aquaphone plant in Leith. Angus enjoys Jeff's visits, because he feels that Americans are like Scotsmen. He also welcomes American business in Scotland generally, since he feels that the British government gives exclusive advantages to English interests. As Angus is a fierce Scottish nationalist, however, he has lately come to wonder if the American dominance in ownership has meant that the Scots have exchanged one master for another.

After this introduction, we find Jeff thinking about the day, two years ago, when his boss called him into his office and gave him his assignment. He remembers how the boss briefed him about the English people and how to do business with them. Centuries of empire building had created an inner pride and composure in the British. And one has to respect British technology, because the Americans has benefited from it since the times of the industrial revolution. He should be aware, too, that Britain is a "polyglot of old cultural influences - Angles, Saxons, Normans, Vikings, Celts, Picts, Romans and others" (ibid.:439), and that it today has become more pluralistic with the influx of immigrants from the old colonies. Nationalism has become more manifest in Scotland, Wales and North Ireland. The British are normally reserved,
polite, and friendly, but they can be ruthless when necessary. Furthermore, Jeff had learned, the British are not overwhelmingly preoccupied with making money and hard work. They value free time, and do not care to have many possessions (something that has changed with American influences). The American concern with profits and efficiency is irreconcilable with the British approach. "You have to be sensitive to such forces when you do business in the United Kingdom and rid yourself of the John Bull stereotype," Jeff's boss had concluded (ibid.:439).

This is followed in the case study by accounts of incidents in London and Edinburgh. These are introduced by Jeff, thinking during his plane ride back to New York about what took place during his last meetings with Dudley and Angus. He had had the impression that he had the United Kingdom in hand; that with the changes he had introduced in Aquaphone, sales has increased and working conditions improved, while he had avoided significant labor strife. These he considered to be major improvements, but something had gone wrong. In London, Dudley Letts-Jones had invited Jeff for lunch at the Imperial Club - something Jeff had been waiting for since he first got to know Dudley two years ago. Yet Dudley had been very upset, and had had an outburst about how American businesses in Britain has increased, and about the dependency this had created for many British companies:

"During my lifetime, England has lost a territorial empire, while America has gained a commercial empire. I have watched my country decline drastically in natural resources and productivity, while we pursued an insane internationalism. How do you think I feel when I witness Arabs and other foreigners like yourself buying up the British Isles! I almost resent having to be employed by an American-owned subsidiary!!! Many of your American business chaps over here are vulgar, noisy, and brash. Your high pressure salesmanship is causing Britons to buy what they don't need and can't afford" (ibid.:443).
Jeff had been startled by this outburst and was not sure on how to manage the situation. After this he had gone to Edinburgh to meet Angus, something he had looked forward to since he felt that he and Angus were on the same level. But the same thing happened as with Dudley. Angus was upset about the American business take-over in Scotland. The case ends with Jeff on the plane back to New York, pondering new challenges to face in the British Isles.

Having told the story of Jeff, Dudley and Angus, Harris and Moran offer a list of some issues for analysis. The reader is asked to make use of the background information about the three characters, and examine how their cultural values have affected their perceptions and communications; for example, “As you re-read Angus’ background and the incident, what are the implications of Scottish nationalism for Americans doing business there?” (ibid.:445). Or in the case of the meeting with Dudley, “List some of the learning you received which help you to better understand why he reacted as he did” (ibid.).

Through the creation of fictive characters with a background that seems realistic (such as Jeff’s educational background from an existing business school), the depiction of a business relationship that could be taken from real life, and by putting the characters’ comments in quotation marks, this “ethnography” gives the impression of being authentic (although for example Dudley’s last name and the account of his imperial, royal, school and club connections perhaps take things rather too far). Particularly through the lists of issues for analysis, the impression that the event is real becomes pertinent. A conspicuous feature of the fabricated ethnography is the accentuation of cultural differences. Britons are presented as being the opposite of Americans: not as keen as Americans to make money, or to work, or to be cost-effective. Most often information about different cultures are presented in opposites.
Jean Phillips-Martinsson's book *Swedes as Others See Them* has not gained the same reputation among the interculturalists as those already described. Yet it deserves mention because it is typical of its kind. It blends personal experiences of intercultural communication with a selective reading of a few scholarly books. Intercultural Press has several books of this type, and encourages authors to write books where personal experiences of cultural differences are discussed within a conceptual framework.

The first edition of the book was published by Affärsförlaget, a Swedish business press, in 1981, and sold 40,000 copies. This is the edition that will be discussed here. In one of her chapters, Phillips-Martinsson presents data gathered through interviews with over 100 business people from different parts of the world about their perceptions of Swedes. This small-scale survey stands in stark contrast to the large-scale studies by Hofstede and Trompenaars, who each interviewed some 15,000 business people. Books like Phillips-Martinsson's often present a small-scale survey conducted by the authors, and in many cases such surveys are then related to those large-scale efforts. In the second edition of her book, for example, Phillips-Martinsson relates her survey data to Hofstede's research (Phillips-Martinsson, 1991:106).

It is worth noting that in the books by Hofstede, Trompenaars and Phillips-Martinsson, the populations from which information about culture and cultural differences is derived are drawn from the business environment, consisting of individuals such as managers and administrative staff of different corporations. Questionnaires are the only method used, and the information gathered from these questionnaires is often presented in tables and diagrams. The procedure, then, seems somewhat reminiscent of those times, not least in the 1950s and 1960s, when American college students, readily accessible to survey researchers, constituted the population from which conclusions were drawn about Americans, or even "human nature," in general (see Calhoun 1995:71).

*Swedes As Others See Them* featured in the 1982 Spring Catalogue of Intercultural Press, where it was described as follows:
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“A unique book that explores the more popular beliefs about Sweden, the problems foreign people encounter when dealing with Swedes, and how a more effective method of interaction can be developed.”

The cover of the book shows the Swedish flag as background and three pairs of eyes in the forefront, each with a flag representing different parts of the world, inserted as the iris of the eye. On the back of the book is a picture of the author, together with some quotes from Swedish business people praising the relevance of the book for international business. The book is divided into six chapters, and begins with anecdotes of some of the author’s first experiences with Swedes. They are told in a humorous way, and some of them are accompanied with illustrations. The anecdotes are interspersed with advice for foreigners on how to interact with Swedes. A section follows about the experiences of foreign businessmen in interacting with their Swedish counterparts. Phillips-Martinsson then begins to explain these experiences in terms of cultural patterns, where she emphasizes certain aspects of non-verbal behavior: intonation (paralinguistics), body talk (kinesics), eye contact (oculesics), touch (haptics), smell (olfaction), space (proxemics), time, and appearance. The book ends with one chapter of advice for Swedes dealing with foreigners, and another one with general advice for foreigners dealing with Swedes.

In describing the Swedes, the book has a personal tone which sometimes becomes a little aggressive - for example, “You can’t blame your behaviour on your ancestors forever. Start fighting your shyness and build up your self-confidence by finding out more about others” (Phillips-Martinsson, 1981:89), or “If company policy does not encourage you to entertain [visitors] in your home blaming the rigidity of the taxation system, change your job!” (ibid.:94).
Helpful hints: on not proposing suicide

There are also numerous how-to books with lists of tips for doing business in different cultures. These often focus on how to negotiate with foreigners, how to behave in formal and informal meetings with foreigners, or how to build productive business relationships. Such books are not acceptable to all interculturalists, since they are perceived to simplify issues of cross-cultural encounters (J. Bennett, 1986). Most of them are written for an American audience, the major market of how-to books in general.

Do’s and Taboos of Hosting International Visitors (1990) is an example of a work in this genre. The author, Roger E. Axtell, retired vice president of the Worldwide Marketing division of The Parker Pen Company, says that the purpose of the book is to have the reader learn about cross-cultural differences in courtesies, comportment, and behavior.

“You will learn [for example]: How to be especially adroit at conducting business with the Japanese, or the British, or the Canadians. How to avoid social faux pas that could ruin a perfectly good business deal. How to use certain business negotiating tactics depending on which culture is sitting across the business table. Most of all, you will read how to be a considerate and understanding human being with people from other cultures. And that, after all, should be the cornerstone of any business relationship” (Axtell, 1990:x).

The book includes anecdotes from experiences of cultural differences in business. The author says that he has collected many of these anecdotes from his seminars, lectures and talks, where people have told him about their own experiences of cultural differences when doing business abroad. As we have seen, the use of anecdotes and stories in conveying knowledge about culture and cultural differences is common in intercultural training. Several trainers and consultants have told
me that they have acquired vast repertoires of anecdotes over the years, from people who have told them either during or after their sessions. Here is an anecdote from Axtell’s (1990:1) book:

“In Grand Rapids, Larry Bratschie, marketing executive for a large manufacturer of office furniture, once hosted a key group of Japanese customers. Knowing that the Japanese were great giftgivers, Bratschie purchased sterling silver pocket knives for each guest. He had them carefully wrapped Japanese-style (pastel colored paper, no bows) and positioned at each place at the dining table. As the Japanese opened their gifts, each guest suddenly went mute. Each carefully set the knife back in the gift box and stared stiffly into the distance. As the guests left the dinner table, the gifts remained behind, untouched. Later, Bratschie learned that in the Japanese culture the act of presenting a knife as a gift can be a symbol of suicide.”

One might sense how this anecdote could easily be turned into a cultural assimilator, where four options as to what went wrong in this situation could be stated. In this case it is offered to illustrate “that in the world of international etiquette there exists a tangled thicket of customs, habits, protocol and behavior that can confuse and trap the most accomplished business professional” (ibid.:2). Axtell’s book also contains lists of tips on what he sees as important aspects of international hosting. An example of such a list is the one for Sweden, which is presented as being a list of national characteristics. Some of the characteristics of Swedes are:

- Handshaking common, touching and back-slapping uncommon
- Punctuality a must but the business pace unrushed
- May seem stiff and overly serious at first
- Take great joy in nature
- Pride taken in Viking heritage
- Good topics: Sweden’s high standard of living, sports
- Bad topics: High taxation, neutrality during World War II
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One might compare this to Jean Phillips-Martinsson's list of Swedish culture traits, collected through her interview with over 100 foreign businessmen and their impressions of Swedish businessmen. These are presented under different rubrics: negotiating, decision-making, personal relations, timing, use of language, appearance and general impressions, and rules and regulations. For example, Phillips-Martinsson (1981:50) says that particularly the Arabs and the Latins see Swedes as inflexible in negotiations. Swedes are also said to be punctual at meetings, but afraid of taking risks, and slow in taking decisions. They dress in a sloppy manner, and leave no room for original ideas, accepting petty rules and regulations (ibid.).
The Making of Professionals

About 250 people are gathered in a lecture theater at The University of Portland in Portland, Oregon, for the opening session of the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication. During the session, faculty members present themselves to the participants by telling them about their "burning issue," their particular priorities for the intercultural field. While addressing their "burning issue," each faculty member holds a ball modelled as the Earth, and when finished gives it to the next speaker. Each person has about three minutes to talk about his or her burning issue. Here Alice, one of the faculty members, expresses her concern for professionalization. People need to be committed to educating others into becoming professionals:

“My concern is the role we have, and the commitment we make, to educating our clients and any stakeholders in this globe on what is truly intercultural or global. Too many people are trying to do that which is not based on theory. They are changing words and calling it intercultural, or calling it diversity training, and doing a disservice to their clients. They are doing a disservice to the field, and I think we need to be totally committed to educating, to training the world... Here we understand one another, we talk a language that is in common with our field, with our culture. But, the outside world doesn’t know. So we need to
be committed to that. And along that line there is a story, I don't know if it's got to all of you, that's going around San Francisco. About the hen and the pig, who lived on Farmer Brown's farm and were very grateful to him for the food that he presented to them, and the life they lived. And they decided to give him a gift, and they thought, what could they give him? They decided to give him a beautiful breakfast for his birthday. And the breakfast was going to be ham and eggs. The pig thought for a few minutes, he said, 'Wait a minute. For you, madam hen, that's involvement, for me it's total commitment.' We need to be totally committed to educating, to spreading the word, if you will."

In this chapter I will continue to discuss the organizational forms of professionalism in the intercultural field, with some emphasis on how people's intercultural experiences are codified into a common body of knowledge and practice. I will focus on two educational centers: the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication (SIIC) in Portland, Oregon, and the Intercultural Relations Program at the Lesley College Graduate School in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

At the annual SIETAR congresses, representatives from the Summer Institute and Lesley College inform participants about courses and programs. There is indeed an intensive traffic of people and products between these sites. People invited as faculty members of the Summer Institute are also invited to lecture at Lesley College, and offer workshops at SIETAR conferences. Students at Lesley College also visit the Summer Institute, which offers college credits they can count toward their Master's degree. These centers are consequently well known among the interculturalists, and considered important for the professionalization of intercultural trainers and consultants. Here, the latter will be certified as professional interculturalists.
Every summer since the mid-1980s, the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication takes place at a university campus in the Portland, Oregon area. The Institute was originally founded at Stanford University in 1976, and at that time was called the Stanford University Institute for Applied Intercultural Communication, although mostly known as the Stanford Institute for Intercultural Communication (SIIC). In *Communique*, April, 1976, it was announced as a program designed for the training of trainers. The institute was conceived by David Hoopes and Clifford Clarke, and Hoopes told me that the idea behind the institute was:

“To provide a place for people who could get some kind of training in intercultural communication and methodologies of cross-cultural training that was not available anywhere else. To fill a pretty big void, because there was nowhere they could get it, there were no academic programs.”

The Institute was sponsored by The Stanford University School of Education in cooperation with SIETAR, the Bechtel International Center at Stanford, and the Intercultural Communication Network. In the mid-1980s, it moved to Portland, under the sponsorship of the Intercultural Communication Institute (ICI), “a non-profit, private operating foundation designed to foster an awareness and appreciation of cultural differences in both the international and domestic arenas” (quoted from a brochure published by the Summer Institute). At this point, the meaning of the acronym SIIC was changed to the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication.

The Intercultural Communication Institute is directed by Milton and Janet Bennett, both former Peace Corps volunteers with doctorates in Speech Communication from the University of Minnesota. Milton Bennett was for many years on the faculty of the Department of Speech Communication at Portland State University, teaching courses in inter-
cultural communication. Now he develops and conducts intercultural training for corporations and universities. He described the purpose of the Summer Institute to me as one of bringing more professionalism to people who are already practicing professionals. So, from primarily filling a void in providing a place for learning about methodologies in intercultural training, SIIC has become a place for the “production of producers.” Milton Bennett also gave the following description of the relationship between the Intercultural Communication Institute and the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication:

“To us, the Summer Institute represents one aspect of the overall mission of the ICI. You remember the relationship where the ICI is the sort of parental body, and the SIIC is the major activity, but only one of the activities. And we see SIIC as being professional development. Then we see the ICI branching off into some other areas, mainly two. One an educational program that would actually offer a degree, beginning with a Masters degree, an accredited Masters degree, in cooperation with an accredited school in US. And this is actually being set up right now. Where we could attract the students, the people that we don’t particularly want to attract at this point to the institute. We come into this other program, where some of the same faculty may be doing things for them, but we will design a program that will be mainly to give people a credential in this area. And then the third area would be research. And eventually, I hope in not too many years, we would like to see the institute sponsoring special research projects. Maybe be a place where some people who just wanted to do research could come to the ICI, and be doing this, using the library, and doing other things.”

The workshops at the Summer Institute are divided into three sessions: the first one runs for three days, the other two for five days each. A session consists of several different workshops running parallel.
In the summer of 1991, these were the workshops of the second and third sessions:

Session II

1. Teaching Intercultural Communication
2. Training Design for International/Multicultural Programs
3. Training for Global Organizational Development
4. Counseling Across Cultures
5. Facilitating Culture Learning in International Exchange
6. Developing Diversity in Higher Education
7. Perspectives on Hispanic Communication
8. Using the Intercultural Perspective

Session III

1. Intercultural Theory and Application: Advanced Seminar
2. Teaching Intercultural Communication
3. Training for International Transitions
4. Managing Multicultural Organizations
5. Curriculum Design for Cognitive and Cultural Diversity
6. Developing an Integrated Globalization Strategy
7. Communicating with the Japanese
8. Family Training for International Effectiveness

The courses are designed for different groups of professionals and are said to relate to their work situation. A common theme of the courses is to convey an understanding of and sensitivity towards cultural differences. For example, in the course description for “Perspectives on Hispanic Communication,” the course is said to be designed for managers, educators, teachers, administrators and those who are responsible for designing courses and developing curriculum. Some of the objectives are: to recognize the variety of Hispanic peoples, to increase cultural awareness and sensitivity of Hispanic communication styles, and to explore ways to enhance cultural diversity and under-
standing. This is somewhat different from the course description for "Communicating with the Japanese," which is said to be designed for teachers of intercultural communication and of Japanese language and culture, business people, students and others who are interested in the subject. The objectives are to develop awareness of Japanese patterns of thought, norms and values, communication styles, and conflict resolution, but also to apply this understanding in interpersonal communication in everyday life situations.

All but a few of the participants stay on campus. The workshops begin at 8 a.m. and end at 5:30 p.m. During breaks, people from different workshops can meet and exchange experiences. After dinner the evening activities begin around 7 p.m. The evening activities are optional, but most of the participants attend, watching and discussing different videos, or playing simulation games. When these activities end, at about 10 p.m., faculty members and participants can meet over wine and cheese. In the evening before the last day of sessions, there is a party. Food and drinks are served, and there is a live band. All this leaves little room for anything other than intense interaction between workshop participants and faculty members.

The faculty members are well known in the intercultural field, from their theoretical as well as practical work in intercultural communication. Some of them have known each other, both as teachers and students, from their time in the graduate program in intercultural communication at the University of Minnesota. It was from there that the first cohort of people with a Ph.D. in intercultural communication came, in 1976, and its members are still active in the intercultural field. Milton Bennett gave this answer to my question of how faculty members of the Summer Institute are selected:

"What we try to do, and what has been the tradition over the fifteen years of the Institute, is to bring people in as faculty for the Institute who are, and have been, working centrally in the area of intercultural communication, in both theoretical and applied areas. In fact, we have as our model one similar to that of SIETAR, and that is theory
into practice. The idea is that one cannot really practice without being theoretically well grounded, but on the other hand, knowing a lot of theory doesn’t do you much good if you can’t do something with it. All of the people that we bring here are people that a large number of people in the field of intercultural communication believe are folks that really exemplify that principle of theory into practice.”

When asked about how he finds out what could attract people to attend the workshops at the Summer Institute, Milton mentions attending SIETAR and NAFSA conferences, but also different education and corporate conferences. He and his wife are also in constant contact with faculty members, mainly by telephone, and this provides them with information on what is going on in the field. But most important is to ask the participants what they would like to come back for next year. For some of the faculty members this means that they will come back each year to give the same kind of workshops. This is something they appreciate, mostly because it is one of the few opportunities they have of meeting each other. Most of the year they live and work elsewhere, and only keep in touch with each other by telephone.

At the Opening Session of the Summer Institute mentioned above, Milton presents the faculty members as being in the forefront of the field. They are said to have been thinking about issues “that concern us not only as interculturalists buts as human beings, trying to survive and perhaps even thrive in the world today.” Then, as we have seen, they present their “burning issues,” which are often presented by way of anecdotes and jokes. Marc, one of the faculty members, told the following story:

“In my field we have a dictum that says that any gesture is an obscene gesture somewhere. That might or might not be true, I do not really know that, but if you take it seriously you get kind of paralysed... The counterpart to ‘every gesture is an obscene gesture somewhere’ is that ‘any-
thing you say here risks offending somebody.' And that really seems true to me. I want to tell you a story that I hope ties all this together. On my campus I'm trying to put together a workshop that’s being designed jointly by some international people and some multicultural people, people who are into what they call diversity training. So, we've had a number of meetings, a group of ten or twelve of us, from these two sides, from these two sets of interests, and trying to design a workshop. And one of the things that we are doing in the course of this is to propose various exercises and activities, and since we are not generally familiar with the exercises and activities they use, nor are they familiar with ours, we have to talk about these or demonstrate these, so people understand what we are doing. I talked about, it's really not an exercise, but it's a point I make and the way I make the point, in some of my workshops on international matters on non-verbal behavior, is that I tell a story that I'll tell now, and then I get back to how this fit in, into this meeting. I told about this in the meeting. I explained that when I am talking about non-verbal things, to a group of people, I will ask somebody to come up and help me with a demonstration, and in this case I am going to ask, I think Robert (here Marc turns around facing the other faculty members and points at Robert), who doesn't know about this. Bring a chair with you. I explain that I worked for a while in Malaysia, I was an academic advisor at the Indiana University program over there. I explained that as it happens here at the opening of a term, there is a lot of business for the academic advisors, students coming in to register for classes in large numbers. So at the beginning of each term we would have a lot of students coming into our rather small office. And one day, I finished with two students who were in my office, and I went out to the waiting area to find the person who had the next appointment with me, and it
was crowded. All the chairs were taken, and there were people standing around, and there were a couple of guys who were arranged like this (here Marc jumps into Roberts’ lap, which brings a lot of laughter from the audience). You know, chatting with friends, or chatting with each other, or chatting with other people. It was perfectly normal, because the Malays do this. But you do this in front of an audience of Americans? (laughs from the audience) Forget what he is thinking (pointing towards Robert; more laughs from the audience). Because most Americans get really upset, just watching this, let alone taking part in it (laughs from the audience again). Even though they know its just a demonstration, everybody understands I’m just trying to make a point, they still think, ‘get up!’ (laughs from the audience). In this meeting, trying to plan the workshop, I didn’t actually do this, I just talked about it, I did it for you because I thought you’d like it (laughs from the audience). The woman from the affirmative action office, which is concerned with minority-majority relations and sexual harrassment issues jumped up, and she said, ‘You don’t do that just with volunteers, do you!’ ‘You bring somebody with you who has agreed to do that, don’t you!’ ‘You can get in big trouble, for making an unwanted sexual advance if you did that workshop.’ (‘Oh no’ is heard from several people in the audience). And she was worked up about that. Never occurred to me, I don’t know if it occurred to Robert (laughs from the audience), we’ll ask him about that (laughs from the audience). What are you supposed to do, you know, everything you do risks offending somebody, everything is an obscene gesture somewhere. We have to be careful, I guess, but we can be so careful that we don’t do anything. I think we are in a bind here, this is one of our issues. What are we going to do that people will pay attention, pay respectful attention, to?” (Applause)
Steve, another faculty member, began with a joke he had heard from an interculturalist friend of his who told this to an audience in Japan, consisting of Americans and Japanese:

“If this had been an all American audience, I would have started by telling a joke. And if it had been an all Japanese audience, I would have started by excusing myself. But in this mixed audience, I will begin by excusing myself for not telling a joke.”

During their stay at the institute, the participants will become accustomed to using a common vocabulary. Again, Hall’s and Hofstede’s concepts and models are part of that vocabulary, which is then used within as well as outside the workshops, to share experiences and to discuss the content of the workshops. All participants will also learn about their own learning and teaching styles. These notions are introduced in sessions conducted by Milton and Janet Bennett, where the participants fill in a questionnaire consisting of words that are perceived to characterize such styles. First, one has to rank words in a list of nine sets, with four different words in each set. After ranking these words (from 1 to 4, where 4 is the rank of the word that is supposed to best characterize one’s own learning style), one is to compute the overall learning style. There are said to be four different types of learning styles: Concrete Experience (CE); Reflective Observation (RO); Abstract Conceptualization (AC); Active Experimentation (AE). Experiential learning is described as a four-stage cycle, in which the learner

“must be able to involve himself fully, openly, and without bias in new experiences (CE), he must be able to reflect on and observe these experiences from many perspectives (RO), he must be able to create concepts that integrate his observations into logically sound theories (AC), and he must be able to use these theories to make decisions and solve problems (AE)” (quoted from the instructions of how to calculate one’s learning style, handed out to all participants). ³
Finding out one's learning style does not take long, and when finished, each participant informs Milton or Janet about his or her learning style, and gets a colored dot on his or her name tag signifying this style. During my stay at the Summer Institute, I could often hear people talking about their learning styles, and using the vocabulary in describing the workshop they attended. During a coffee break, I overheard a participant saying that her learning style was CE (Concrete Experience), and that the workshop she was attending was too much oriented toward AC (Abstract Conceptualization) people. She was complaining about this to a participant of another workshop, saying that she had expected the workshop to be more oriented towards CE.

Another example of this comes from a workshop I attended. Here the participants were divided into groups to discuss problems they had encountered in their work as intercultural trainers. We were instructed to write down one such problem and then pass it around. Since I am not an intercultural trainer myself, and therefore could not contribute with a personal experience from work, I wrote down the following statement:

"Deep down all humans are alike, so what you anthropologists do is just muddle things by saying that gender is a cultural construction."

A woman had said this to me in another workshop I had attended before, and I thought it could be an example of a person who was negative toward intercultural training. The responses I got were:

- "Do a role play that shows different communication styles (AE/CE), or give data on differences and how they play out (AC/RO)."
- "Do an exercise which highlights gender differences - though I don't know one off hand."
- "Do an exercise that demonstrates similarities across cultures in terms of basic needs - food, shelter, etc. Follow with an exercise that demonstrates differences in cultures."
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If this doesn't demonstrate cross-cultural gender differences, follow with a discussion. Use pictures for interpretation."
- "If we wish to be effective on the job and in other situations, we must understand how others view the world to enable us to successfully interact with various groups."

At the graduation ceremony, the different workshops are presented by having each group stand up. There are shouts, laughs and applause, and some of the groups make short comments like, "We are the touchy-feely group." People are then encouraged to say something about their experiences during the week. "In this last week, thinking about everything all together, what stood out for you?," asks Milton. Some of the responses are:

"For me, personally, I think it was the learning style. I found it really really interesting, because of what it validated."

"I view this as reality and what's out there is distortion of reality." (laughs and applause)

"This is my first time here, and I was in the counselling group, and I could see very much that what we were talking about, cognitively, was becoming a reality. Our group very much progressed and today, this morning it came together, very very much, I think for all of us. So, we didn't only talk about it, but we practiced it and lived it, and very deeply internalized it." (applause)

"This is a new community which we need to take with us."

"One of the things that I really appreciate is not only the safe place that honors the ability to explore the diversity among all of us, but the diversity within ourselves."
The graduation is coming to an end, and people who have worked with administration during the week are thanked, as well as the interns and the members of the faculty, who are praised for their capacity to care for each other, and their willingness to share their ideas. Here Janet and Milton encourage us to continue the mission of spreading the word of intercultural communication. This is then followed by the handing out of Certificates of Attendance, as overt signs of professionalism.

The Lesley College Intercultural Relations Program

Lesley College is situated in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and was founded in 1909 to train childhood education professionals. In its program catalog Lesley College is described as being committed to providing educational opportunities to “those historically underserved in higher education,” such as working adults, women and disabled young adults. A distinctive part of the educational ideology at Lesley College is the conviction “that people matter, and that the professionals who respond to their needs provide a unique service to society.” This is done by combining theory and practice, which has made Lesley College famous for its practically oriented education. As part of the academic program, students are placed in field-based training sites, such as schools, day-care centers, hospitals, government offices, and public and private corporations.

Today, Lesley College is comprised of three schools: The Undergraduate School, The Graduate School, and the School of Management. The Undergraduate School offers education to young women in the fields of education, human services, and management. The School of Management offers working men and women programs in management and in training and development. The Graduate School offers bachelor’s and master’s degree programs through its divisions of Educational Studies and Public Policy, Counseling Psychology and Expressive Therapies, and Liberal Studies and Adult Learning. A Ph.D. program is offered in Educational Studies. As with Lesley College in gen-
eral, the Graduate School is committed to diversity in its study body and faculty. "A commitment to diversity through class, gender and ethnicity permeates the school's curriculum and programs." The Graduate School is widely recognized as one of the leading schools in the field of teacher education as well as in adult and experience-based learning. It is in the Liberal Studies and Adult Learning division of the Graduate School of Lesley College that we find the Intercultural Relations Program. It was first offered in 1986, and its director, Professor Zareen Lam de Araoz, sees its intention as one of professionalizing the intercultural field. (Professor Zareen Lam de Araoz is from India, and her husband is Argentinian. She has a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology and is a well-known intercultural trainer and consultant. Between 1992 and 1994 she was the President of SIETAR International.)

The Intercultural Relations Program is a practically oriented educational program. As the course catalog has it:

"Students in the Intercultural Relations program acquire a sound theoretical and experiential foundation, in addition to the skills appropriate for facilitating intercultural relations and enhancing effectiveness in a variety of professional settings."

This, it is said, will contribute to a notion among the students of accepting diversity and transcending differences in order to cherish a common humanity.

Two kinds of degrees are offered; a Master of Arts in Intercultural Relations (38 credits), designed for those who "wish to acquire the knowledge and professional skills to facilitate intercultural relations in a variety of professional settings, both domestically and internationally," and a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study in Intercultural Relations (38 credits), which can be pursued by those who already have a Master's degree in Intercultural Relations or a related field. It is said to offer "professionals the opportunity to receive additional research skills and enhance their career opportunities."

The Master's degree is divided into core courses, elective courses,
internship, and a thesis, which from Spring 1992 was changed to become an advanced research course (Advanced Topics in Intercultural Research). The internship constitutes the final exam and is meant to be an experience of culture differences, which is perceived as a necessary part of the educational program. Here it is also suggested that the setting of the internship “should reflect the professional interests, skills, and previous experiences of the student.”

The courses take place in late afternoon or early evening, which leaves most of the day for the students to work with their materials, or to hold a day job. This reflects the school’s ideology of catering for adults who cannot participate in ordinary educational programs, which take place in daytime. In the description of the course “Introduction to Intercultural Relations,” some of its objectives are said to be to introduce basic concepts, to develop attitudes that are perceived as important to intercultural practice, such as tolerance, respect and patience, to make the students aware of the different areas that makes up the intercultural field, to develop the necessary skills that are required of them in their role as interculturalists, and to make them more self-aware about their own skills and how to develop them to match the skills needed in the different areas.

In pursuing an internship the students can utilize the network and resources that the program has built up over the years. The internship specializations offered are designed for professional career paths: international education/foreign student advising, managing culturally diverse human resources, intercultural health and human services, development project administration, multicultural education, intercultural conflict management, intercultural training and consulting, and the possibility of an individually designed specialization.

There is also a concern among the faculty with developing the intercultural field in terms of providing theoretical concepts and models. This makes some of the courses more theoretically oriented than others, such as “Dimensions and methods in cultural analysis,” the objective of which is to develop skills for designing and implementing a research project in the intercultural field. Here the focus, according to the description handed to the students at the beginning of the course,
is on developing

“skills in ethnographic research methods, including information gathering (participant observation, ethnographic interviewing, and the construction of narrative accounts), analysis (content and discourse), and options for presenting ethnographic texts.”

In this course, some contemporary anthropological books have recently been used, such as John Van Maanen’s *Tales of the Field*, Ulf Hannerz’ *Transnational Connections*, and *Writing Culture*, edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Since 1992, a course on “Advanced Topics in Intercultural Research” has also been added, eliminating the writing of a thesis as a program requirement. The new course focuses more on survey research and quantitative methods.

In planning the Intercultural Relations Program, Zareen together with Jay Jones, Associate Professor at the Program, set up an Advisory Committee consisting of people they knew, considered to be outstanding interculturalists. There has also been a strong link to SIETAR, particularly during the period when Zareen was the president of that association. Faculty members and students are encouraged to participate in the annual SIETAR congresses, and to contribute with workshops or paper presentations. Each year some of the students from the program go to the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication to get some college credits, thereby linking these two educational centers to each other. Their faculty members also know each other, and occasionally some of the SIIC faculty members come to the Lesley program to give a lecture.

The students are divided into groups, and many of the exercises are done in these groups. Often the group members meet off-campus to discuss the readings. Most students are American citizens, of different ethnic backgrounds, between 20 and 30 years old. But there are also students from other countries around the world.

Before being accepted into the program all students are interviewed. One of the things looked for in the interview is the student’s
commitment to caring about other people, or as Zareen put it to me:

“I think what I look for is, firstly the variety of their experiences. And it doesn’t only have to be international. So if they’ve lived in different cultures, gone through different things, both environmentally and personally. The other thing I suppose I look at is their communication skill. And I suppose in that what I look for is are they good listeners, are they really paying attention? Whether they’re empathetic. Whether they’re tolerant and flexible... Then, on the other hand, the concrete question I always ask them is, ‘what attracted you to this program?’ So I want to see their motivation. If they talk about a job-related opportunities aspect, it’s not somebody I would encourage to continue. Or if they say that ‘being an internationalist is a way to go, that it is a great career especially in the business world,’ then I would really question that. Then I would try and probe and see what other motivation is there... Then I always ask them, ‘what’s your dream, what’s your vision, what do you want to contribute?’ Maybe this is the most important question that I ask. You will be surprised how many people you ask, ‘What do you want to contribute,’ will keep coming back to, ‘I really love to travel,’ they’ll say, ‘I like meeting people from different cultures.’ None of that is, ‘What are they wanting to give,’ and, ‘What do they want to serve to make a difference through people,’ So, I try to sense their commitment to make a difference, and then I think I talk a little about our values, what we believe in, and the educational process. And I try to sense how comfortable they are with the educational process. For example, if a Chinese student comes, or a Japanese student comes, they need to know that this is not going to be like their home country, they’re going to have to self-disclose, they’re going to have to look at their own things, and this may not be the best way, but this is the way we
educate at Lesley. So, I try to prepare them before what we do. I think I try to sense for rigidities, about sort of 'I know it all,' and I prefer people who come in with a sense of 'I want to learn'... I think I also look for, now that you are asking me, I really look to see whether people have demonstrated a commitment to a cause during their life. Even if it was looking after their grandmother with great dedication. You know, it means they care, and they care about people."

The students have had different kinds of intercultural experiences. Some are former Peace Corps volunteers, others have travelled in different countries, or worked and lived in another country, or worked with foreigners, or worked as foreign language teachers, or grown up in a multiethnic surrounding, or are married to a person of another culture. Many of them say that the reason for choosing the Intercultural Relations Program is that they want to do something practical with these experiences. In class, the teachers encourage the students to talk about their intercultural experiences, and to help them understand and express these experiences in terms of concepts and models used in the intercultural field.

At the beginning of the semester there is a potluck party for new and old students. The students are asked to bring a dish which is common in their own culture, so that everybody can have "a taste of cultural differences." The party takes place at the Alumni Hall of Lesley College, and at the far end of the room a table is laid with these different dishes. Some of the students put a lot of effort into preparing these dishes, while others bring bread and cheese, or ice cream. The party is an opportunity for the students to meet each other and the faculty members, but also former students who have finished the program and have already started careers as interculturalists. This is said to help "foster an intercultural community."

Former students are also invited to class, to talk about their past experiences from the program as well as about their present careers. Well-known intercultural trainers are also invited to talk about their
career as interculturalists. A theme that these people frequently dwell on is “networking.” The students are encouraged to make contacts with different people for future employment. As one visiting intercultural trainer said: “Network, network, network is going to get you out there.”

The invited intercultural trainers and consultants are working in different areas, such as business, education, governmental institutions, and various organizations. This is to show the students that their knowledge and expertise are in demand in every walk of life. It is also meant to give them a role model of what it means to be a professional interculturalist. One student commented after a visit from a well-known intercultural trainer that: “It seems he is at the high end, something to strive for.”

The faculty members look upon the program as an educational process, in which the students move from becoming culturally self-aware to becoming sensitive to how to bring about change in other people’s attitudes towards cultural differences. This is considered part of their role as professional intercultural trainers. The first semester is thus focused on how culture has shaped them into what they are. In classes, a lot of time is spent on encouraging the students to talk about their personal intercultural experiences, as for example, “culture shock.” By talking about these experiences and framing them in a particular vocabulary, the students are perceived to gain an understanding of their own cultural imprint. The following semester is focused on how to utilize these experiences when conducting intercultural training.

There is also an internship for one semester, either “in-country” or abroad. Here the students have to make their own contacts with an organization or a company, and design an intercultural communication training program for it. After the initial contact is made, one of the faculty members meets the contact person who then becomes the supervisor. The internship is said to prepare the student for work as a professional interculturalist. “So then we feel they are ready to go out there as professionals.”

The teachers strive to create an atmosphere of trust in class, so that the students feel comfortable in sharing their intercultural experiences. These experiences are then codified into knowledge about inter-
cultural communication. For example, in a discussion about non-verbal behavior the students were asked to share their intercultural experiences of this. On a flip chart was written: “Kinds of non-verbals.” Under this rubric was written:

- personal space (proxemics)  - body movement (kinesics)
- general appearance and dress - facial expressions
- eye contact (oculesis)      - touch (haptics)
- smell (olfactics)          - paralanguage
- time

A female student volunteered her experiences from interviewing a man from Egypt, which she said was an example of proxemics:

“He came and sat very close to me during the interview, but I knew he came from Egypt and therefore I could handle the situation.”

A male student talked about his experiences of facial expressions, from his stay in Honduras as a Peace Corps volunteer. In Honduras, he said, people use their lips when pointing out a direction. Here he mimicked it and everybody laughed. Another female student offered her story from Malaysia, on how she was touched on the leg by a Malaysian woman. It felt strange, she said, but at the same time she was pleased.

“I knew it indicated familiarity in Malaysia, and that I was considered as one close.”

A former female Peace Corps volunteer gave an example of time perception:

“We had a saying about when things should be done. Should it be done in American time or Malaysian time, where Malaysian time meant any time.”
Again, the program can be said to codify the students’ intercultural experiences into what is considered to be knowledge about intercultural communication. At the same time this will teach them how to do this codifying, so that it becomes part of their professional work. For example, in one of the classes the students were asked to write down key intercultural insights that would be important to convey in intercultural training. Some of these insights were:

- don’t make assumptions
- be open-minded
- listen through people’s cultural framework
- be open with both heart and mind, show warmth, caring and understanding
- learn to appreciate, not to compare
- bring world peace through understanding
- listen with your whole being

These insights were then presented by the teacher as important qualities of an interculturalist which should be part of intercultural training. The students are also encouraged to see things “from the native’s point of view.” Here they are to reflect upon their own cultural values, as well as on different cultural values.

In talking about values as informing human behavior, the teacher uses different kinds of exercises. Carol asked the students to close their eyes and lean back in their chairs. They were asked to think about when they were children and try to remember the people who were around them, and what they said. This, Carol said, could be things like “In our family we...,” “We have always done...,” “Our values are...,” “If you are a good boy/girl you will get...”

The students are then asked to open their eyes and write down two values that they remember were communicated to them in childhood. Again, the students are asked to close their eyes and try to remember when they went to school, and what the teachers said.

“You enter work or university, what are the values now? Have your values changed or not? Come slowly back into
the room and write down two values you find important to you at this moment in life."

The students are then asked how many of them have the same values now as before, and how many have one value now the same as before, or if the values now are different than they were. The students raise their hands in response to Carol's questions, and she counts them. What was the purpose of this exercise, she asks. To show that values can change over time, says one student. "Correct, but more important, How do I pick up values? When does it crystalize in me?" Carol says.

In the intercultural field values are considered to be the building blocks of culture, and thus students are constantly asked to reflect upon their own cultural values and how these condition their behavior. For many of the American students, it is held, this creates a conflict, in that it goes against what they feel is their own uniqueness. In class, this is talked about as itself a typical American value - most Americans are said to believe that they have no culture.

A way of showing how cultural values condition behavior is by playing simulation games. One such game is about a group of anthropologists coming to a culture and trying to understand what is going on. Six students play the anthropologists and are taken aside by Helen, the teacher, who instructs them in their role. The rest of the students are to represent a culture called Yaminini. The Yaminini culture is said to be characterized by hospitality. There are also certain cultural rules: if someone asks a question with a smile on his lips, people answer "yes." If the question is stated without a smile, the answer is "no." Men talk only with men, and women talk only with women. People who carry glasses can only talk with others who also carry glasses. When the instructions have been given, the "anthropologists" are let in.

At this point the Yaminini women cluster into two groups. The anthropologists walk around and begin making contact with the Yaminini people, asking questions which are answered "yes" or "no," depending on whether they are asked with a smile or not. This can become bizarre, as when one of the "anthropologists," with a smile on his lips, asks a male member of Yaminini "Do you live?", whereupon
the latter answers, "yes." The next question is, "do you live in Hawaii," this time without smiling. The answer then is "no." Again the anthropologist asks "but you live?," but this time without smiling, thus receiving the answer "no." After a while the anthropologists are told to leave, and they exit from the room to go and talk about their experiences. Then they return and start asking questions once more, later to be led out again by Helen. They return for the last time and the process repeats itself. Helen then interrupts and says that the game is over. There is time for a debriefing, and Helen begins by asking the anthropologists what they felt.

Some of the answers are: "confused"; "welcomed;" "difficult to communicate;" "feeling like an intruder;" "curious;" "discouraged." The Yaminini are then asked what they felt: "invaded our territory;" "being in a zoo and observed;" "exposed;" "stereotyped - the anthropologists came in to look for certain things;" "offended by the anthropologists in that they left when they got the answers;" "Didn't want them to find out about the culture, tried to confuse them."

Helen writes down the responses on the blackboard. She then asks the anthropologists what they had found out about the culture of the Yaminini. One student said, "I couldn't find out what it was." Another says, "I felt great when they invited me, but if I didn't smile they took it all back." A third said, "I come from a touching culture, so I touched the people in the culture." Helen then says that "the interpretation of culture can be different - there may be different interpretations of the rules in the same culture." The purpose of the simulation game, she continues, is to learn about misunderstandings due to different cultural codes, and to develop sensitivity to learning about such codes:

"When you are following certain rules and practices one feels a binding. That helps us to see that it is difficult to communicate when there are no rules and practices, that it is important to find a common ground for communication to come about."
After the debriefing, the students are asked to think about a situation in their life when they entered a group of people and felt strange about it. This is described as culture shock, and Helen says: "You don't know the rules and feel strange about that." The students are to discuss this in their groups, and Helen writes on the blackboard some questions they are to focus upon:

1) How did it feel?
2) Why?
3) How did I behave (because of this feeling)?
4) What did I do that helped?

Afterwards there is a discussion in which all groups take part. A student in one group talks about her experience of coming to an organization to work. They used a certain vocabulary which she did not understand, and that was frustrating. She pretended to understand what was going on. But later she asked people what things meant, and then it became easier.

Helen writes the responses of the different groups on the blackboard, shortening them into one word or phrase: "overwhelmed," "isolated," "depressed," "confused," "helpless," "loss of control," "humiliated," "feeling misunderstood," "feeling stereotyped," "identity crisis."

"How did this affect your behavior," asks Helen. Again the students answers are written on the blackboard, in single words or phrases: "constricted," "loss of identity," "can't be yourself," "limited."

Helen then interprets these experiences:

"Your potential to be productive is lower when you are in culture shock. It affects productivity, functioning, and the ability to articulate and negotiate. When being in a foreign culture one can either go native or reject it. There is little leeway to do or not to do things, like wearing or not
wearing a suit. These are extremes, a third way is to compromise. The most intercultural way is to tune in, experience from that culture's point of view, and see how comfortable it feels. Initial trying out a new behavior without prejudice. As interculturalists, we should allow ourselves to experience another being in a non-judgemental manner. To see if one can live in that manner. We are trying out a new way of being.”

Through such exercises, a certain format for discussing and depicting culture and cultural differences is conveyed to the students. The format will then be used later, when students work as intercultural trainers or consultants.

The students are encouraged to share their thoughts and feelings about anything in class. A way of doing that is to have the students write these down anonymously on a piece of paper. The teacher then reads these papers aloud to the class, and then glues them on a flip-chart paper on a wall in the classroom. The students are encouraged to comment on what is on these papers, and some of them tell the others which one they wrote.

An incident which one teacher identified as an example of intercultural communication was when Nancy stood up in class and told everybody how she got a phone call from another female student, who said that Nancy had offended her. It was not mentioned who had been offended, but Nancy made an apology to this woman in class. To respect and understand other people without prejudgement, and to make it safe for them to express themselves, said the teacher, is intercultural communication. Creating a safe environment in which the lay clientele can express themselves is another quality considered to distinguish a good intercultural trainer. This message is sent again and again to the students.

It is here that complaints about charlatans can be heard, as in Mary’s “burning issue” which opened the chapter. In class, the students are constantly told what distinguishes a real interculturalist. “If you are a real interculturalist, you learn from others all the time.” Stories are
told about former students who left after one semester to set up a consulting firm of their own, and how they failed to provide their clients with what they needed. Or how students thought they knew best when helping to set up a training program for a client, and how that client later refused to work with students from the program. Carol, one of the teachers, told me what she usually says in class about charlatans:

"I think that there are many people who wanted to jump on to this band wagon, intercultural training, and it's very well paid, and it's the buzz-word. So, since I've lived in France, let me do intercultural training for France, and so on. They may have a lot of country information, but they don't understand the responsibilities, or the process of training, or cultural awareness... And I think some people have made a business out of it, and don't really have the background. And that does a lot of harm, because then people say, 'Well, we had an intercultural trainer, but the training doesn't really work.' So I believe in trying to get certified for the field, but I think that since there are so many senior interculturalists who are out there without training or background or degrees, they also resist this professionalization thing. Because it is threatening as well, because they may not have all the requirements."

Professionalization and community-building

Both the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication and the Lesley College Intercultural Relations Program are sites for the "production of producers." The main difference between them is that the latter is more of an ordinary academic program, with weekly reading assignments, group exercises and examinations, and thereby more clearly a part of the organizational forms of professionalism associated with higher education. The Summer Institute, on the other hand, does not offer such an academic program. Its affiliation with higher education
comes from recruiting its faculty members from academia, and from offering college credits to the Lesley students. Yet this contributes to the professional ambience of the workshops offered at the institute.

And we may remind ourselves here of Larson's (1977:43) comments on the role of educators. As educators become concerned with professional identity, their role within the profession increases, so that those who want to become professionals will attend to them and to their way of identifying what is professional knowledge. As we have seen in this chapter, many of the faculty of the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication are prominent intercultural trainers and consultants within the intercultural field. People perceive their work to set the standards for intercultural training and consulting. This is a strong reason for people in choosing to attend their courses at SIIC, and also when they give workshops at the SIETAR congresses. And again, these well-known interculturalists are also invited to lecture at Lesley College. Their reputation within the intercultural community makes their standards something to strive toward for many students.

The annual SIETAR congresses, we have seen, are another context where experienced intercultural trainers, often without an academic background, occupy the same space as academics. These different organizational forms of professionalism signify some of the problems in achieving unity in the intercultural field. As Macdonald (1995:194) notes, such a disunity can reflect different traditions feeding into an occupation at its beginning, and sometimes never really coming fully together. A common pattern here, in establishing a profession, is the creation of an academic group which will insist on playing a large part in professional formation.

This is also the picture for the intercultural field, where many practitioners sense a lack of unity. The inception of different educational programs is looked upon as a way of creating a coherent body of knowledge and practice, yet it can lead to even more pronounced splits. In the intercultural field, this is reflected in the tension between trainers and researchers. Today, intercultural communication is an established academic subject in the United States, while intercultural training is still struggling to achieve that status. The existence of two associations
claiming rights to intercultural communication as their subject area is evidence of this. One is SIETAR, the other is the Intercultural Communication Division of the International Communication Association (ICA). While the former, we have seen, is associated with intercultural training and consulting, the latter is more associated with research. It is here that the academic community of interculturalists can be found. And as one researcher told me, going to a SIETAR congress is only for having fun and meeting old friends. The academic discussions, he said, take place elsewhere.

In writing on the professionalizing project of accountants, Macdonald (1995:195) also makes the interesting observation that in the professional formation of accountancy, an academic group is present, with a concern for professional education: something which he says is common in such projects in the United States, but which occurs less often in Britain. When looking at the strivings toward credentialism in the intercultural field, we find that it is most often people affiliated with academia who are the strongest advocates of professional credentials; the faculty of the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication is an example.

Yet if participants may be of two minds with regard to the more purely credentializing aspect of professionalism, there is also a social aspect. In writing about the transnational organizational culture of Apple Computer, Christina Garsten (1994:43) notes that

"Sharing a community of space and time gives individuals an opportunity to observe the way colleagues perform tasks, and to hear them discuss problems and comment on events. In this way, the different office sites of Apple, or even smaller units such as work groups, serve as breeding-grounds for local shared meaning."

A similar picture can be drawn for the interculturalists, in that the SIETAR congresses, the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication and Lesley College are different settings in which people discuss and comment upon events, tasks and experiences; an interac-
tive process which gives rise to shared meanings. And through the circulation between these places, of people and products, these contextually shared meanings become integrated into a body of common knowledge and practices which makes up the occupational culture of the interculturalists. Many of those who attend the Summer Institute are not primarily there to get professional credentials, since they are already established as intercultural trainers. Their presence has more to do with being around well-known intercultural trainers and gaining new materials for their own workshops. The people who circulate between these places, then, become mediators of professionalism; creating, in Benedict Anderson’s (1983) sense, an “imagined community” of professionals. Here they convey stories about “universality of insights, methodology, research results and advisory successes” (Robertson, 1992:172). For such a community to exist over time, trust is an important ingredient. This is created by what Giddens (1990:87) calls “facework commitment;” informal relationships of trust are developed and maintained between colleagues or associates within an expert system, through face-to-face interactions which must often occur in formal contexts.
Conclusion: Interculturalists, Anthropologists and Culture

For an anthropologist to do research among the interculturalists, I noted in the introductory chapter of this book, involves some ambiguity: as we both deal with culture, should I engage in a continuous critical debate with them over their way of doing it, or should I observe, as an ethnographer, their understandings of culture as parts of their culture? Mostly, in the preceding chapters, I have chosen the latter course. Now, by way of conclusion, the time has come to confront more directly the relationships and the differences between the two modes of thinking about culture; one more academic, the other practically oriented and situated in the marketplace.

Recycling anthropology

In Chapter 1, I quoted a definition of the culture concept by the interculturalist Robert Kohls, and noted that it could remind anthropologists of an earlier period in their own discipline, especially in its American form. A couple of other interculturalist definitions might support the same point. In *Understanding Culture's Influence on Behavior*, Brislin (1993:4) suggests that:
“Culture consists of ideals, values and assumptions about life that are widely shared among people and that guide specific behavior.”

And Samovar and Porter (1991:15), editors of the reader Intercultural Communication, take this view:

“Cultural values are a set of organized rules for making choices, reducing uncertainty, and reducing conflicts within a given society... Cultural values also specify which behaviors are important and which should be avoided within a culture.”

Indeed, in the first edition of Samovar’s and Porter’s reader, published in 1972, Clyde Kluckhohn and Margaret Mead, central figures of midcentury American anthropology, were represented. In another of their books, Communication between Cultures, they refer to Ruth Benedict as they speak of “the force of culture” in shaping attitudes and behavior (Samovar and Porter, 1991:62).

There are also frequent references in the intercultural field to A.L. Kroeber’s and Clyde Kluckhohn’s (1952) famous compendium, Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. The value of this book is that it is a source of definitions of culture, but also that one can refer the sheer multitude of such definitions found in it. It is presented as proof that there is no consensus within anthropology on the definition of culture, which then is taken as a legitimation for choosing a particular definition. In contemporary anthropology, on the other hand, there is very little interest in repeating Kroeber and Kluckhohn’s effort to count the definitions of culture.2

The work of Edward T. Hall, as we have seen, is a bridge between anthropology and intercultural communication; and especially through his connections to Columbia University, Hall was linked to the American mainstream anthropology of an earlier period.3 A larger social science milieu of the past which also carries special lasting weight in interculturalist understandings of culture is obviously that of the old
Department of Social Relations at Harvard University, as it was for an extended period after World War II. Clyde Kluckhohn was the leading anthropologist here, but the view of culture and related concepts cultivated through interdisciplinary interactions could also draw on contributions by Talcott Parsons, Florence Kluckhohn, Fred Strodtbeck, Samuel Stouffer and others.

Parsonian structural-functionalism has clearly been widely influential, viewing culture as a stable value system, governing human action and manifested in social institutions such as family, corporations and government (see Parsons and Shils, 1951). In the interculturalist field, on the other hand, the work of Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck (1961) on “variations in value orientations” has had a more specific and immediate impact. While neither of them was a professional anthropologist, they participated in a comparative research project with a major anthropological component, named “The Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures,” or more informally known as the “Values Project,” in the American Southwest. The cultures in question were Navajo, Zuni, Mormon, Texan and Spanish-American. The conceptualizations developed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck have attracted interculturalist attention since the beginnings of this field; one learns of them, for example, at SIETAR congresses. Their basic assumption is that there exists a limited set of fundamental human problems which people all over the world have to solve. They identified five such problem areas:

- human nature
- the relationship between man and nature
- the orientation towards time
- the modality of human activity
- people’s relation to each other

To each of these problems are found three solutions. For instance, solutions to man’s relation to nature are: subjugation-to-nature, or harmony-with-nature, or mastery-over-nature. These solutions are called “value orientations,” and together they make up an ordered system of
fifteen value orientations. These are considered to be the building blocks of culture, shared by all members of it and affecting their perceptions, attitudes and behavior. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck illustrated this system of value orientations in a five-by-three table (see Appendix D), reproduced in various books and articles on intercultural communication.4

Obviously the interculturalist appropriation of old anthropological notions about culture has something to do with the eclectic reading habits of the pioneers of the intercultural field. David Hoopes (1979a:11) has described the sources they drew on in the early days:

“People read Edward T. Hall’s books, *The Silent Language*, in which he argued that culture is communication and demonstrated its pervasive influence, and *The Hidden Dimension*, in which he analyzed the cultural use of space and demonstrated vividly the practical value of cross-cultural analysis. They read communication theory, especially David Berlo’s *Process of Communication*, which was used as the theoretical framework for international communications training programs at Michigan State University. They read Herskovits on cultural relativism and Gordon Allport on prejudice. They studied the results of Rokeach’s worldmindedness research and began to explore kinesics and other aspects of non-verbal communication. They read anthropologists Clyde Kluckhohn and Margaret Mead and were particularly influenced by Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck’s *Variations in Value Orientations*. Many turned to humanistic psychology and human relations training, studying the work of Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow.”5

We also find some of the same roots of ideas, however, in the more systematic frameworks of Geert Hofstede and Fons Trompenaars. Early in *Culture’s Consequences*, Hofstede (1984: 29) quotes Margaret Mead on anthropological methodology in national character studies,
noting that “modern nations are too complex and subculturally heterogeneous for their national characters or modal personalities to be determined in this way,” but argues that his book shows that “modern nations do have dominant national character traits which can be revealed by survey studies and by the comparison of measurable data on the society level.” Here, then, are reminiscences of American “culture and personality” studies. When he goes on to identify his four dimensions for the comparison of cultures, he finds supports for his position in Clyde Kluckhohn’s concern with universal categories of cultures:

“In principle... there is a generalized framework that underlies the more important and striking facts of cultural relativity. All cultures constitute so many somewhat distinct answers to essentially the same questions posed by human biology and by the generalities of the human situation... Every society’s patterns for living must provide approved and sanctioned ways for dealing with such universal circumstances as the existence of two sexes; the helplessness of infants; the need for satisfaction of the elementary biological requirements such as food, warmth, and sex; the presence of individuals of different ages and of differing physical and other capacities.” (Kluckhohn, 1952:520-521)

Hofstede interprets this to mean that Kluckhohn is concerned with a framework consisting of “empirically verifiable, more or less independent dimensions on which cultures can be meaningfully ordered” (Hofstede, 1984:36).

Fons Trompenaars writes out of a similar tradition as Hofstede. The heritage of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard is especially noticeable: Trompenaars draws on the writings of Talcott Parsons, Samuel Stouffer and Jackson Toby, and Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck. His point of departure is the notion of culture as problem-solving, which he borrows from the latter two. He identifies three universal problem areas, to which, he says, different cultures have found
different solutions: relationships with people, attitudes to time, and attitudes to the environment. The solution to problems in these areas, he argues, have over time become part of the norms and values of a culture. His research examines the solutions different cultures have chosen for these problems. On this basis he identifies those seven cultural dimensions already identified in Chapter 5: universalism/particularism, individualism/collectivism, neutral/emotional, specific/diffuse, achievement/ascription, attitudes toward time, and attitudes toward the environment. The first five, according to Trompenaars, correspond with Kluckhohn's and Strodtbeck's "relational orientation," and concern relationships with people. "Attitudes to time" is said to correspond with their "time orientation," and "attitudes to the environment" to their "man-nature orientation." One might note that the five first dimensions also resemble Parsons' (1951) "types of social value-orientation."

Trompenaar's use of the work of Stouffer and Toby can be seen in a more concrete example. In the late 1940s, these Harvard sociologists worked with the notion of national characters, and explored operational procedures for linking norms to personality. They were trying to develop a technique that could measure the predisposition of people to select one norm in favor of another. For this purpose they constructed a set of four different situations, involving conflicts between obligations to a friend and general social obligations. These situations were presented to a group of American college students. I will here quote one of their four questions:

"You are riding in a car driven by a close friend, and he hits a pedestrian. You know he was going at least 35 miles an hour in a 20 mile-an-hour speed zone. There are no other witnesses. His lawyer says that if you testify under oath that the speed was only 20 miles an hour, it may save him from serious consequences. What right has your friend to expect you to protect him?"
Check one:
- My friend has a definite right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure.
- He has some right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure.
- He has no right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure.

What do you think you'd probably do in view of the obligations of a sworn witness and the obligation to your friend?

Check one:
- Testify that he was going 20 miles an hour.
- Not testify that he was going 20 miles an hour.”

(Stouffer and Toby, 1951:396).

Trompenaars uses this set of four questions, together with some others relevant for the business environment which he has developed in line with these four questions, to gather his data on different cultures. The answers to the questions, says Trompenaars, show cultural patterns, and can therefore be used to predict the behavior of people from different cultures. He does not concern himself with the problem identified by Stouffer and Toby (1951:404) that one should “anticipate the possibility that tendencies of a respondent to adopt more stereotyped roles on hypothetical than in real-life situations will complicate predictions.”

For Trompenaars, Stouffer's and Toby's method thus became a key to identifying cultural differences, and a means of predicting behavior in different cultures. For example, the answers to the above question are presented by Trompenaars in a staple diagram with the caption, "The Car and the Pedestrian" and are said to present the "percentage of respondents opting for a universalist system rather than a particular social group" (Trompenaars, 1993:35). In the diagram the respondents are no longer individuals, but cultures: 26% of the people of
South Korea are opting for a universalist system, while 65% of the Spanish people, 90% of the people from the UK, and 96% of the Canadians are opting for such a system (see Appendix C for a presentation of the diagram). People from the UK and Canada are universalistic, according to Trompenaars, while people from South Korea are more particularistic.

What emerges in the writings of Hall, Hofstede and Trompenaars is a notion of culture as an entity with properties of its own, residing within people's minds and affecting their perceptions and behavior. It turns into a separating device, distinguishing and classifying cultures in terms of dimensions. This conception of culture has had a profound influence on practicing interculturalists, as can be seen in their vocabulary when describing cultural differences. Here we may be told, for instance, that Japanese people are members of a high context culture; show a polychronic time perception; score low on the individualism index; and are more universalistic than Americans. And that Americans are members of a low context culture; show a monochronic time perception; score high on the individualism index; and are more particularistic than the Japanese.

Meanwhile, in anthropology

The view of culture in the intercultural field is hardly unfamiliar to anthropologists; as we have just seen, in no small part its historical roots are in anthropology. Yet one reason why it tends to bother anthropologists is that while the interculturalist profession has been forming around it, much of the contemporary theoretical debate in anthropology has been devoted to a critique of the understanding of culture as bounded, homogeneous, coherent and timeless - and indeed to a questioning of the value of the concept itself. In their important book Anthropology as Cultural Critique, Marcus and Fischer (1986:10-11) argue that the upheavals of the 1960s brought into focus the apolitical and ahistorical character of Parsonian social theory, which since the early 1950s had been dominant in the social sciences. What was at
issue here was how social reality was to be described in a radically changing world order. A Parsonian social theory of encompassing paradigms, or general theories, was perceived to reduce the richness of social life, thereby doing away with qualities such as ambiguity, ambivalence, uncertainty, contradiction, and irony in representations of social phenomena. And its emphasis on function and system equilibrium left no space for political and historical circumstances in these explanations.

In American anthropology, this came to spur the development of interpretive anthropology, in which the theoretical debates shifted the focus of analysis from social structure and behavior toward symbols and meaning. A sophisticated discussion developed focusing on how the “native’s point of view” was elucidated in ethnographic writings, but also on how the ethnographer gained knowledge about his subjects in order to present them in ethnographic texts.

Much of this had its beginnings with the work of Clifford Geertz in the 1960s and 1970s. Geertz actually came out of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard University, and Parsonian theory was a point of departure for his conception of culture, but gradually he moved away from the Parsonian notion of culture as being a frame of mind governing human behavior. Instead, Geertz said that human behavior should be seen as “symbolic action” (Geertz, 1973:10). To him the concept of culture was a semiotic one, and anthropology was to be seen as the study of meaning. In what has become an often quoted passage from Geertz, he says that culture has to be seen as webs of significance:

“man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning” (Geertz, 1973:5).

Geertz (1973:37-43) was critical of what he described as the consensus gentium theorists, who would try to base an understanding of culture on purported human universals - an idea he traced through
anthropology from Clark Wissler and Bronislaw Malinowski to George Peter Murdock and Clyde Kluckhohn. (Here we could add that Edward Hall’s notion of Primary Message Systems, based on human biological universals, as referred to in Chapter 5, seems to be of the same kind, and note that Hofstede explicitly draws on Kluckhohn in this respect.) This, he argued, was a blind alley for thinking about culture. The emphasis which Geertz suggested was instead on variability, and on “thick description,” rather than abstraction, in ethnography.

As noted before (in chapter 5), in the following years, Geertz was followed by many others in his concern with writing and representation in anthropology. “Writing culture” and “ethnographic authority” (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Clifford 1988; Geertz 1988) became preoccupations especially of American anthropologists. Fabian (1989) dwelt on temporal discourse in ethnographic texts, and the placing of “the Other” in a distant time. Boon (1982) discussed the importance of the social and historical context in the production of ethnographic texts, and there was increasing experimentation in ethnographic writings (see Marcus and Fischer, 1986, and Atkinson and Coffey, 1995 for a discussion about this).

As the debate over such matters continued in anthropology, however, there also developed a critique of some of the tendencies in interpretive anthropology which Geertz had come to stand for. Roger Keesing (1994:302) argued that cultures were “put in separate compartments and characterized in essentialist terms,” suggesting a radical otherness. As cultural constructions were assumed to be shared, interpretive anthropology had neglected to examine the ways in which symbolic production is linked to gender, class, and history. In his own view toward culture, Keesing took his point of departure in the idea of culture as a meaning system, but insisted on linking this to an awareness of power and interests. He also noted that cultural processes should be seen as extending across borders, and that this fact should lead to “more complex conceptions of interpenetration, superimposition, and pastiche” in the cultural production of meaning (ibid.:310).

In its emphasis on internal variations, Ulf Hannerz’ (1992a, 1996) view of culture is related to Keesing’s. Based on the view of culture as
an "organization of diversity," Hannerz concerns himself with the con­
temporary social organization of meaning through different social frame­
works of varying scale - everyday forms of life, states, markets, move­
ments. People can be seen as differentially involved in cultural flows
within and between these frameworks, and this can also contribute to a
 cultural production of individuality. With a special focus on transnational
cultural processes, Hannerz also problematizes assumptions of cultural
boundedness.

A more radical stance toward the culture concept is that adopted
by Tim Ingold (1993), who wants to abolish the culture concept, since,
he argues, it fragments the world. The anthropological conception of
culture, in Ingold's view, has been built on the idea of translation: mak­
ing different cultures understandable in terms of the anthropologist's
culture, which is largely western. People are assumed to carry within
their minds cognitive rules for perception and action in their social and
natural environments. Culture is thus held to serve as an organizing
device, acquired through enculturation, which makes the sensory input
of the environment meaningful. But at the heart of this theory, Ingold
points out, there is a dilemma: how will the unenculturated infant ac­
quire a cognitive schema through experience, when experience already
itself requires that schema? To resolve this puzzle, Ingold proposes a
"direct" theory of perception. People create meaning by attending to
the world. It is through this engagement that one learns to perceive,
rather than through the acquisition of a cognitive schema. A child learns
how to engage in the world through the involvement with others in
everyday life. According to Ingold, through the experience of a shared
environment "a foundational level of sociality" is thus created which
constitutes "the relational baseline on which all attempts at verbal com­
munication must subsequently build" (ibid.:223).

For Ingold this means that people are dwelling in a "continuous
and unbounded landscape, endlessly varied in its features and contours,
yet without seams and breaks" (ibid.:226). When one travels in this
landscape, from place to place, the horizons will change, but the land­
scape is the same; two people standing at the same place will share the
same view. It is from such a perspective that anthropologists actually
build their understanding of foreign cultures, something Ingold exemplifies with his own understanding of reindeer herdsmen. He came to see the world of these herdsmen as they did by immersing himself in their herding activities "in a shared environment." No need for translation, then; and Ingold's conclusion is that one should simply let go of the culture concept, since it disregards similarity in human experience, and fragments the world.

Another anthropologist with a similar view is Unni Wikan (1993), who suggests that the culture concept tends to freeze and magnify cultural differences. She finds anthropologists too concerned with rendering different cultures into words, something which blinds them to what actually goes on in communication. Mutual understanding does not build on sharing words, she argues, but on the "resonance," a feeling-thinking understanding between people which communication creates; resonance being akin to empathy or sympathy, and looking more for similarity then for difference. Wikan experienced this in her own field work in Bali, among Muslims and Hindus, who even though they have different religious dogmas could develop a mutual understanding in feeling between them, built on resonance. For Wikan, then, the difference between the two concepts, resonance and culture, is that "where culture separates, resonance bridges" (ibid.:208).

Lila Abu-Lughod (1991), the last anthropological writer to be considered in this context, again takes a position related to Ingold's and Wikan's. What she says about the concept of culture in anthropology is that it is a "tool for making other," one that creates differences. This is because the culture concept is built on the "historically constructed divide between the West and non-West" (ibid.:139), and thereby on a distinction between the self and the other:

"Women, blacks, and people of most of the non-West have been historically constituted as others in the major political systems of difference on which the unequal world of modern capitalism has depended" (ibid.:142).
The culture concept, she says, must be seen as an instrument of power and inequality. As a form of professional discourse, and thereby part of such a system, elaborating on the meaning of culture to understand cultural differences, anthropology also helps produce and maintain these differences, giving them the air of the self-evident.

As a way out of the problems she identifies, Abu-Lughod offers three possibilities: a concern with "discourse" and "practice," an emphasis on "connections," and "ethnographies of the particular." Notions of discourse and practice, often associated with Foucault and Bourdieu, draw attention to contradictions, strategies, interests and improvisations in everyday life. People are connected with each other through national and transnational networks, where indirect social relationships are gaining equal importance as more traditional ones of face-to-face interaction, in shaping people's perception of themselves and their relationships with others. For the ethnographer, such relationships and networks goes against pictures of boundedness, and attending to them makes way for a more person-centered ethnography. And here Abu-Lughod offers the strategy of "ethnographies of the particular." Instead of working with generalizations, anthropologists should be more concerned with the way individuals go through life, "agonizing over decisions, making mistakes, trying to make themselves look good, enduring tragedies and personal losses, enjoying others, and finding moments of happiness" (ibid.:158), than with perceiving them as robots, following a collective mental program.

The interculturalists as ethnographers

Far from all anthropologists would probably now be ready to discard the culture concept, even having heard the arguments of Ingold, Wikan and Abu-Lughod, and found something of value in them. The idea of culture as socially acquired and organized diversity in thought and action is not entirely dependent on assumptions of bounded, separate, internally integrated cultural units, and it is possible to take a pluralistic view of what occurs in human learning and communication, instead of
one which concentrates entirely on either conceptual learning, empathy, or shared natural experience (see Hannerz 1996:30ff.)

Yet the developments summarized here show that within anthropology there is a lively debate surrounding the concept of culture as well as the nature of cultural description, something which has been mostly lacking in the intercultural field.

Where do the practices of the interculturalists place them with regard to recent arguments in anthropology? One may find some interesting similarities between their assumptions and those which James Clifford (1988:30-32) has identified as underlying claims to ethnographic authority in classic anthropology. To begin with, there was a sense of professionalism in the use of analytical techniques and modes of scientific explanation, a prescribed attitude of cultural relativism, and a prolonged stay, living with the natives, in the alien place. Second, a real mastery of the language of that place was not necessary. It was sufficient to be able to maintain rapport, generally get along, and ask questions in particular areas of concentrated effort. Third, the “power of observation,” in the visual dimension, was emphasized at the expense of indigenous interpretations. Fourth, the ethnographer was understood to be equipped with a theoretical framework by which he or she could reach the heart of a culture more rapidly than others (such as missionaries or colonial officers). Fifth, the aim of the ethnographer was not to contribute with a comprehensive picture of all customs and beliefs, but to “get at the whole through one or more of its parts” (ibid.:31). Sixth, the depiction of an “ethnographic present” made historical, diachronic inquiry unnecessary.

The interculturalists also have at least an emergent sense of professionalism, honor cultural relativism and diversity, and have usually had personal experiences of at least one foreign culture. In particular, it is said that people who have grown up in a foreign culture, such as the children of missionaries or diplomats, are best suited to become intercultural trainers and consultants; a notion that can also be heard among anthropologists in relation to who is best suited to become an anthropologist. (In the intercultural field these people goes by the name of “third-culture kids.”) But there is also a sense of “the more, the better”:
as interculturalists market their services, we have seen, they are likely to list the countries ("cultures") in which they have lived or traveled, and the more numerous they are, the more one gains in professional authority. Among anthropologists this is seldom elaborated upon. Their professional authority is not so much linked to the number of cultures one has conducted field work in, although this can play an important role in deciding between anthropologists applying for a position in higher education.

Interculturalists also focus on certain domains, such as micro-behavior; space and time perceptions, non-verbal behavior and body language. They perceive themselves as trained observers of differences in behavior patterns: Hofstede (1984:23) says about his own observation skills that,

“If I take the train from Brussels to Rotterdam, I can tell the Belgian passengers from the Dutch; most Dutch people greet strangers when entering a small, closed space like a train compartment, elevator, or doctor’s waiting room, but most Belgians do not.”

Their theoretical concepts and models, again, allow them ready access to the “heart of a culture,” as in the case with Hofstede’s and Trompenaars’ dimensions of culture, and Hall’s high and low contexts. The viewpoint that the whole is reachable through its parts is exemplified by Hofstede when he says that “cultural traits sometimes can be measured by personality tests” (Hofstede, ibid.:21). And in interculturalist portrayals of cultural characteristics, finally, there is seldom much concern with change or history either.

Yet in some ways, interculturalist practices are unlike what anthropological practices have ever been, or especially unlike what it has been argued recently that they should be. Interculturalists do not really produce “thick descriptions” of actual life. They convey information about cultural difference through anecdotes, cultural assimilators, tables, and diagrams, and fabricated ethnography, as in the case study of the American Jeff Donovan, the Englishman Dudley Letts-Jones, and the
Scotsman Angus McKay, provided by Harris and Moran. What images of other people are then conveyed in the interculturalist’s ethnography? And what kind of cultural knowledge does it give rise to?

With regard to empathy, and the kinds of arguments set forth by Wikan and Ingold, it is interesting to note here that many interculturalists emphasize its role in understanding cultural differences. But while Wikan (1993:208) says about resonance that it does not deny difference, but renders it insignificant “in face of that which counts more for certain purposes: shared human potential,” interculturalist empathy is instead said to be gained precisely through a notion of cultural differences. As one interculturalist puts it:

“Empathy... is based on an assumption of difference, and it implies respect for that difference and a readiness to give up temporarily one’s own worldview in order to imaginatively participate in the other’s” (M. Bennett, 1993:53).

As far as the story of Jeff, Dudley and Angus is concerned, in a way one could perhaps view it as “ethnography of the particular,” in Abu-Lughod’s sense, dealing with individuals in ordinary situations. But then it is fictitious, and indeed becomes a “tool for making other” in its typification of national traits. This is certainly not “writing against culture”; but rather its opposite. The same tendency can be seen in the use of anecdotes illustrating cultural differences. They focus on certain kinds of behavior, as in the story about the Lebanese woman in Stockholm who thought she had problems with her hearing: in this case, Swedes are soft spoken, the Lebanese speak loudly. Information about cultures is ordered contrastively.

Ethnographic authority is achieved here not by way of “thick descriptions” of particular cultures, but through the sheer number and variety of anecdotes about cultural differences that one can produce. Roger Axtell’s book *Do’s and Taboos of Hosting International Visitors* is an example. Axtell draws his repertoire of anecdotes both from his own personal experiences and from participants in his workshops who have told him other stories. And on the basis of this repertoire, he seems
authoritative as he points out that Austrians are punctual, use a firm handshake, and like to talk about history, art, music, sport and wine, whereas Saudi Arabians are relaxed about punctuality, accompany handshaking with touching arm or shoulder, and like to talk about history, culture and respect for Islamic faith (Axtell, 1990:170,186).

In simulation games the players are presented with an ethnographic experience said to be like “real” life. For example, in that very popular and widespread simulation game Baťa Baťa, the players are divided into two groups called Culture Alpha and Culture Beta. They are then instructed in the rules of the game, which say that Alpha and Beta are two different cultures with their own particular values and norms, which are shown in the behavior of group members. Here players in the respective groups learn some behavior patterns, such as blinking with their eyes, waving their elbows, hugging each other, and trading cards. The purpose of the game is to experience cultural differences. At a debriefing after a Baťa Baťa game, Lori, the facilitator of the game, suggested that the game could be used as a diagnostic tool with regard to the groups taking part in it, to get information about assumptions, group behavior, and projections. And in advertising for Baťa Baťa it is said that the game is used to “introduce the notion of cultures,” which will be followed up “with a discussion and analysis of specific cultures and the way they are formed.”

The game is built on the notion that experiences, together with interpretation, provide the method to gain knowledge about culture and cultural differences. In this it follows the anthropological methodological formula of participant observation. But the use of “participant observation” in playing simulation games de-emphasizes the fact that the ethnography of the game is fabricated, and instead the game creates the impression of a “real” ethnographic experience. Ethnographic authority, as we know it from anthropology, is then distorted. “Being there” involves a fabricated ethnography in which culture is reified as a homogeneous entity, and where people are disembedded from historical, political, social and economic contexts and pictured as abstract ahistorical “others.” Yet this is exactly the purpose of the game - it is constructed as a tool for experiencing culture and cultural difference in
a generic sense.

Abu-Lughod (1991:153), in her critique of the tendency toward generalizations about cultures in anthropology, points out that these convey images of "the Nuer" or "the Balinese" as undifferentiated groups. It is this picture of culture that is conveyed in Bafá Bafá. Through the ethnography of Bafá Bafá, the players of "culture Alpha" and "culture Beta" feel they are members of groups "who do this or that and believe such-and-such" (ibid.). In recent anthropology, on the other hand, there is a noticeable convergence on greater attention to internal diversity within various kinds of social units.

Gender has been particularly emphasized in this context, and it may be of some interest to comment briefly on the interculturalist record here. Generally, there is little recognition of gender differences in interculturalist representations of culture. It could be noted, too, that although more women than men are active as intercultural trainers and consultants, the intercultural field is male-dominated. During the twenty years that SIETAR has existed as an organization, eight of the twelve presidents have been men and four women. Men have also provided the field with most concepts and models of intercultural communication, and have written most of the books and articles read by practitioners. This issue is seldom discussed within SIETAR or the field in general. While the code of ethics of SIETAR states that it is committed to diversity both within and outside the organization, a study conducted in 1994 by some students of the School for International Training suggests that it has the image of being profit-oriented and dominated by white males. The authors of the report suggest recruiting more women to the organization to get away from that image, but it does indeed appear that gender sensitivity has been rather weakly developed. Mary, an American intercultural trainer and consultant who has been in the field for a long time, had this comment:

"It started out as a very male field. It is very interesting to look at that history, and in fact at the first SIIC [Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication] at Stanford [University], there were four of us that sat up one night
and talked. I had to fight to be part of that discussion, because men don't hear women. I got cold and borrowed a sweater. When I later started to leave I said, 'Oh, let me just give you the sweater back now,' and I pulled it off and handed it to John, and he said, 'Oh, and those are my pants,' and Frank said, 'And that's my shirt,' and I said, 'You guys couldn't get through the evening without joking about this, could you.' At one point John said to me, 'We push women out, and you have to hang in there. It is important for you to hang in there, and not get pushed out of there.' So, you had to be tough if you were a woman in this field.

Another very conspicuous means of presenting information about cultures in the interculturalist field is the use of tables and diagrams. In the first chapter, in the workshop scene, we saw Jim Mullen using it; and it is also employed in the books by Hofstede, Trompenaars, Harris and Moran, and Axtell. In Hofstede's (1984:159) four-field diagram of power distance and individualism it is shown, for instance, that Pakistan scores high on power distance and low on individualism, while Australia scores low on power distance and high on individualism.

The obvious advantage of such devices is that they can make information, even in large quantities, readily accessible. Malinowski (1961:14) wrote in *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* that "the method of reducing information, if possible, into charts or synoptic tables ought to be extended to the study of practically all aspects of native life." It was in fact rather common in anthropological monographs in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, but on the whole, it may have played a rather lesser part in anthropology since then. Perhaps the most prominent exception is Mary Douglas' (e.g. 1970:59) four-field diagram including the axes of "grid" and "group," which Douglas has used extensively in attempting to develop a comparative sociology of knowledge. Hofstede refers to Douglas' work in *Culture's Consequences*, noting that in relation to his own dimensions of culture, her "group" corresponds to the Individualism dimension, while her "grid" resembles Uncertainty Avoid-
ance. He also comments that while Douglas’ taxonomy refers to the subcultures of small units, he is more concerned with entire societies. With regard to Douglas’ work, this is not really quite true, as there are examples of her arranging smaller and presumably at least relatively less differentiated societies into her scheme (see Douglas 1978:40).

A characteristic of diagrams, tables, lists and similar devices is obviously that they decontextualize; they tend to be far from “thick description” as an ethnographic practice. Jack Goody (1977:52ff) has commented extensively on this, especially in problematizing the representation of oral language in written form. In the case of interculturalist representation of culture, we may simply note that again, the effect of using such tools can be to describe units such as cultures in terms of a single or a few dimensions, to disregard more complex connections, and to suppress evidence of variation and change. While one can hardly advocate a total rejection of such means of presenting materials, in this case, then, tendencies which are pronounced in interculturalist work tend to be strengthened even further.

The commodification of cultural understanding

Why, finally, do interculturalists seem little concerned with the kinds of issues with regard to cultural understanding which anthropologists have been raising in recent times? One could perhaps argue that this is a matter of the ordinary lag in interdisciplinary communication. Interculturalists may feel confident that they have a quite clear grasp of what “the anthropological culture concept” is about, by way of Edward T. Hall, Clyde Kluckhohn and others, those who were present more or less at the creation of their field. And this lag may be increased further by the fact that interculturalist practitioners are busy people. They may have time to listen only with half an ear even to what their own theorists are up to.

What I will emphasize once more here, however, is that the market framework of interculturalist activity is a major factor in shaping the ways in which they handle cultural knowledge (or what passes
for it). Much of what may give academic anthropologists a light culture shock of their own in the confrontation with the interculturalist enterprise has to do with the fact that it is precisely an enterprise. What could make the culture concept of an older American anthropology a viable commercial product, and how does the commercial context influence interculturalist work?

To begin with, as some anthropological commentators on the market have pointed out, the market is not just a matter of a circulation of commodities but also a network of social relationships, involving primarily (although not only) sellers and buyers (see e.g. Appadurai, 1986; Hannerz, 1992b, forthcoming; Kopytoff, 1986). While in much economic thought these relationships may be understood as characterized by anonymity, this anonymity can be a matter of degree (see e.g., Hannerz, forthcoming). Much of today’s market research is focused on defining the buyers, in order to tailor the commodities to their needs and desires.

The interculturalists’ frequent use of tables, lists, and diagrams is itself very likely an example of this orientation toward a particular clientele, since these are commonly used in presenting information in the business environment where the merchandise of the interculturalists is on offer.

Moreover, subtle, detailed cultural understanding is unlikely to be a major concern in itself to the consumers of interculturalist commodities, in contrast to the professional anthropological market where scholars present intellectual goods mostly to each other. Rich contextualizations and descriptive thickness thus do not necessarily meet with much appreciation among people with a largely instrumental interest in overcoming difficulties that cultural differences create. At the same time, of course, they need to be persuaded that culture is a significant, identifiable factor behind the conflicts and misunderstandings arising in their interactions with particular others. We noted this in Chapter 1 already: a culture concept which accentuates difference is a vested interest of cultural brokers.

One might argue that the culture concept of the interculturalists is so internally heterogeneous that it should need some more compli-
cated conceptual effort to make it hang together. The steps from basic values and norms to such matters of intercultural technique and etiquette as space and time perception, or admonitions not to show the sole of one’s shoes to Arabs, seem rather long. But tracing them may be a tedious affair, not appealing to a lay audience, and taking considerable time. Instead of analyzing them in detail, or creating a coherent theoretical system, the interculturalist practitioners may just evoke the complexity involved by using one striking metaphor or other. The iceberg and onion metaphors are recurrent examples, conveying to customers an immediate sense of what it is all about. The onion metaphor can be found in diagrammatic form in the writings of Hofstede and Trompenaars, offering the image of culture as ordered into different layers, with values at the center. And Trompenaars offers a vivid example:

“Imagine you are on a flight to South Africa and the pilot says ‘We have some problems with the engine so we will land temporarily in Burundi’ (for those who do not know Burundi, it is next to Rwanda). What is your first impression of Burundi culture once you enter the airport building? It is not ‘what a nice set of values these people have’ or even ‘don’t they have an interesting shared system of meaning.’ It is the concrete, observable things like language, food or dress. Culture comes in layers, like an onion. To understand it you have to unpeel it layer by layer” (Trompenaars, 1993:6).

In general, it would appear to be an advantage of the conception of culture as something with its own properties, rather tangible, bounded, atemporal, and internally homogeneous. It thereby has an advantageous commodity form, being readily accessible. The cover, as it were, says what it is all about. It is a concept of culture which, with its range of associated products - games, videos, guidebooks - lends itself to what Wernick, as referred to in chapter 1, has called the “commodity imaging process.” The customer can fairly quickly form an understanding of
the nature of the goods, and acquisition is not very complicated and for one thing need not take very much time. It would probably be difficult to package the cultural understandings of 1990s anthropological thought equally effectively.

It is also a part of the logic of the market place, somewhat curious to those professional students of culture who do not operate there, that interculturalists (such as Richard Lewis, Fons Trompenaars and Geert Hofstede) use trademarks and copyrights to protect rights to diagrams, tables, or modes of cultural inquiry or training. The market involves, as Hannerz (1992a:116ff.) puts it, an “unfree flow” of knowledge. This again can be viewed in terms of the difference between scientific and consulting professions. To reiterate here, according to Larson (1977), the establishment of scientific markets, in which professional commodities can be recognized, is related to the adequate training and socialization of professionals at universities. According to Strathern (1996:23) the success of this reproduction can be “measured by the number of sites at which it grows.” The increase of students into higher education during the latter half of this century, and the great number of existing universities today bear witness to this success story. A prerequisite here is the free flow of knowledge.

For the consulting profession, on the other hand, it is the market potential of services and products that secures its reproduction, and here copyrights and registered trademarks can become crucial. They secure commercial profit for the consultants, and thereby sustain the reproduction of the consulting profession. But, of course, they also restrict the free flow of knowledge.

***

These, then, are some notes toward an understanding of what happens to cultural knowledge, and attempts to communicate it, as it enters the marketplace. Could there, despite everything, be ways to open the interculturalist enterprise to the views of culture which are now more current in anthropology? Perhaps, but hardly without some long and serious conversations between the anthropologists and the interculturalists.
A common way to illustrate the different stages of culture shock is by drawing the so-called “U-curve” and “W-curve.” These two curves were presented by Gullahorn and Gullahorn in 1963 as the “U-curve hypothesis of cultural adjustment” and the “W-curve of cultural adjustment.” Over the years these curves have been discussed in the intercultural literature (see, for example, Thomas and Harrell, 1994). The following illustration and comments are from *Intercultural Communication Training* by Richard Brislin and Tomoko Yoshida (1994:78-79).

Period A is the so-called “honey money” period. In this stage everything seems wonderful. In period B, people start recognizing that things are very different from home. Period C is when these feelings have become critical and people start resenting the host-nationals. Period D marks when people have started to become more realistic and begin to have positive emotions about the new culture. It is here that people’s level of stress decreases, but then it is time to go home. It is then that reverse culture-shock happens, and they go through the same sequence of culture shock as before. This is represented in the stages G to J.
George is an American salesman working for a multinational company in Spain. He had expressed an interest to his Spanish colleagues in attending a bullfight so when the first corrida (fight) of the season was announced, they invited him to accompany them. As the first bull was let out George jokingly asked the others, "So who's going to win? I'll put my money on the bull." The rest suddenly became silent, and one of his fellow salesmen remarked tartly, "You Americans know nothing." George did not know what he had said to offend them and felt very uneasy throughout the corrida.

What explanation would you give to George as to how he had given offense?

1. They thought George was suggesting they bet on the outcome.
2. George was viewing the event as a sport; the Spanish view bullfighting more as a ritual.
3. They obviously thought the bull had no chance and so George was being very ignorant.
4. It is regarded as very unlucky for the matador for someone to proclaim publicly that the bull will win.

Here follows the answer to each of the alternatives:
(1) While they may be offended by such notions, to the Spanish there is no notion of either bull or man “winning”, so they would not conceive the event as anything to gamble on. Please select another response.

(2) This is the best response. To the aficionados (devotees) bull-fighting is a ritual, not a sport. It is viewed as a ceremony or drama in which the form, skill, and intensity of the performance are regarded as more important than the outcome. If the ritual is correctly performed, the bull’s death is inevitable, but he will be allowed to exhibit dignity in this final act. As such the concept of a “winner” is irrelevant and seen as debasing the event to George’s colleagues. Thus they took offense to his flippant remark. Modern, secular societies have stripped their cultures of many of the rituals that were formally significant or trivialized them to such a degree that they have largely lost their meaning. Sojourners from such societies are apt to view rituals of other cultures as quaint, amusing superstition or mere spectacle or sport. Failure to take them seriously can easily cause offense, so sojourners should be sensitive to their hosts’ regard for such events.

(3) They would probably not expect George to know anything of the relative merits of individual bulls or matadors, nor would they be likely to take offense at George’s ignorance of such matters. There is a more probable explanation. Please select again.

(4) While many matadors have their own personal superstitions, there is nothing in the story to indicate that such statements are thought of as unlucky. There is a more substantial explanation for the Spaniards’ reaction to George’s remark. Please choose again.

## Appendix C

### Table of Cultural Differences

Figure 4.1 The car and the pedestrian

Percentage of respondents opting for a universalist system rather than a particular social group (answers c or b + e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% 0</th>
<th>% 20</th>
<th>% 40</th>
<th>% 60</th>
<th>% 80</th>
<th>% 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reprinted by permission of Nicholas Brealey Publishing. From *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business* by Fons Trompenaars; 1993; Published by Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 36 John Street, London WC1N 2AT @ £12.99.
## Appendix D

### Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s Diagram of Variations in Value Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Postulated Range of Variations¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human nature</td>
<td>mutable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man-nature</td>
<td>Subjugation-to-nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relational</td>
<td>Lineality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. The arrangement in columns of sets of orientations is only the accidental result of this particular chart. Although statistically it may prove to be the case that some combinations of orientations will be found more often than others, the assumption is that all combinations are possible ones. For example, it may be found that the combination of first-order choices is that of Individualism, Future, Doing, Mastery-over-Nature, and Evil-mutable, now changing, as in the case of the dominant middle-class culture of the United States, or that it is, as in the case of the Navaho Indians, a combination of the first-order preferences of Collaterality, Present, Doing, Harmony-with-Nature, and Good-and-Evil (immutable).

From Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961:12).
Chapter 1 Introduction: Interculturalist Scenes

1 This list corresponds roughly with Abraham Maslow's (1954) "hierarchy of needs." I thank Jay Jones at Lesley College for pointing this out to me.

2 There is a strong tendency in the intercultural field to assume "one country-one culture." This is most noticeable in products such as videos, simulation games and how-to books.

3 See also Hannerz (1990) for an early reference to this industry as a transnational occupational culture.

4 Alveson and Berg (1988) mention the success of Japanese business enterprises as one major factor for the interest in culture in organizational studies.

5 According to Paige (1993), the concept of culture shock was coined by the well-known American anthropologist Cora DuBois in 1951.

6 The intercultural field also encompasses research. This takes place in different academic disciplines such as business administration, speech communication, applied linguistics, social psychology, anthropology, and cross-cultural psychology, as well as in the growing number of Departments of Intercultural Communication, particularly in the United States. Here can be found a variety of studies on cross-cultural encounters, for example, on ways to predict the outcome of the interaction between members from different cultures, or on the adjustment of different groups of refugees or immigrants to their host country. Evaluations of different intercultural training programs are
also made. Naturally, there are great variations with regard to theory as well as method in such research.

7 I will use the word consulting here to cover both training and consulting, since consultants in intercultural communication provide both intercultural training and consulting.

8 For discussions concerning the market as a flow of signs, see Appadurai, 1986; Hannerz, 1992a, 1996; Lash and Urry, 1994; Kopytoff, 1986; Wemick, 1991.

9 This perspective traces its origin to Durkheim's view that the division of labor in society is built on a moral basis (Durkheim, 1957).

10 Here Andrew Abbott (1988) has argued for an "ecology of professions," suggesting that the professions make up an interacting system in which they compete with each other for the control of labor. If a profession succeeds in establishing itself, this is said to reflect on the competing profession's position and the structure of the system. Abbott uses the concept "jurisdictional claims" to characterize the way a profession gains access to an occupation.

11 Larson draws upon the work of the Chicago School, and in particular on Hughes (1971) and Freidson (1970), who were interested in how professions gain autonomy. This interest gave rise to the "power approach" in the study of professionalism (see Macdonald 1995).

12 When plans were made to introduce a specialization on culture and management in the undergraduate program of the anthropology department at the University of Utrecht, Koot (1991) notes, one reaction by a Dutch professor of anthropology was that this meant the "selling out of anthropology."

13 For an overview of the field of cultural studies, see During, 1993; S. Hall, 1986; Inglis, 1993; Johnson, 1987; G. Turner, 1992).

14 Moving beyond classical modes of fieldwork has recently been a topic of discussion within anthropology. While Marcus (1986:171)
argues for a “multi-locale ethnography,” in which the ethnographer explores the relationship between different locales, I think a more proper label for this kind of ethnography is “translocal,” pointing toward the connections between different locales.

15 In trying to illuminate how culture is organized across space, Hannerz (1992b:40) draws attention to network analysis. To him different types of networks connect the “local and the long-distance” in complex societies, and provide the contexts in which transnational culture processes operate: “culture as a collective phenomenon is understood to belong primarily to social relationships and their networks and only derivatively and without logical necessity to particular territories.” Another writer having a similar interest in the organization of culture across space is Calhoun (1991:95): “People have come increasingly to conceive of themselves as members of very large collectivities linked primarily by common identities but minimally by networks of directly interpersonal relationships - nations, races, classes, genders, Republicans, Muslims and ‘civilised people’.”

Chapter 2 Organizing Interculturalists

1 Roger Harrison was at the time a consultant in organization development, and had been program director at NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science. Richard L. Hopkins was then general manager at Westinghouse Learning Corporation. Before that he had been director of the Peace Corps Training Center in Puerto Rico.

2 Wight told me about this period in Peace Corps history, in which people experimented extensively with different kinds of training models: “Anything that anybody wanted to do they would try.” He also said that by the mid-1960s, most of the research and training in intercultural communication was done in a Peace Corps context.

3 Roger Harrison and Richard Hopkins were invited to this meeting because of their article on experiential learning (Wight, personal communication). Their article was then reprinted in the fourth volume of the Guidelines for Peace Corps Cross-Cultural Training which came out
of this meeting, and which were edited by Albert Wight, Mary Ann Hammons and William Wight.

4 According to Wight, it was Steven Rhinesmith who came up with this name; they liked it since the acronym alluded to the Indian string instrument.

5 In the literature on intercultural training, this workshop is often mentioned as the first "intercultural communication workshop." Today, among intercultural trainers and consultants, the concept "intercultural communication workshop," or "cross-cultural workshop," has become generic for all kinds of workshops dealing with intercultural communication, whether the participants are from the same culture or from different ones. On the other hand, among interculturalists affiliated with higher education the "intercultural communication workshop" is an approach to what is called "cultural awareness training," which is considered as one of many different intercultural training models. According to one commentator, Janet Bennett (1986:128), the "intercultural communication workshop" is concerned with communication between people with different cultural values. "It features a small group experience with members of at least two different cultures, led by trained facilitators. The group experience itself becomes a laboratory in which members observe themselves, and begin to achieve awareness of the values and beliefs that are affecting their interaction."

6 NAFSA was founded in 1948.

7 In his discussion about professionalization as related to modernity, Giddens (1990:87) talks about "facework commitment" as being important for sustaining trust among colleagues and associates.

8 On several occasions people have pointed out to me different persons and said that these are "not true interculturalists," or that they are "too commercial." The charlatans are said to be those who have had no personal experience of intercultural encounters, and who participate in an intercultural communication workshop, or a SIETAR congress, and then start their own business as intercultural trainers.
and consultants. They are said to give the intercultural field a “bad reputation.”

9 This speech was later published in a collection of articles presented at the symposium (Marsh & Salo-Lee, 1994).

10 This is considered the most prestigious award, and is talked about as the “Nobel Prize of the Intercultural Community.”

11 The School for International Training (SIT) is affiliated with the Experiment in International Living (EIL), and considered the oldest exchange organisation. Recently EIL has become World Learning, Inc.

12 Not all trainers agree on this. There is a large literature on the sequencing of intercultural training program, and to use simulation games in the beginning is sometimes said to create more havoc than comfort (see, for example, Gudykunst and Hammer, 1983; Gudykunst et. al., 1996).

Chapter 3 The Business Landscape

1 In particular his concept of Individualism/Collectivism is often referred to in social psychology, cross-cultural psychology and organizational behavior. At the XIIth Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology in Pamplona, Spain, 1994, there was a symposium about his concept Masculinity/Femininity called “Masculinity/Femininity as a Cultural Dimension.” In a later chapter I will discuss Hofstede’s and Trompenaars’ concepts and theories about culture, and place them in relation to current anthropological notions about culture.

2 Phillip Harris is one of the authors of the best selling book Managing Cultural Differences, which I will discuss in a later chapter. Suffice it to say here that Harris gave workshops at SIETAR International conferences in the 1970s and 1980s.
3 I have heard versions of this story referring to Saudi Arabia instead of North Africa, and involving a pill against stomach pain rather than headache. Is this a "travelling myth" in the intercultural field? No one seems able to tell me who the advertising company was, or where the story comes from. But the story is reproduced in books, and used by many interculturalists as an illustration of culture clashes and the importance of recognizing intercultural communication.

Chapter 4 Intercultural Merchandise


2 See Hoopes (1979b) and Paige and Martin (1983) for detailed accounts of this.

3 Anthropologists may be reminded of Bateson's (1972) concept of deutero-learning.

4 There are some interculturalists who disagree on cultural explanations for all kinds of behavior. Judith Martin (1986:109) says: "There is a tendency when dealing with cross-cultural situations and issues to attribute all variations in behavior to cultural differences, and to seek cultural explanations for all behaviors." Such reflections usually come from interculturalists affiliated with higher education, where there in general is a more critical stance toward much of what goes on in intercultural training and consulting.

5 For an example of a cultural assimilator taken from this book see Appendix B).

6 There are some culture-specific simulation games, constructed and conducted by experienced trainers and consultants who specialize in one or a few cultures. These games are highly elaborated and can be
extended over 2-3 days. But most games are culture-general and can be played for a couple of hours. The most popular ones have been commercialized, and come packaged in a box.

7 Sandra Fowler, a well-known intercultural trainer and consultant and former president of SIETAR, told me about the development of this game, with which she was involved:

“At that point they said, you know this is crazy, what we need is a culture-general simulation, where we will be able to extrapolate these scores that say this is how a person will do in any overseas assignment. I don’t know if there were any data to support that decision, all I know is that that was the decision, and just good for us because that is how Bafâ Bafâ was born. And the reason it got its name was that they had called it the Alpha Beta Game, but there was a big grocery store chain in California called the Alpha Beta Grocery Store, and they didn’t like that. So, they tried to come up with a different name for it. And Garry [Shirts], at the same time he was developing this game, was also developing a series of comic books. Because most of the sailors, who were the problems, were eighteen years old. And eighteen-year olds love comics. So, he developed a series of adventures about Brent Folsom. Brent Folsom was this American sailor who had all these escapades and adventures in Greece actually. So, he decided to use Brent Folsom in Bafâ Bafâ. And from the description of the Beta language, if you were named Brent Folsom and want to use an ‘a’ to make the numbers, you say Ba for one, and BaFa for Two, and BaFa Ba for three, and BaFa BaFa for four. That is how it was called Bafâ Bafâ.”

Chapter 5 Writing Cultural Difference

1 Other commentators in the intercultural field says that it is difficult to identify a single source for the development of intercultural communication. Stewart (1980), for example, is dubious whether such a source
can be found, and mentions people like Kalervo Oberg, Karl Pribram and F.S.C. Northrop as other possible sources.

2 In a speech which President Harry S. Truman gave in 1949, after having been returned to office, his fourth point was technical aid to less developed nations. This became known as "Point Four," and thus the technicians implementing the program came to be called the "Point IV technicians."

3 See Felix Keesing (1949) for a brief description of experiments in this type of training conducted at the Stanford University.

4 See also Edward Kennard (1948) for an early discussion on the importance of cultural anthropology for the Foreign Service personnel going overseas.

5 See Stocking, 1986, for a discussion on the "culture and personality" school within American cultural anthropology.

6 See Leach (1968) for a critical review of Hall's books *The Silent Language* and *The Hidden Dimension*. Leach says about Hall that he is an old-fashioned American anthropologist who has not been affected by the developments in anthropology and linguistics for the last 25 years, and that he practices a low-grade popular ethology. He also says that Hall's argument are implicitly racist, but that he does not have a racist view, he is only confusing or confused. One example of this, says Leach, can be seen in the analogy Hall makes between differences of species of animal and differences of culture in man: "Cultural labels are used like species labels, and the fact that a single individual may (and probably will) radically change his culture several times over in the course of a single lifetime is completely ignored" (Leach, 1968:16). This confusion leads Hall, says Leach, to, for example, refer to "ethnic communities in their culturally adapted setting as 'biotypes'" (ibid.:17). From this Hall then says the following: "some groups such as Italians and Greeks are much more sensorially involved with each other than some other groups such as Germans and Scandinavians" (Hall, 1966, quoted in Leach, 1968:17). The point Leach makes here is that Hall is not referring to this groups in
terms of genetical differences, but differences in the use of their sen­sory apparatus. Something Leach says is true, but which in Hall's writing leads to pitfalls, such as "By what criteria can we discriminate one culture from another at the 'sensorial' level?" (ibid.:17).

Mary Douglas is also critical of Hall's writings. She says that Hall does not provide a theory to explain cultural variations. His research on bodily symbolism only "deals with well-observed differences of convention in the use of space, time and gesture" (Douglas, 1970:66).

7 Hofstede borrows this argument from Spicer (1971:799).

8 The concept is borrowed from Mulder's "Power Distance Reduction Theory," which is developed in relation to organizational theory and applies to the relationship between managers and subordinates (Mulder, 1976).

9 Again Hofstede chooses a concept that is related to studies of the corporate sector. The concept of "uncertainty avoidance" is used by Cyert and March (1963) to describe decision-making processes of companies when anticipating future events.

10 Here Hofstede draws upon the "curvilinear hypothesis" of Blumberg and Winch (1972), which says that there is a relationship between family complexity and the complexity of society. For example, they say that in small-scale societies such as hunter-gatherers, people tend to live in nuclear family units, while people in more complex soci­eties tends to live in extended families or clans.

11 Hsu is interested in cross-cultural studies of basic personalities, drawing upon a neo-Freudian theory of personality borrowed from Abram Kardiner (see Manson, 1986).

12 Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1997) criticize Hofstede's claim to having introduced the concept "individualism vs. collectivism" in the social sciences (see Hofstede, 1996:196). They say that Hofstede is only one in a series of writers who have used this conceptual pair.
13 Trompenaars, Phillips-Martinsson and Axtell are not mentioned in the survey. Trompenaars' book was published after the survey was conducted.

14 Richard Harris is no longer doing intercultural training, and in a letter I received from him he says "I am no longer doing cross-cultural training programs for terrestrial relocation." Today he works with NASA and trains astronauts, calling himself a "space psychologist." But he is still involved in writing books on transcultural leadership, such as, for instance, Multicultural Management: New Skills for Global Success, with Elashmawi Farid as co-author, Transcultural Leadership: Empowering the Diverse Workforce, co-authored with George F. Simon and Carmen Vazquez, and Developing Global Organizations: Human Resource Development Strategies, co-authored with Robert T. Moran and William G. Stripp. All books are marketed, together with Managing Cultural Differences, as part of the Gulf Publishing Company series Managing Cultural Differences.

Chapter 6 The Making of Professionals

1 This program began in January 1994, and is a joint offering of the Intercultural Communication Institute and The McGregor School of Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. It is designed for adult professionals and is a two-year program.

2 In the 1997 brochure for the Summer Institute the second and third sessions consist altogether of 30 different workshops, which shows the increase in importance of this institute as a center for the professionalization of the interculturalists.

3 This model is developed by David Kolb (1976).

4 In the late 1980s, Zareen Lam de Araoz was involved with developing a program for the foreign student advisors at Stockholm University in how to prepare foreign students' adjustment to Swedish culture and the Swedish educational system.
5 During my fieldwork at the Intercultural Relations program, I proposed to the teachers different anthropology books to be used, particularly in the course "Dimensions and methods in cultural analysis." As can be seen here some of these suggestions were accepted, and this shows again my ambiguous role as both an insider and an outsider in studying the intercultural field.

6 This list is similar to the one Jean Phillis-Martinsson uses in her book *Swedes As Others See Them*, when describing cultural differences between Swedes and foreigners. The content of this list then shows what many interculturalists considers to be important information about culture and cultural differences.

7 The game was constructed by Paul Pedersen, who was the president of SIETAR International between 1978-1980. He has a Ph.D. in Asian studies from Claremont Graduate School, with a focus on Counseling Student Personnel and Cultural History of Southeast Asia.

Chapter 7 Conclusion: Interculturalists, Anthropologists and Culture

1 Kluckhohn is represented with an extract from his book *Mirror for Man*, published in 1949. Margaret Mead's contribution is an extract from her article "Some cultural approaches to communication problems," which was published in 1948.

2 Among the interculturalists, but also among other commentators, there is no consensus about the number of definitions of culture that Kroeber and Kluckhohn offer. The counts seem to range between 100 and 2,000! For example, Samovar and Porter (1991:51) say that Kroeber and Kluckhohn reviewed "some five hundred definitions, phrasings and use of the concept." A recent number given by an anthropologist is 161 (Ingold, 1993:210).

3 Later on, Hall became Professor of Anthropology at the Illinois Institute of Technology, 1963-1966, and Professor of Anthropology at Northwestern University, 1966-1977. Since 1957, he has engaged in
research and consulting in intercultural relations for foundations, government agencies, and international business. In 1987 the American Anthropological Association awarded him its Edward J. Lehman Award for demonstrating the relevance of anthropology to government, business and industry.

4 Two writers who, in the early days of the intercultural field, became inspired by the work of Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck, and developed the idea of a system of value orientations, are John C. Condon and Fathi Yousef. In their book *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication*, published in 1975, they have created a chart of value orientations grouped into the following sets:

- Self - The Family
- Society - Human Nature
- Nature - The Supernatural

Under these headlines can be found Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's system of value orientations, which Condon and Yousef have developed into a system of seventy-five value orientations, using empirical data obtained from different cultures.

5 In the early 1960s, Hall's *The Silent Language* was available in a mass market edition (at 50 cents), and thereby easy to get access to for the early interculturalists. Contemporary with Hall's book is Dorothy Lee's book *Freedom and Culture*, which also was available in the mass market. One of the topics Lee discusses is cultural differences in codification of reality, here presented as lineal versus nonlinear codification. She suggests that the Trobrianders codify and apprehend reality in a nonlinear way, in comparison with Westerners who do so in a lineal way. Many of the early interculturalists know about Lee's work, and at one of the SIETAR Europa conferences I attended in the early 1990s, there was a workshop on intercultural awareness influenced by Lee's writings.

6 A more recent notion about such universal circumstances which people everywhere have to deal with comes from Peter Winch (1970:107). He identifies three universal circumstances - birth, death and sexual
relations - and says that

"The specific forms which these concepts take, the particular institutions in which they are expressed, vary very considerably from one society to another; but their central position within a society's institutions is and must be a constant factor. In trying to understand the life of an alien society, then, it will be of the utmost importance to be clear about the way in which these notions enter into it."

7 Boon (1982:26) says about ethnographic writing that it exaggerates cultural differences, "We start with the exaggerations (the languages, the cultures), and only certain kinds of theories - each itself an unwitting exaggeration - and attempt to compromise the mutual exaggerations into cozy universals."

8 I thank Alvino Fantini at the School for International Training for drawing my attention to this study.
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Globalization has compressed the world into a single space, in which people from different parts of the world have come into closer contact with each other than ever before. In this context of intercultural communication, a transnational industry of intercultural training and consulting has arisen. The new cultural brokers call themselves interculturalists and offer services and products to give an enhanced understanding of and sensitivity towards culture and cultural differences, such as intercultural communication workshops, simulation games on culture clashes, videos and how-to books.

This book describes the interculturalists' services and products, and how they are packaged and marketed. There is also a concern with professionalization and the concept of culture. How is the professional status of the interculturalists legitimized? Is there a relationship between such legitimation and particular conceptions and representations of culture and cultural differences? And on such grounds, in what ways do interculturalists and anthropologists differ? These are some of the questions addressed in this book.