ISSN 0915-3454

異文化コミュニケーション NEWSLETTER

No. 12
February 1992

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION INSTITUTE
KANDA UNIVERSITY OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
1-4-1, Wakaba, Chiba-shi, Chiba-ken, 260 Japan

神田外語大学・異文化コミュニケーション研究所
〒260 千葉市若葉1-4-1
(Phone) 0472-73-1233 (Fax) 0472-72-1777

VALUES AND THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Diana B. Putman
(Fulbright Visiting Researcher, University of Shizuoka)

Approaches used by donors, in particular the United States Government, to fund projects in developing countries have gone through several phases since the beginning of the 1950s (Morss and Morss 1982). Early policies were based on a belief that a growing economy in a country would solve most issues of poverty and social inequality. With some experience, developers began to realize that economic growth, though an important ingredient, was not necessarily synonymous with economic development. It also became apparent that social and economic change programs which were handed down to people from above without including the recipients in the planning and implementation often failed.

Efforts then were made to promote programs which began at the "grassroots" level. Unfortunately, many of these did not succeed either, for they failed to take into consideration the role of entrenched elites who wanted to maintain their status quo. Although, as a stated ideal, projects that involve community participation remain popular, in reality they are few in number. In recent years, the pendulum for donor approaches has swung once again with structural adjustment and macro economic policy change now being the driving forces behind donors. This has been tempered somewhat by a concern for the promotion of democratic reforms and human rights and providing a "safety net" for the most impoverished.

No matter what development approach is in vogue, however, most donor funds are provided to a developing country through the mechanism of programs and projects. American funding is usually managed by the Agency for International Development (AID) which sends abroad career staff, supplemented by contractors, to oversee the use of its funds. Mid-term and final evaluations of projects are undertaken in order to provide lessons learned which can be incorporated into the design of new activities. Generally, it is suggested that barriers to progress come from the beneficiary community or the host country government. However, when the development process is viewed from a holistic systems perspective, it becomes apparent that barriers to planned culture change are a result of the culture of the developers as well (Foster 1969).

Early data from Mali, Rwanda, Somalia, (Putman 1985) and confirmed in Indonesia and Tunisia, provide evidence to show that the culture of the developers, their behaviors and values, has an important impact on how projects are defined and implemented. For any development context, it is possible to identify four types of values: national, bureaucratic, developmental and professional which have an impact on how development goals are chosen and put into action. Foster identified three categories; 1) general, national values which bureaucrats share with other members of their societies; 2) values which are not specific to any profession, but which characterize bureaucracies per se; and 3) values specific to a profession, and to a bureaucracy based on this profession(1969: 97). Shared"developer values"also have been identified (Putman 1985: 166-168) which characterize individuals working for AID, but most likely are similar for donors of other nationalities. For instance, the system may reward and promote the employee who can"move money quickly", rather than one who undertakes time consuming analyses of the needs of local populations and thereby slows down the design process.

Any critique of development activities, therefore, needs to take into consideration several levels of analysis. While an understanding of the macro economic environment of the country in question is important, development implementation must be understood as a result of the culture of the implementing agency and the political pressures on it. This is true not only for the donor agency, but also for the host country implementing agency and its employees who represent an additional value system which is part of the equation. The behavior of developers is determined by professional and bureaucratic demands of the agency for which they work, by political decisions outside of the agency and by the value system which individual developers carry with them. Finally, an understanding of the needs and constraints of the recipients is required.

This type of holistic systems analysis was undertaken for the Baay Region in Somalia and

by Dove (1991), a systematic analysis of "the development process itself"on a broader scale has been missing over the years. It is suggested that such broader, holistic analyses be undertaken of other donor agencies in order to ascertain if the model is applicable and to gain a better understanding of the general dynamics involved in the development process.

REFERENCES CITED

Dove, Michael R.(1991) "Anthropology Development Versus Development Anthropology: Mediating the Forester-Farmer Relationship in Pakistan" in *Practicing Anthropology.* Volume 113, Number 2, Spring.

Foster, George (1969) *Applied Anthropology.* Boston: Little, Brown and Co.Inc.

Morss, Elliott R. and Victoria A.(1982) *US Foreign Aid : An Assessment of New and Traditional Development Strategies.* Boulder : Westview Press.

Putman, Diana B. (1985) "A Cultural Interpretation of Development : Developers, Values, and Agricultural Change in the Somali Context. Isku Kalsoonaan Baa Horumar Lagu Garaa (Trust Leads to Success). (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.

THE RHETORIC OF CONSENSUS IN A HIGH-CONTEXT CULTURE

Michael Day

(Ph.D. Candidate, UC.Berkeley)

Few anthropologists have been as helpful at giving us insight into the multiple hidden dimensions of culture as Edward T.Hall. His earlier studies, *The Silent Language, The Hidden Dimension, The Dance of Life* have shown us that space and time figure heavily in communication and other cultural phenomena. In *Beyond Culture,* Hall brings up the notion of context to apply in the nexus of covert cultural phenomena. Context, then, is the set of shared unspoken beliefs in any culture which underlie explicit forms of communication and make all communication possible—for without any context we would be lost in a solipsistic dream world, spending all our waking moments explaining the world as each of us sees it. Historically, repeated articulations of patterns of existence build context, but context becomes a part of *covert* culture when those patterns need no longer be articulated. Context binds people in cultural groups together, but different groups share different levels of context.

Throughout *Beyond Culture,* Hall makes what to us will be a crucial distinction—that between"high—context" and "low-context" cultures. He points out that in a low-context culture (i.e. one in which the people do not share many attitudes, values, and beliefs) like the U.S., being direct is crucial to being understood. In contrast, since people in high-context cultures share so many attitudes, values, and beliefs, being explicit is a sign of immaturity or lack of education. As an example of the difference between U.S. and Japanese cultures, in chapter seven of *Beyond Culture,* Hall contrasts their legal systems. Where in our low-context, highly litigious society, "only established facts, stripped of all contexting background data, are admissible as evidence" (Hall, p.107). In Japan much more "subjective" information is allowed, which "has the effect of putting the accused, the court, the public, and those who are the injured parties on the same side, where, ideally, they can work together to settle things" (Hall, p.111).

Further, in a high-context culture like Japan, one is expected to know considerably more about covert conventions than in the West. "It is very seldom in Japan that someone will correct you or explain things to you. You are supposed to know, and they get quite upset when you don't" (p.112). But you never articulate what you know, that would be bad manners. What you say when you reply isn't nearly as important as how you say it, and many cases call for complete ellipsis of the subject, or what we would call beating around the bush. Hall explains the interlocutor's tendency to hedge in high-context cultures:

> People raised in high-context systems expect more of others than do the participants in low-context systems. When talking about something they have on their minds, a high-context individual will expect his interlocutor to know what's bothering him, so he doesn't have to be specific. The result is that he will talk around and around the point, in effect putting all the pieces in place except the crucial one. Placing it properly—this keystone—is the role of his interlocutor. To do this for him is an insult and a violation of his individuality. (113)

In such a high-context culture, then, ambiguity and indirectness are neither accidental nor a sign of insincerity. In fact, they are the mark of utmost respect and honesty toward the interlocutor, and serve to bind the participants together. The Japanese like to think of themselves as a homogeneous group sharing a single culture, often to the extent of ignoring or denying the presence of minorities in Japanese society. Ambiguity in communication ties them together by allowing shared conventions to fill in the gaps. (we shall return to the important notion of gaps or spaces (ma) in discourse later)

In our low-context, heterogeneous culture, the lack of shared conventions among the different subcultures prevents us from being clearly understood, to some degree. When we are vague, we cannot depend on cultural context to fill in the blanks for us, so we privilege a kind of directness, and look upon indirection, equivocation, and fuzziness as dishonest and even rude. Nowhere is our tendency toward connection and explicitness more evident than in the way composition teachers

are expected to teach expository writing.

Eleven years of teaching American-style expository writing in high-context Japan and the low-context U.S. have given me first hand experience with the major differences between American and Japanese expository prose. That is, whereas I ask my students to follow the dictates of "good English prose" by being explicit, identifying and foregrounding human agency, making strong transitions, and relating all the evidence to a single, specific thesis, I find that, out of social responsibility, Japanese writers usually avoid being so logical (in the linear, connected sense) and direct because they think such habits overstate the obvious and are an affront to the reader's intelligence. In short, I have found that the kind of expository prose we teach makes many demands on the writer to provide context and connections, agency and responsibility, where Japanese prose, since it is written for a high-context culture, allows the reader to make those connections without forcing a strict interpretation. It is particularly this Japanese communicative tendency—the context-inclusive rhetoric of ambiguity, indirectness, understatement and ellipsis, which prioritizes the recipient's intelligence, feelings and sense of belonging to a group—that I am currently investigating in a more detailed study.

Because of the limited scope of this article, I cannot here present much of the evidence I have uncovered. But I will make two suggestions;

1)It is no accident that Americans first laughed at Berkeley Professor Lofti Zadeh's mathematical model of "fuzzy logic"because it did not fit their low-context cultural conventions of logic, and that the high-context Japanese could sense its value almost at once, and laughed back, all the way to the bank. The same fuzziness of thought that American writing teachers usually try to excise from their students' prose is highly valued in Japanese discourse. Just as the machine using fuzzy logic is capable of sensing context and reacting in vague "in-between"settings, so do the Japanese read cultural context in order to allow the speaker or writer〝space〞—the place between the signifier on the page and the intended signified, in which meaning solidifies. I discuss elsewhere the similarity of this〝space〞to Western theories of metaphor.

2) If we must peel away the skin of ambiguity to look at the structural aspects of culture which underlie rhetoric, as Hall correctly surmised in *The Hidden Dimension,* it is to the notion of 〝space〞we must turn. According to Kenmochi Takehiko in his *Ma no Nihon Bunka, ma* (which can be translated as space, pause, interval, room, time, while, leisure, luck, timing) is the guiding factor in all relationships, between humans and their environment, and between people. Kenmochi hypothesizes that the sense of ma developed out of the needs of a high-context agrarian populace who gradually developed systems of psychological distancing and politeness in order to avoid overt conflict which could destroy the fragile harmony and result in hardship or starvation for the people. The way Japanese bow to each other rather than shake hands, then, can be seen as an outgrowth of the need to affirm the psychological space required between people to keep them sane. Elsewhere I show that ma is a concept, a convention of high-context culture that underlies every aspect of Japanese discourse, from the syntax of a single sentence to the logical construction of an entire book.

Geertz, Clifford (1974) "From the Native's Point of View: On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding" in Keith H. Basso and Henry A. Selby, eds., *Meaning in Anthropology.* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974, 221-237)

Hall, Edward T. (1976) *Beyond Culture.* (New York: Anchor Books)

Kenmochi, Takehiko (1978) *Ma no Nihon Bunka.* Tokyo: Kodansha

Kindaichi, Haruhiko (1978) *The Japanese Language.* Tokyo: Tuttle.

Mizutani, Osamu (1981) *Japanese: The Spoken Language in Japanese Life.* Janet Ashby, trans. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Nagashima, Nobuhiro (1973) "A Reversed World: Or Is It?—Japanese Way of Communication and their Attitudes Towards Alien Cultures. "in Robin Horton and Ruth Finnegan, eds., *Modes of Thought: Essays on Thinking in Western and Non-Western Societies.* London: Faber and Faber, 92-111.

Suzuki, Takao (1978) *Words in Context: A Japanese Perspective on Language and Culture.* Tokyo: Kodansha.

名古屋国際教育ワークショップに参加して

1991年11月22、23、24日の3日間を通して開かれたこのワークショップは名古屋から電車で40分の、緑豊かでのどかな多治見で行われた。参加者は留学生主事、日本語教師、英語教師、また異文化コミュニケーション研究者、などと様々なバックグラウンドを持った人々であったが、外国の人々との接触・交流に日々携わり、異文化理解のためのトレーニングに興味を抱き、何かを学ぼうという強い意欲を抱いているという点では共通していた。以下で、3日間のワークショップの簡単な内容紹介をする。

ワークショップの第1日目は、自由参加の形式をとり、米国で新しく開発されBARNGAと呼ばれるシミュレーション・ゲームで始まった。必要なものはトランプと説明用の紙だけでありルールも簡単という手ごろなゲームであるが、参加者は非言語コミュニケーションや「異文化」コミュニケーションの難しさを疑似体験出来るという点で非常に有益なものであるとの印象を抱いた。また、このゲームの利点としてはまとめのセッションを含めても

1時間少々あればでき、大学の授業などでも使えるということであろう。

夜は主催者である南山大学の近藤祐一氏が「異文化コミュニケーショントレーニングの理論及び方法論」について約3時間講義された。これまでトレーニング方法に余り馴染みの無い者でも翌日からのセッションに参加できるように、また実際トレーニングを行っているものにはおさらいという意味で理論・方法論が簡潔且つ明瞭に説明された。その後翌日から一緒にトレーニングを行うパートナーが発表され、各自早速トレーニングパートナーと組になり、夜遅くまで話し合いが続いた。

第2日目は2人1組になった4つのグループが自らが作成した思い思いのトレーニングを他の参加者相手に行い、その後全員でディスカッションをしてまとめをするという形式で進められた。夜は、シミュレーション・ゲームとして幅広くその有効性が認められているBaFá BaFáを行い、その後ゲーム終了後に行うまとめのディスカッションの進め方について講義がなされた。

第3日目は、2日目と同様、まだトレーニングを行っていないグループがトレーニングを行い、その後主催者側からの異文化コミュニケーショントレーニングに関する文献についての紹介に続いて、全員でワークショップ全体についての総括的な討議を行いこのワークショップは終了した。

長いようで短かったワークショップであったが、トレーニングを実際に企画し、実践する中で、また実際にトレーニングを受ける中で、参加者各自は様々なことを学んだことと思う。特に有意義だったと思えることは、初対面の人間、しかも主催者側の「なるべく違った背景の人とグループになる」という意図もあいまって、初対面で、しかも相当異なる考えをもつトレーニングパートナーと組んで話し合い、トレーニング内容を決め、トレーニングを行うことの難しさを肌で体験したことである。また、同じ興味を分かちあう者が合宿形式でこのように密なコミュニケーションをとれたことも参加者には大きな収穫であろう。このような場を共有した者同志が、それぞれ大きな刺激を受け、さわやかな気分でワークショップ会場を後にした。（NH）

学会・研究会予告

異文化コミュニケーション・ワークショップ

異文化の人々とのコミュニケーションを円滑にするための態度を養うためのシミュレーション、ロールプレイ、ゲーム、練習問題などを実際に体験するワークショップ

日時：1992年4月18日
場所：青山学院大学総合研究所
主催：異文化コミュニケーション研究会(SIETAR JAPAN)
　　全国語学教育学会東京支部（JALT TOKYO）
会費：SIETAR JAPAN, JALT会員4,000円、
　　一般7,000円
問い合わせ先：異文化コミュニケーション研究会事務局
　　国際ビジネスコミュニケーション協会
　　千代田区永田町2-14-2 山王グランドビル
　　TEL 03-3580-0286 FAX 03-3581-5608

異文化間教育学会

日時：1992年5月14日(木)・15日(金)
場所：筑波大学および国際会議場
問い合わせ先：異文化間教育学会第13回大会準備委員会
　　筑波大学教育学系　天野正治研究室
　　茨城県つくば市天王台1-1-1（〒305）

日本コミュニケーション研究者会議

日時：1992年5月16日(土)・17日(日)
テーマ：Communication Competence
場所：南山大学
問い合わせ先：日本コミュニケーション研究者会議
　　事務局　岡部朗一
　　名古屋市昭和区山里町18（〒466）
　　南山大学外国語学部英米科内

日本コミュニケーション学会

日時：1992年6月27日(土)・28(日)
場所：日本大学文理学部
問い合わせ先：日本コミュニケーション学会学術局長
　　川 島 彪 秀
　　東京都世田谷区桜上水3-25-40（〒156）
　　日本大学文理学部

研究所からのお知らせ

異文化コミュニケーション研究　原稿募集

1993年4月発行予定の当研究所紀要「異文化コミュニケーション研究」第5号の原稿を一篇募集します。論文執筆を希望される方は下記の寄稿規定にしたがって寄稿して下さい。

寄稿規定

1．異文化コミュニケーション、コミュニケーション及び関連分野の研究者は自由に寄稿できます。
2．投稿、依頼を問わず、寄稿された原稿を掲載するか否かは、本紀要編集委員会で判断します。また書き直しをお願いすることがあります。
3．原稿は採否にかかわらず原則としてお返ししません。
4．枚数は原則として400字詰原稿用紙30枚とします。
5．論文には400字以内の和文要旨1通と、1000語程度の英文要旨1通を添えて下さい。
6．原稿の締切日は1992年11月30日とします。

原稿に関するお問い合わせは、当研究所宛にお願いします。寄稿希望の方には詳しい執筆要領をお送りします。