UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION OF IDENTITY:

A STUDY OF JAPANESE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

SATOKO IZUMI
Norman, Oklahoma
2010

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/318527

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION OF IDENTITY:
A STUDY OF JAPANESE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
IN THE UNITED STATES

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

BY

_____
Dr. Todd Sandel, Chair

_____
Dr. Eric Kramer

_____
Dr. Millie Audas

_____
Dr. Amy Johnson

_____
Dr. Elaine Hsieh

© Copyright by SATOKO IZUMI 2010
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisors and dissertation chairs, Dr. Todd Sandel and Dr. Eric Kramer. Without their encouragement and understanding, this work could not have been brought to fruition. With their continuous support, I could grow out of all the challenges I have come across for this work. Knowing that they kept their faith in me gave me the strength to believe in myself. The very last thing they would have done to me is to limit my intellectual horizon and potential. They opened up a door for me to great scholars and philosophers, one after another. Their academic guidance and profound knowledge has provided me the most enlightening time of my life. Simply put, "Thank you for teaching me, Dr. Sandel and Dr. Kramer. I learned a lot!"

Without the encouragement and understanding of my dissertation committee members, I could not have achieved this goal. Dr. Amy Johnson, I admire her hard work and insightfulness. Whenever I receive her feedback on my work, I feel like a fresh spring breeze running through my brain. Her insightfulness and intellect helped me realize essential points that I overlooked in my work. Dr. Elaine Hsieh, I am sincerely grateful to her for being by my side when I was in need. This work would not exist if she had not been there for me. One day, when I serve on a committee for graduate students, I would like to follow what she has done for me. Having Dr. Millie Audas on my committee is a priceless gift. She has dedicated her passion to providing numerous students all over the world with opportunities to explore beauty of diverse cultures. She has given me constant encouragement to follow my passion—my passion for studying

about and for international students. I could not have done this work without her understanding of my passion

My friends both in the U.S. and in Japan continuously and unconditionally support me to complete this work. I met wonderful people in University of Oklahoma, Konstantin Tovstiadi, Magdalena Igiel, Hyejung Ju, and Wen-Yu Chao. As close friends and classmates, we have shared joyful years and sad moments. Having them as my friends is the best part of my life in Oklahoma. My boyfriend, Kenneth Barton. Without his support and understanding, I could not achieve this goal. Whenever I was filled with doubt about my ability, he always tells me, "I know you can do this." He devoted his time and energy to proofreading my dissertation. Words can never express my gratitude. My dearest and forever Japanese friends in the East coast and Japan, Emi Hikita, Junko Komatsu, Noriko Ikebe, Sachiko Komori, and Tokuko Mitsumori. No matter how many miles we are apart from each other, they are always there for me.

Last but not least, I would like to express my utmost gratitude to my family—my parents Shingo Izumi, Yoshiko Izumi, my sister Asako Kawai, my brother-in-law Naoto Kawai, and my nephew Katsuhiro Kawai. I am unspeakably thankful that I have them as my family. It was not easy for my parents to let their daughter to leave Japan and move to the United States. Without their understanding and unconditional support, I could not have pursued a doctoral degree. It is to my family that I would like to dedicate this work.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: SELF AND IDENTITY ---------- 1
Introduction 1
Focal Concepts 4
Purpose of Study 12
Organization of the Dissertation 13
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW ---------- 16
Self-Presentation 16
Identity Negotiation 22
Identity in Acculturation Theories 30
Alienation 46
Research Question 65
Intercultural Experiences of Asian International Students 68
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD ---------- 81
Data Collection 82
Data Analysis 106
CHAPTER FOUR: COMMUNICATION WITH AMERICANS ------- 111
The Attitudes and Behaviors of American Students 113
Japan-Connected Americans 140
Lack of Common Conversation Topics 150
Joking Together 157
Summary 167
CHAPTER FIVE: IDENTITY DISCREPANCY, ALIENATION, AND SELF-EFFICACY ---------- 173
Identity Discrepancy 173
Alienation 242
Self-efficacy 247
Summary 251

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION ---------- 254

Findings 254

Limitations 272

Practical Implication 279

Future Directions 282

Conclusions 284

References ---------- 288

Appendices ---------- 340

List of Tables

Table 1. Background Information of the Interview Participants---------- page 87

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore and describe intercultural communication of personal identity in the case of Japanese international students in the United States. In this study, personal identity is defined as the individual unique attributes such as competence which define who they are and individuate them as a distinctive existence in the social environment. Communication of personal identity refers to presenting one's personal identity toward others and receiving others' feedback on his or her presentation of identity. In order to explore communication of personal identity in intercultural situations, this study focuses on self-perceived personal identity (i.e. how a person considers him- or herself), self-observed performance (i.e. how a person observes his or her own performance) and perception of others' identity (i.e., one's imagination of others' perspectives on his or her personal identity). The following research question is addressed: How do Japanese international students experience their self-perceived identity, self-observed performance, and their perception of Americans' perspectives of their identity in intercultural interactions?

A total of eighteen students participated in the interviews. The interviews were conducted individually based on a semi-structured interview protocol. Interview transcripts were analyzed using an ethnographic approach with the aim of understanding the research topic from the perspectives of Japanese international students and presenting rich and thick description of their experiences.

This study finds four features of Japanese students' experiences of intercultural communication with American students. First, the Japanese students in this study described their perceptions of American students' attitudes and behaviors as unwilling to

communicate, unfriendly in their responses, and difficult to understand (e.g., speaking too fast). Second, the Japanese students in this study reported that they developed satisfactory relationships with Japan-connected Americans (i.e., Americans who have an interest in Japan). Third, they reported difficulties communicating with Americans because they lack common topics of conversation. Finally, they felt that they had difficulty joking together with Americans

The Japanese students in this study experience the discrepancy between their self-perceived identities and their self-observed performance (i.e., identity-performance discrepancy) as well as the discrepancy between their self-perceived identities and their perception of others' perspectives on their identities (i.e., identity-other discrepancy) with regard to their essential identity elements of being intelligent and socially attractive (e.g., funny, friendly, talkative). To illustrate, the students observed that their performance in intercultural interactions failed to represent their self-perceived identities as being intelligent and socially attractive individuals. As a result of unsuccessful presentations of their identities, the Japanese students believe that the Americans around them recognize them as less intelligent or less socially attractive individuals.

Based on the interview research, this study finds that Japanese students believe that they tend to communicate a *reduced* or *dissonant* representation of their self-perceived identity during intercultural interactions with Americans. To illustrate, Japanese students believe that their performances present a *reduced or dissonant* version of their identity. Consequently, they believe that Americans interpret that they are less intelligent or less socially attractive. As a result, the feedback they receive is discrepant from their self-perceived identity. Grounded in this finding, I propose the concept *identity*

apnea to describe these problems with intercultural communication of personal identity among Japanese international students. This term was chosen as a way to describe the findings that the Japanese students cannot smoothly present (breathe out) their identity elements of being intelligent and socially attractive and they resist internalizing (breathing in) others' perspective on their identities.

This study finds that, in interactions with Americans, Japanese students are undergoing internal struggles with a dilemma between: (a) high motivation to communicate their identity and (b) low ability to do so toward Americans. Japanese students have learned techniques to communicate their identities in their native culture. When their identities are inseparably bound with their habitual communication styles, they need additional communicative competencies which allow them to communicate their identity in their habitual conversational styles through English language. Based on this finding, I propose the conceptualization of identity flexibility in intercultural interactions (i.e., *intercultural identity flexibility*).

CHAPTER ONE: SELF AND IDENTITY

Introduction

In the fall of 2002, I moved to Oklahoma, U.S. from Tokyo, Japan to pursue a doctoral degree in communication. I decided to move across borders not only to study intercultural communication but also to understand the meaning of living in a foreign country. By becoming an international student, I became an insider of the research target group and started a long-term ethnographic study.

My eight years of intercultural experiences as an international student is a part of this research project. My personal experience has not been always pleasant. It has been inspiring and challenging in a good way; however, it has been also stressful. Since I moved to the U.S., the most painful and persistent discomfort has been constant anxiety and fear that I am being misunderstood by people around me including instructors, classmates, friends, and acquaintances. On March 3, 2003, I wrote in my journal:

> I am so frustrated. I feel like I was a different person here. My friends here must see me as a boring, quiet, and reserved person. I have to admit that I am that kind of girl in front of them. If I were them, oh yeah, I would see myself as a little shivering kitten. Instructors and classmates must think that I am an incapable and dull student because I do not say anything significant in class. In Japan, I share my opinion and participated in discussion very actively. Here, I am so nervous to death that I can barely say one word. Whenever I make a comment, it sounds nothing like what I have in my mind. Remember how classmates look when I made that stupid comment? A huge question mark was floating in the classroom. It was even printed on their faces. So embarrassing! I can tell that they were thinking "Oh poor girl, she doesn't know what she is doing here." I am very stupid and elementary. All the things I say and I do give them a wrong impression of me. But I am NOT stupid. I am NOT boring. I am NOT quiet. I am sharp. I am funny. I am talkative. This is who I am. They do not know who I really am because I can not be my true self. I miss 泉　里子 that I have known for 28 years. She was a confident, funny, intelligent, and witty girl.

I was highly frustrated with the way I communicated with the Americans around me. I could not be myself when I was communicating with them. I considered myself as a

funny and witty girl with high level of communicative competence in Japan. I liked making my friends laugh with my jokes. Since I moved to the United States, it became difficult to live as I am. Through my personal experience and observation, I started paying attention to the sense of being ourselves in intercultural contexts. What will happen to our sense of "being ourselves" when we move across culture borders?

This personal experience of mine is shared by other sojourners, especially adults who are learning a foreign language. Past studies have demonstrated that sojourners commonly tend to experience problems about their self-image (e.g., Aventi, 2005; Bailey, 1983; Brislin, 1982; Harder, 1980; Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Stengel, 1939). Brislin (1982) noted that many (adult) sojourners feel unpleasant because they find their behavioral skills comparable to those of the host culture's children. They fear that they will appear comic or ridiculous (Stengel, 1939). Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) discuss that "adult language learners' self-perceptions of genuineness in presenting themselves to others may be threatened by the limited range of meaning and affect that can be deliberately communicated" (p.128). They discuss that foreign language anxiety is caused by "the importance of the disparity between the 'true' self as known to the language learner and the more limited self as can be presented at any given moment in the foreign language" (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Copes, 1986, p.128). Adult second language learners feel that people around them do not understand their personality and abilities, and consequently experience emotional and psychological discomfort. Aventi (2005) cites an excerpt from interviews with American students studying Russian in Russia. Beth talked about what the most difficult part of communicating in a second language:

> I'm not myself here! I'm not the per—, I think, I okay, I know I'm a pain in the ass, but I think I'm a really cool person when it comes down to it. I think I do have a good personality, and it's so frustrating being, like, so vacuous [laughs] . . . I can't be sassy in the language! A little sassy, but not, like, as sassy as I want to be! . . . Like I think if you knew how sassy I was, um, how, maybe intelligent I was, or maybe, mmm, how confident I am normally, I wouldn't be treated this way. Because, it just wouldn't happen because the respect, I don't think I have it, and the respect is so, so important to me. But there's no way! I never can get it if I can't communicate, so it's difficult, it really is . . ." (Aventi, 2005, p.17)

At first glance, the idea of being ourselves seems natural and maybe even effortless. Being ourselves, however, is not always an easy thing to do. We sometimes fall short of ability and resource to being ourselves. When we are sick, we cannot be ourselves. The social world is not a vacuum. There are situational constraints, social expectations, responsibilities and other potential obstacles which make it difficult for us to be ourselves.

Living in a different culture can be another situation in which being oneself is no longer effortless for many. Surrounded by the unfamiliar and challenges, people are likely to experience difficulty in being themselves. The language barrier is often the greatest difficulty faced when living abroad. Our habitual practices do not work as well as they do in our home country. It is challenging to meet practical and pragmatic needs of everyday activities. We feel powerless and lonely in a foreign country.

Paradoxically, it is when we are challenged that we become more aware of a sense of who we are. It is not until we find ourselves being unable to be ourselves that our sense of self becomes clearer. It is similar to the situation in which we first truly appreciate our thumb only after we cut it with a knife. We rarely appreciate our thumb in our everyday lives. Once we lose its function, we begin to appreciate its function. A sense of self becomes clear for those who cannot be themselves.

Research Topic

Based on my ethnographic research as an international student as well as the brief review of existing studies about second language learners, it is not uncommon that international students have problems in communicating their identities in intercultural situations. Communication of identity is the process whereby an individual presents his or her identity toward others and receives feedback to his or her identity presentation from others. In intercultural contexts, it is difficult to accurately present one's identity and others are more likely to misunderstand who he or she is. This study focuses on *intercultural communication of identity among international students*.

Focal Concepts

Sojourners

Nowadays a large number of people temporarily relocate themselves in other countries. They live abroad for a long term (e.g., a year or longer) for a specific reason (e.g., business, study). Usually, they plan to return when their purpose of cross-border relocation is achieved. These people are called sojourners. Sojourners are "relatively short-term visitors to a new culture whose permanent settlement is not the purpose of the sojourn" (Ady, 1995, p.93). International students, diplomats, international business expatriates are classified as sojourners.

The improvement of transportation technology has enhanced our mobility to move across borders. The impact to globalization in a large variety of fields and professions demands people to travel and relocate internationally. According to the Department of National Security of the United States, during 2008, 3.7 million people

were admitted to the United States as sojourners. It is not uncommon that we know directly or indirectly someone who moves abroad for business or education.

International Students

This study focuses on a specific group of sojourners in the U.S., namely, international students. International students are a major sub-group within the population of sojourners. To illustrate, during 2008, the United States admitted 3.7 million sojourners, of which there were about 917,373 students (25%). According to the Open Doors' (2008) Report published by the Institute of International Education, during the academic year 2007/2008, a total of 623,805 international students enrolled in educational institutions across the United States. 243,360 students were enrolled in undergraduate level programs; 276,842 students were enrolled in graduate level programs; and 46,834 students are enrolled in non-degree programs. The leading countries of origin for international students are: India (94,563. 15.2%), China (81,127, 13.0%), South Korea (69, 124, 11.1%), Japan (33,974, 5.4%), Canada (29,051, 4.7%), and Taiwan (29,001, 4.6%). The U.S. states with most international students are: California (84, 800), New York (69,844), and Texas (51,824).

For the majority of international students, studying abroad is a voluntary choice. Unlike some business expatriates who are assigned to work aboard, most students voluntarily decide to move across countries to study for a year or longer. International students are more likely to have higher interest in and familiarity with the host culture even before their sojourn (Furnham & Bochner, 1982). Compared to permanent immigrants or refugees, students are given more freedom with regard to the degree to which they commit themselves to a host society. However, it is impossible for

international students to completely refuse to learn a host culture and language and interact with local people. As college students, it is their responsibility and task to perform successfully in class and pass exams. Even though they reside in a host society only temporarily, it is important, necessary and beneficial for students to learn a host culture and language and interact with domestic students and instructors.

Long-Term Cultural Adjustment

When sojourners move to a foreign country, they cross the cultural boundaries from the familiar and/or habitual to the unfamiliar and/or unknown. Sojourners have completed their primary enculturation in their home country. As a member of a home culture, adult sojourners learn and share the beliefs, attitudes, norms, roles, values, and memory with the other members (Kluckhohn, 1954; Triandis, 1995). The home culture is imprinted and internalized in their minds. Their characteristics such as personality and capabilities are constructed through interaction with members of the home culture. Moving to a foreign country means that they have to abruptly jump into a cultural milieu where a different culture is created, maintained, learned, and memorized through social interaction among its members. When the two cultures are radically different, they are more likely to experience the difficulties with coping with the differences between the two cultures. They are also subject to the experiences of inner conflict between their current state in the host society and past state in the home country in terms of their personalities, abilities, and identities.

The experiences of sojourners in an unfamiliar cultural milieu have been studied by many researchers in the various fields including sociology, psychology, education, and communication (e.g., Ady, 1995; Brislin, 1982; Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Reece

& Palmgreen, 2000; Sakamoto, 2006; Sato & Hodge, 2009; Swagler & Jome, 2005) Several theories and models have been proposed to describe and explain the process of adjustment and the factors which influence this process (Berry, 1990, 1994, 2003, 2005, 1006; Kim, 1988, 2001; Ward, 2001b; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001). Researchers have used terms such as *acculturation* and *cross-cultural adaptation* (e.g., Kim, 2001). I find problems in these conceptualizations. First, although some researchers use acculturation as a broad concept (Berry, 2006), acculturation is often interpreted as learning the culture of a dominant group. Sojourners and immigrants' intercultural experiences, however, include more than learning the culture of the dominant group. Second, the cultural adjustment process is a matter of personal choice, and cultural adjustment is successful as long as individuals are happy about themselves in certain social contexts and environments. Adapting themselves to the dominant culture cannot be the only way of cultural adjustment. From this standpoint, I use more general and neutral term, *long-term cultural adjustment.*

Identity

Identity is a broad and rather ambiguous construct describing a range of human phenomena. Psychologists most commonly use the term "identity" to describe personal identity, or the idiosyncratic thing that make a person unique (see Cote & Levine, 2002). A psychological identity relates to self-image (a person's mental model of him or herself), self-esteem, and individuality. In cognitive psychology, the term "identity" refers to the capacity for self-reflection and the awareness of self (Leary & Tangney, 2003, p. 3). Erik Erikson was one of the earliest psychologists to be explicitly interested in identity. Erikson posits three aspects of identity: the ego identity (self), personal identity (the

personal idiosyncrasies that distinguish a person from another, and social/cultural identity (the collection of social roles a person might play).

Sociologists often use the term identity to describe social identity, or the way that individuals label and define themselves as members of particular groups (e.g., nation, social class, subculture, ethnicity, gender, etc.) (see Stets & Burke, 2006). As Tajfel and Turners' (1979) social identity theory postulates, many people adopt group identity to gain a sense of positive self-esteem from the particular group that they belong to. Within sociology, identity is often conceptualized as social roles and categories helping to explain how social position influences one's sense of self (Schlenker, 1985; Styker & Burke, 2000). From a sociological viewpoint, identity is tied to aspects of the social structure and identities are persons' roles and memberships in particular groups or organizations (Stets & Burke, 2006).

In this study, identity refers to *the aggregation of the qualities that define who they are, individuate them as distinctive existence in social environment, and connect them to particular groups.* A sociologist Owen (2006) defines identity as "categories people use to specify who they are and to locate themselves relative to other people (p.207). In this sense, "identity implies both a distinctiveness (I am not like them or a "not-me") and a sameness as others (I am like them or a "me-too") (Owen, 2006, p.207).

Personal Identity

Identity consists of various dimensions (e.g., social and personal) and elements (e.g., competence and personality) (Cote & Levine, 2002; Stets & Burke, 2006). Personal identity is defined as individual unique attributes (Ting-Toomey, 2005), whereas social identity is defined as persons' roles and memberships in particular groups or

organizations (Stets & Burke, 2006; Tajfel & Turners, 1979; Ting-Toomey, 2005). Competence and personality are the constitutive elements of personal identity. Individual unique attributes include both acquired attributes (e.g., capability) and inborn attributes (e.g., eye color, skin color). Inborn attribute dimensions of personal identity can overlap with social identity (e.g., skin color and ethnicity). The difference between them is group membership. This study attempts to understand how international students in the U.S. communicate their personal identity such as competence and personality in intercultural contexts.

Three Phenomena regarding Personal Identity

To restate, communication of identity means the interactional process whereby a person presents his or her personal identity toward the interactant(s) and receives their reactions to his or her identity presentation. In order to explore the communication of personal identity, this study focuses on how a person considers him or herself (i.e., self-perceived identity), how he or she observes his or her own performance (i.e., self-observed performance), and how he or she believes others see him or her (i.e., one's perception of others' perspectives).

Self-perceived identity. Self-perceived identity refers to one's qualities (e.g., competence, personality, group membership) that an individual recognizes and believes that they individuate him or her as a distinctive existence. Roughly stating, self-perceived identity is how a person personally considers him- or herself without taking into consideration others' perspectives. This study focuses on sojourners' experiences of one's self-perceived personal identity, which I refer "self-perceived identity" hereafter throughout the dissertation.

People are not always conscious of their self-perceived identities. Identities are constructed as an individual is engaged in self-presentation and he or she internalizes others' perspectives (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Collier, 1998; Collier & Thomas, 1988; Cooley, 1902; Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003; Mead, 1934; Ting-Toomey, 2005). Identity is the integration of how she sees herself, how she presents herself toward others, and how she thinks others see her. We do not clearly differentiate how we see ourselves, how we present ourselves toward others and how we think others see us. Thus, we do not have a clear idea of our self-perceived identity in our minds.

However, people become conscious of their self-perceived identities when they perceive contradicting information about self. When a person perceives that the persona that her performance represents is different from how she considers herself, her self-perceived identity emerges as contrastive cognition to her presented self. When a person perceives how others see her to be discrepant from how she sees herself, her self-perceived identity emerges as contrastive cognition to other-perceived identity (i.e., how others see her).

Self-observed performance. This study focuses on one's self-observed performance, that is a person's observation of how one believes he or she is performing in social interactions. As the notion of self-monitoring contends, people have the ability to monitor or observe one's own behavior (e.g., Dodge & Somberg, 1985; Goetz & Dweck, 1980; Snyder, 1974). The notion that a person observes one's own behavior is rooted in Mead's (1934) concept of *Me*-self. In Mead's understanding, the *Me* is self as object. An individual is able to observe one's own behavior and one's interactions with

others, taking different perspectives into account (Blanchard-Fields & Norris, 1995; Clayton, 1982; Dittmann-Kohli &Baltes, 1990; Sternberg, 1990). When people are engaged in communication with others, they observe their own behaviors as they observe others' behaviors. Self-observed performance is one's biased observation; therefore, there is always the possibility that it is inconsistent with how he or she actually performs or how others observe his of her performance.

Perception of others' perspective. Another focus of this study is one's perception of how one believes others may see him or her. This notion is rooted in Cooley's (1902) concept of the looking-glass self. The term looking-glass self was used to call attention to the fact that other people serve as a mirror; that is, we see ourselves reflected in other people's eyes.

It is important to emphasize that one's perception of others' perspective of his or her identity is imaginary. We imagine how others think of us and then we develop our self-images based on the self-perception of how others see us. It is through our imagination, not the actuality, which we get to know how others see us. A significant point about Cooley's conceptualization of looking-glass self is the role of *imagination*. We do not simply see ourselves as others see us. Rather, we *imagine* how others see us. We cannot know for sure what the others factually think of us; we are not privy to the private thoughts of others. To account for this element of uncertainty, Cooley stressed "imputed sentiments" or imagination. Cooley (1902) states:

> A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principle elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance; and some fort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification. The comparison with a looking-glass hardly suggests the second element, the imagined judgment, which is quite essential. The thing that moves us to pride or

> shame is not the mere mechanical reflection of ourselves, but an imputed sentiment, the imagined effect of this reflection upon another's mind. (p. 153).

We use our imagination to try to see how others see us. "We see ourselves as we think others see us" (Rosernberg & Kaplan, 1982, p.174). We imagine how we are seen by another person. Consequently, it is inevitable to some extent that one's perception of how others may see him or her is inconsistent with how others actually see him or her.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to *explore* and *understand* how international students communicate their personal identities in intercultural encounters with a focus on self-perceived identity, self-observed performance, and perception of how others may see him or her in intercultural interactions. The data set (i.e., interview transcripts, observation notes, audiotapes) is analyzed using an ethnographic analysis approach. The aims of the data analysis are: (1) to analyze the data from the perspective of Japanese international students; (2) to analyze the experiences of Japanese international students in holistic matter; (3) to understand and describe the complexity of their lived experiences; (4) to appreciate the diversity among the participants as much as the common themes and patterns. The final product that I aim for is the thick description (Greetz, 1973) of the intercultural communication of identity of Japanese international students.

Among various ethnic groups of international students, this study focuses on Japanese international students in the United States for primarily methodological reasons. I, as a researcher, am also a Japanese national and native speaker of Japanese who has studied in the U.S. for nearly eight years. By focusing on Japanese students, I can conduct the research based solely on the common metacommunicative competence (Briggs, 1986) of both the interviewer and the interviewees. Consequently, it can

eliminate the risk of communicative hegemony (Briggs, 1986). Some of the interview questions are concerned with the interviewees' internal and emotional experiences, and thus the questions require the participants to think introspectively and in a self-reflective manner. It may be difficult to talk about such subjects in English for those whose English language skills are limited. Interviewing Japanese students in Japanese eliminates the risk of language barriers. My insider perspective is necessary and advantageous to explore, describe and interpret the experience of Japanese international students. It is important for a researcher and interviewer to have in-depth knowledge about the cultural values, norms, beliefs of Japanese people and have communicative competence (Hymes, 1974) to understand the meaning of their remarks and performances. Since I am an insider of the group of the participants, the possibility of misunderstanding and misinterpretation could be reduced. Although this study addresses only Japanese international students, we can expect that the findings from this particular group of sojourners serve as a guide for future research.

Organization of the Dissertation

The next chapter reviews the literature which is related to intercultural communication of personal identity of international students. The literature review covers the following topics: (1) self-presentation, (2) theories related to identity communication; (3) the approach to identity in acculturation theories; (4) the approach to alienation; and (5) research on Asian international students.

First, research on self-presentation is reviewed. Self-presentation of identity is an essential part of communication of identity. Secondly, theories about identity communication are reviewed. Included in the review are Hecht's Communication Theory

of Identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003) and Ting-Toomey's (1993; 2005) Identity Negotiation Theory. The third section addresses Berry's (1990) model of acculturation strategies, Kim's (2001) integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation, and Zaharna's (1989) theory of self-shock. The purpose is to explore how these scholars have addressed intercultural communication of personal identity in the context of long-term cultural adjustment. The fourth section reviews the conceptualization of alienation including Hegel, Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Parsons, Seeman, Fromm, and so forth. This section will provide a brief review of the conceptualization of alienation. The fifth section the synthesis of common problems among Asian international students. This overview will help build a better understanding of the intercultural experiences of Japanese international students.

The third chapter demonstrates the research method. Specifically, it reports on the data collection processes including: (1) how I found the participants; (2) a description of the eighteen interviewees; (3) interview settings; (4) how I developed the interview protocol; (5) the outline of interview protocol; (6) interview procedures; and (7) global assessment of the interviews, including reports on my overall observation of how the eighteen interviews went. Along with the data collection process, the data analysis procedure is outlined. This research utilizes the ethnographic analysis approach.

The fourth chapter reports on findings about communication with Americans. This study finds four problems that Japanese international students have in terms of the communication with Americans. The fifth chapter reports on findings about intercultural communication of personal identity of international students. This dissertation concludes

with a discussion about the findings, practical implication, their limitations, and future directions for research.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This research addresses the intercultural communication of personal identity among Japanese international students. The following areas of research are reviewed, self-presentation, identity negotiation, identity in long-term cultural adjustment, alienation, and intercultural experiences of Asian international students.

First of all, research on self-presentation is reviewed because communication of identity starts with one's presentation of self-perceived identity. Studies on self-presentation are reviewed to understand its motivation—why people are motivated to present and perform one's identities.

Self-Presentation

Self-presentation is a genuine and ubiquitous feature of communicative behavior (Hogan, 1982; Schlenker, 1980, 1985). Presenting self-image is an essential and unavoidable component of everyday social interaction (e.g, Baumeister, 1982; Goffman, 1959; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992). Goffman (1959), who pioneered the concept of self-presentation in the sociology literature, views self-presentation as a condition of interaction which is inherent in the fundamental nature of social life. Schlenker and Weigold (1992) argue that asking "When do people engage in self-presentation during social interaction?" is like asking "When do people engage in cognition during social interaction?" Baumeister (1982) argues that it is difficult to find an interpersonal behavior in which self-presentation is not involved.

Motives for Self-Presentation

People regulate how they display themselves and how they are perceived by others for various reasons. People engage in self-presentation: (1) to exert interpersonal

influence on others (e.g., persuasion, deception, manipulation, glorification) (see Leary, 1995); (2) to initiate and develop relationship with others, (3) to play a given role in the social situation (Goffman, 1959); and (4) to verify and validate their self-image (Swann, 1983; 1985).

Self-presentation to exert interpersonal influence. People present their identity to exert interpersonal influence on others (see Leary, 1995). For this purpose, people may project their public image to exaggerate, deceive, or manipulate their competence and other attributes and qualities. They occasionally deceive, exaggerate, or accentuate their positive qualities to gain attraction, acceptance, and approval from interactional partners (Leary, 1995).

Self-presentation for relationship development. People present their identities to initiate and develop relationships. People express and disclose information about selves to get to know each other and develop intimate relationships. As such, self-disclosure plays an important role in relationships development. Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory portrays relationship development as like an onion—suggesting that relationship develops as individuals "peel off" one layer of information about a relational partner. Altman and Taylor (1973) suggest that, as people come to know and trust one another more, they share a greater number of topics (breadth) and more intimate information about themselves (depth).

When two individuals first meet, he or she knows a little about the other. Berger and Calabrese (1975) argue initial interactions between strangers are characterized with uncertainty. Uncertainty Reduction Theory (e.g., Berger & Calabrese, 1975) suggests that, in order to reduce such uncertainty, a person discloses more information about him- or

herself (i.e., self-disclosure) and seeks more information about the partner. The purpose of Uncertainty Reduction Theory is to document and predict universal patterns of behaviors to reduce uncertainty, and to quantitatively measure level of uncertainty and communication behaviors. Alternatively, Goldsmith (2001) proposes a normative approach to uncertainty reduction theory and emphasizes the diversity across speech communities. Goldsmith (2001) argues that uncertainty has different significance in different speech community, different speech community uses different communication behaviors to seek information, and the variability in the skills with which individual respond to conflicting goals.

As these interpersonal communication theories posit, self-presentation activity facilitates development of interpersonal relationships. When people disclose more about themselves through self-presentation, it helps increase breadth and depth of information sharing and reduce uncertainty in initial interactions.

Self-presentation to play a role. People control self-presentation to play a role in a given social situation. The concepts of "front stage" and "back stage" in Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical approach explain that an individual may control expression of their personal identities to fit in a given situation. Goffman (1959) describes social life as a series of performances in which people are players who project their “faces” to audience (others) and engage in social interaction that are governed by social rules. When we are engaged in social interaction (i.e., front-stage), we strategically control our impression to present self.

Self-presentation for self-verification. People display their identities in social interactions in order to verify and validate them. People display their identities to

construct, define, and validate them. The self-verification motive is theorized by a social psychologist Swann. Swann's self-verifying theory (e.g., Swann, 1983, 1985) assumes that people have the innate motives for coherence, consistency, predictability, familiarity, and stability. Based on this assumption, it postulates that once people develop ideas about what they are like, they strive to verify the existing self-views in order to satisfy the needs for coherence and stability (Swann, 1983, 1985; Swann, & Hill, 1982; Swann, Rentofrow, & Guinn, 2003; Swann, Stein-Seroussi, & Giesler, 1992). Because people have the consistency motive, they feel more comfortable and secure when they believe that other people see them as they see themselves (Swann, Stein-Seroussi, Giesler, 1992). Thus, people strategically select interaction partners and social settings which are more likely to provide self-verifying feedback.

The self-verification motives lead to the motives to accurately express one's self-perceived identities. Self-presentation involves attempts to convey an accurate portrait of oneself to an audience as much as possible (Baumeister, 1982; Cheek & Hogan, 1983; Leary, 1995; Schlenker, 1980, 1985; Schlenker & Pontani, 2000). Schlenker (2003) argues that people attempt to convey an accurate self-image "to ensure that others view one appropriately (i.e., in ways that secure the desired regard and treatment associated with one's identity), to receive validating feedback that might minimize personal doubt about what one is really like, or even to follow the principle that 'honesty is the best policy' and thereby feel authentic while minimizing the hazards of deceit" (p.493). A person has the desire to be perceived and recognized accurately. Especially with regard to his or her positive self-perceived identity such as intelligence, charm, funniness, and

friendliness, a person wants others to see him or her in the way that he or she sees themself. People strategically display their self-perceived identities to achieve this goal.

People do not always display a full version of their self-perceived identities. In some contexts, they strategically control the amount of information which they disclose about themselves toward their interactants. Goffman's (1959) notion of "front stage" posits that an individual may control and suppress expression of their qualities to fit in a given situation. Petronio's (2000) Communication Boundary Management Theory implies the existence of disclosed and undisclosed parts of self and boundaries between them. Jack's (1991, 1999) Silencing the Self Theory posits that there are expressed and suppressed parts of self. Sometimes, people intentionally display a reduced version of their self-perceived identities.

Usually self-presentation is not the center of our attention in our lives (see Schlenker, 2003). We have more than one agenda simultaneously in our lives, and we need to manage the multiple agendas effectively. Due to the limitation of our cognitive capacity, these multiple agendas are ranked hierarchically in accordance with the degree of salience or significance (Schlenker, 2003). Self-presentation agenda is not always the primary objective of our lives. Yet, self-presentation is always going on however we are aware of it or not (Goffman, 1959). Even when self-presentation is not our primary goal or concern, we continuously monitor our impressions toward others.

In everyday life, self-presentations are frequently automatic in nature. When we are in familiar, routine and frequently encountered situations which involve little cognitive effort (Bargh, 1989; 1996), we feel that our self-presentation is under our control. When we feel that security about our own self-presentation, we hardly pay

attention to self-presentation agenda (Schlenker, Britt, & Pennington, 1996). For example when we are interacting with close friends or family, we automatically operate our self-presentation based on well-learned scripts.

The automatic process of self-presentation is switched to the controlled process under certain circumstances (see Schlenker, 2003). According to Leary (1995), people become conscious about their self-presentation performance and motivated to regulate how they are perceived by others when: (1) they believe that the impression others form of them are relevant to attainment of their goals; (2) these goals are particularly valuable or important to them; and (3) they perceive the undesired a discrepancy between the impression they desire others to have of them and the image they think others hold (Leary, 1995, p.54). The third condition is called self-presentational predicaments (Schlenker, 1980). A self-presentational predicament occurs when "the identity the person is trying to present is somehow spoiled or placed in doubt" (Tedeschi & Riess, 1981, p.5).

In sum, in everyday life, self-presentations are frequently automatic in nature; therefore we pay little attention to how we present our identity toward others. However, we became cautious and sensitive about our self-presentation activity when it is of great importance to regulate our self-presentation to achieve important goals (e.g., job interviews) or when they perceive a discrepancy between their self-images and how people see us.

Communicative competence is an important means for self-presentation in interpersonal interactions. International students have acquired only limited communicative competences of the dominant cultural group. In social interactions with local people, international students perform self-presentation using their limited

communicative competence. International students are stripped of comfortable mastery of their first language and of behavioral flexibility and resourcefulness. Thus, in many cases, intercultural encounters of international students can be identified as "self-presentation predicament" (Tedeschi & Riess, 1981). They do not have full control over their own self-presentation and as a result, self-presentation is switched from automatic process to a complicated task. They experience more difficulties in displaying and presenting their self-perceived identities in intercultural interactions. Under the circumstance of self-presentation predicament, international students regulate their self-presentation to exert interpersonal influence on others (e.g., persuasion, deception, manipulation, glorification), to initiate and develop a relationship with others, to play a given role in the social situation, and to verify and validate their self-image.

Identity Negotiation

The present approach to communication of identity originates in symbolic interactionism (Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934). Cooley (1902) proposed the concept of *looking-glass self* and articulated the notion that people gain knowledge about themselves by observing and imagining how they are seen by others. Others serve as a mirror; we see ourselves reflected in other people's eyes. However, we are not privy to the private thoughts of the others; thus we cannot know for sure what others think of us. We use our imagination to try to see how others see us. "We see ourselves as we think others see us" (Rosernberg & Kaplan, 1982, p.174).

Mead (1934) advanced Cooley's notion of looking-glass self, and introduced the notions of *I*-self and *Me*-self. The *I* is self as subject. The *I* is the knower. The *I* is the active aspect of the person. On the other hand, the *Me* is self as object. The *Me* is the

known. The basic idea of the *Me*-self was introduced by Cooley's (1902) notion of looking-glass self. In Mead's understanding, the *Me*-self is the socialized aspect of the person. The *Me*-self is the accumulated understanding of "the generalized other." Mead (1934) argues that, through the socialization process, we come to average expectations of many other individuals to create "the generalized other" and develop the ability to take perspectives of "the generalized others." Taken together, the *I*-self and the *Me*-self form the self in Mead's social philosophy. For Mead, the thinking process is the internalized dialogue between the *I*-self and the *Me*-self. The mind is the self-reflective movements of the interaction between the *I*-self and the *Me*-self.

Goffman (1959) proposed the notion of "front-stage" and "back-stage" self. Goffman (1959) describes social life as a series of performances in which people are players who project their "faces" to audience (others) and engage in social interaction that are governed by social rules. When we are alone (i.e., back-stage), we can be our true selves (actual self). When we are engaged in social interaction (i.e., front-stage), we strategically control our impression to present self.

Grounded in symbolic interactionism, communication scholars have recognized that identity is constructed through social interactions through reflection and internalization (e.g., Collier, 1998; Collier & Thomas, 1988; Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003; Ting-Toomey, 2005; Mokros, 2003). These researchers postulate that identities are socially constructed and interpersonally negotiated, rather than a fixed, pre-existing, isolated phenomenon. In a communicative approach to identity, social interaction, reflection and internalization are central features of the identity formation process. Identity is conceptualized as the individual qualities

that people externalize (e.g. present and perform) in social interaction and internalize from social interaction through the reflection of others' perspectives. Below, I will review Hecht's Communication Theory of Identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003), the concept of identity gap (Hecht & Jung, 2004), and Ting-Toomey's identity negotiation theory.

Communication Theory of Identity

Communication Theory of Identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003) is grounded in the communicative approaches to identity. This theory focuses on the reciprocal influences between identity and communication. In other words, it directs attention to the influence of communication on identity as well as the influence of identity on communication. Communication Theory of Identity conceptualizes communication as an enactment of identity. (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003). Hecht, Warren, Jung, and Krieger (2005) postulate;

> Identity is formed, maintained, and modified in a communicative process and thus reflects communication. Identity, in turn, is acted out and exchanged in communication. Thus communication externalizes identity (p.262).

Driven by this conceptualization of identity, this theory posits:

> Social relations and roles are internalized by individuals as identities through communication. Individuals' identities, in turn, are acted out as social behavior through communication. Identity not only defines an individual but also reflects social roles and relations through communication. Moreover, social behavior is a function of identity through communication (Jung & Hecht, 2004, p.266).

Hecht et al. (1993) posit two ways through which communication is internalized as identity. First, symbolic meanings of social phenomena are created and exchanged through social interaction. Identity is formed when relevant symbolic meanings are

attached to and organized in an individual in various situations through social interaction. Social interaction is internalized as identity when one forms symbolic meanings and associates these meaning with self.

Second, as noted by Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), people place themselves in socially recognizable categories and confirm or validate whether these categories are relevant to them through social interaction. The relevant categorizations shape her or his identity. As such, identity is formed and reformed by categorization through social interaction. Specific identities entail specific expectations and specific social categories entail specific expectation. These expectations influence the person's social interaction. Identity is manifest in social interaction through expectations attached to identities and social categories (Hecht et al., 1993).

Communication Theory of Identity identifies four layers of identity: personal, enacted, relational, and communal layers (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003). *Personal identity* is an individual's self-concept or self-image. This personal identity parallels the traditional concept of identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Warren, Jung, & Krieger, 2005; Jung & Hecht, 2004). *Enacted identity* is "an individual's performed or expressed identity" (Jung & Hecht, 2004, p.266). People enact their identities and exchange the enacted identities in communication. *Relational identity* is an individual's perception of how others view of him/her (i.e., ascribed identity) (Hecht et al., 2005). *Communal identity* is the collectivity or group's conceptualization of identities. The communal layer exists on a group or collective level instead of the individual and dyadic units of identity that are reflected in the other layers. The communal layer is conceptualized as the

collective level of analysis, while the other gaps are at the individual and interpersonal levels.

Identity gap. When two people come together, discrepancies between and among identity layers are an unavoidable result of communication and social relations (Jung & Hecht, 2004). First, this is because "people are rarely transparent or perfectly consistent" (Jung & Hecht, 2004, p.268). This notion has been also discussed by the researchers of self-presentation. Secondly, a discrepancy between identity layers is inevitable because "two people rarely share the same experiential domain or have the exact same interpretation of social life" (Jung & Hecht, 2004, p.268).

Communication Theory of Identity describes the patterns of the discrepancies between and among identity layers. These discrepancies between or among the four layers are defined as an "*identity gap*" (Jung, 2003). Among the possible identity gaps, two specific gaps that occur directly from communication are more relevant to the present study.

Personal-enacted identity gap. A gap occurs between the personal and enacted layers of identity when an individual perceives him- or herself in one manner but expresses him- or herself in a different manner while interacting with others (Jung & Hecht, 2004). A person's expressed self in communication can be different from his or her self-concept. It is likely that discrepancies arise between how an individual views him- or herself and how self is expressed. However, the size of the gap between these two layers of identity may vary since it is probably rare for people to express themselves exactly the same as the way they view themselves. An individual may suppress expression of his or her authentic self to fit in a given situation (Jack, 1991, 1999) or

manipulate expressions of self to manage impressions (Goffman, 1959; Petronio, 2000; Leary, 1995).

Personal-relational identity gap. Personal-relational identity gap takes place when self-image of an individual differs from the identity ascribed by others (Jung & Hecht, 2004). In other words, other people perceive an individual to be different from the way he or she sees him- or herself. This notion of personal-relational identity gap has been posited in various theories including Cooley (1902), Mead (1934), self-verification theory (Swann, 1983, 1985), control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1982; Powers, 1973), and identity theory (Burke, 1991; Stryker & Burke, 2000). Further, Higgins (1987) also theorizes that discrepancies in self-representation or identity are associated with psychological discomfort. These differences are quite common in social interaction, stemming from inaccurate information, stereotypes, or other issues between communication partners.

Summary. In sum, Communication Theory of Identity assumes that identity is formed, maintained, and modified in a communicative process. Identity is internalized from, as well as externalized to, social interaction. This theory suggests the significance of how an individual presents one's identity and how a person internalizes the others' feedback to his or her self-presentation for identity formation and maintenance. From this standpoint, the four layers of identity are proposed (i.e., personal, enacted, relational and communal) and they theorize that the inconsistency between them (i.e., identity gaps) is almost inevitable in social interactions. Identity gaps take place when an individual perceives him- or herself in one manner but intentionally or unintentionally expresses

him- or herself in a different manner or when his or her self-image differs from the identity ascribed by others.

Ting-Toomey's Identity Negotiation Theory

Based upon the assumption that people have the basic motives for identity consistency, Ting-Toomey's (1993, 2005) Identity Negotiation Theory proposes that people negotiate their identities to secure the identity consistency. Ting-Toomey (1993, 2005) proposes that people in intercultural communication are motivated to negotiate their identities and the identity negotiation skill is a significant component of intercultural communication competence. Identity Negotiation Theory is based upon the core assumptions about identity: (1) "The core dynamics of people's group membership identities (e.g., cultural and ethnic membership) and personal identities (e.g., unique attributes) are formed via symbolic communication with others (Ting-Toomey, 2005, p.218)"; (2) "Individuals in all cultures or ethnic groups have the basic motivation needs for identity security, inclusion, predictability, connection, and consistency on both group-based and person-based identity levels" (Ting-Toomey, 2005, p.218); and therefore, (3) people "attempt to assert, define, modify, challenge, and/or support" their social and personal identities (Ting-Toomey, 2005, p.217). Identity Negotiation Theory presumes that it is through the *negotiation* process in communication that people approach mutually desired identities. Identity negotiation in this theory refers to the communication process in which "the communicators attempt to evoke their own desired identities in interaction, and they also attempt to challenge or support the others' identity (Ting-Toomey, 2005, p.217). Ting-Toomey (1993) argues that intercultural communication competence

includes the ability to perform "the effective identity negotiation process between two or more interactions in a novel communication episode" (p. 73).

Identity Negotiation Theory is concerned with the issue of identity inconsistency in intercultural communication. Its seventh assumption states that "individuals tend to experience identity consistency in repeated cultural routines in a familiar cultural environment, and they tend to experience identity change (or at the extreme, identity chaos) and transformation in a new and unfamiliar environment is concerned with identity consistency and change over time" (Ting-Toomey, 2005, p.218). Identity consistency refers to "a sense of identity continuation or stability through time as practiced through repeated daily routines or familiar cultural/ethnic interaction rituals" (Ting-Toomey, 2005, p.220). Identity change, on the other hand, refers to "a sense of identity dislocation and stretch in the spiraling cross-boundary intercultural contact experiences" (Ting-Toomey, 2005, p.220).

Sojourners and immigrants experience identity change ranging from subtle change to overt one (Ting-Toomey, 2005). In effective acculturation, sojourners need to be open to identity change; otherwise, according to Ting-Toomey (2005), both sojourners and the hosts may experience "great frustrations, miscommunications, and identity misalignments" (p.221). Ting-Toomey (2005) emphasizes the existence of "a tolerable range of identity consistency or rootedness and identity change or rootlessness in intercultural identity transformation process" (p.221). Ting-Toomey (2005) contends that "too much identity rootedness will turn a person into a highly ethnocentric being. Too much identity change (resulting in identity chaos) will turn a person into a highly marginal type with no moral center" (p.222).

In sum, Ting-Toomey's Identity Negotiation Theory and Hecht's Communication Theory of Identity propose a similar idea about how an individual experiences his or her identity in social interactions. Communication Theory of Identity describes identity structures and predicts the emergence of identity gaps in social interactions. Identity Negotiation Theory further predicts that sojourners and immigrants are to *negotiate* their identities so as to evoke their own desired identities and approach mutually desired identities with interactants. According to this theory, identity consistency is one of the motives for identity negotiation in intercultural communication. The two concepts: identity consistency (Ting-Toomey, 2005) and identity gap (Jung, 2003; Jung & Hecht, 2004) share fundamentally the same idea. Both theories suggest that people in intercultural communication are likely to experience a discrepancy between self-perceived identity, self-observed performance, and self-perception of others' perspectives of their identities in social interactions. As Identity Negotiation Theory posits, sojourner and immigrants are motivated to negotiate their identities.

Identity in Acculturation Theories

When people move across borders and live in a foreign country for a long-term, they go through cultural adjustment process. We may all know or can at least imagine that it is stressful to live in a foreign country. Studies have shown that it is common for sojourners to experience psychological discomfort such as stress, depression, frustration, anxiety and loneliness (e.g., Church, 1982; Navara & James, 2005; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 2000; Ward & Searle, 1991). When studies of intercultural communication and acculturation address identity, a focal concept of research tends to be social identities such as ethnic and cultural identity (e.g., Berry, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2006; Kim, 2001). The

researchers studying long-term cultural adjustment have paid more attention to social identity (e.g., group membership) than person identity (e.g., individual unique attributes).

This section addresses Berry's (1990) model of acculturation strategies, Kim's (2001) integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation, and Zaharna's (1989) theory of self-shock. The purpose is to explore how these scholars have addressed intercultural communication of personal identity in the context of long-term cultural adjustment. Although identity is a central issue in Berry's model and Kim's theory, both of them predominantly focus on ethnic or cultural identity. Compared to them, Zaharna's (1989) theory of self-shock is more concerned with and relevant to the focus of this study. Based on these three theories, I overview how the researchers have addressed the focal issue in the context of long-term cultural adjustment.

Berry's Model of Acculturation Strategy

Berry's (1990, 1994, 1997, 2006, 2008) model of acculturation strategy provides the parsimonious description of the acculturation experiences of sojourners and immigrants. Berry (2006) defines acculturation as "a process of cultural and psychological change that results from the continuing contact between people of different cultural backgrounds" (p.27). Berry (1990, 1994, 1997, 2006, 2008) posits that acculturation strategies are determined by the orientation of the members of non-dominant cultural groups and influenced by the orientation of the dominant cultural group. The orientation is concerned with two issues: (1) the degree of maintenance of heritage culture and identity (i.e., "to what extent are cultural identity and characteristics considered to be important, and their maintenance strived for"); and (2) the degree of interest in intergroup relationships (i.e., "to what extent should they become involved in

other cultural groups, or remain primarily among themselves") (Berry, 1997, p.9). Acculturation strategies of non-dominant group include assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization, whereas the orientations of the dominant group toward non-dominant group include melting pot, multiculturalism, segregation, and exclusion.

Assimilation is defined as the strategy "when individuals do not wish to maintain their cultural identity and seek daily interaction with other cultures" (Berry, 2006, p.35). Needless to say, the other cultures are often dominant groups. Integration is the strategy "when there is an interest in both maintaining one's original culture, and having daily interaction with other group" (p.35). Separation strategy is chosen "when individuals place a value on holding on to their original culture, and at the same time wish to avoid interaction with others" (p.35). Marginalization is the acculturation strategy "when there is little possibility of, or interest in, cultural maintenance (often for reasons of enforced cultural loss), and little interest in having relations with others (often for reasons of exclusion or discrimination)" (p.35).

Along with the orientation of the members of non-dominant cultural groups, Berry's model (1990, 1994, 1997, 2006, 2008) considers the orientation of a dominant culture group toward sojourners, immigrants and other non-dominant cultural groups as a significant factor of acculturation. While the preferences of non-dominant peoples are a core feature in their acculturation experience (Berry, 2006a; Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989), the acculturation ideologies and policies of the dominant group also constitute an important element of acculturation of non-dominant people (Berry, Kalin, & Taylor, 1977; Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997). Assimilation when sought by the dominant group is termed the Melting Pot. When Separation is forced by the

dominant group it is Segregation. Marginalization, when imposed by the dominant group it is Exclusion. Finally, Integration, when diversity is a widely-accepted feature of the society as a whole, including by all the various non-dominant groups is called Multiculturalism.

Using Berry's model as framework, the literature of acculturation is reviewed as follows. *Assimilation* refers to the process and outcome when sojourner and immigrants become more and more like the host members by completely swallowing up a host culture and mimicking host members' behaviors and attitudes. Ward, Bochner, and Furnham (2001) view assimilation as the rejection of the original culture and adoption of the new culture among the individuals in the intercultural situations where their culture has lower status and power. Perhaps Gordon's (1964) thesis is the most explicit on the phases involved in assimilation. Gordon suggested that assimilation involves passing through seven stages in a progressive fashion. These, he termed cultural or behavioral assimilation, structural assimilation, marital assimilation, attitudinal reciprocal assimilation, behavioral reciprocal assimilation, civic assimilation, and identification assimilation. The crux of the assimilation theory is that, over time and with increasing contact between the foreign and the host members, foreigners will become more and more like the host members. The essential element of assimilation is the extent to which sojourners swallow up a host culture and mimic American people and become more similar to them. In the history, this case of assimilation has been seen in the colonization or under the racial segregation policy. Because cultural or ethnic diversity was not appreciated by the dominant group, people in ethnic minority groups attempted to reject

their original culture and cultural identity to become more like the members of dominant group in order to be accepted by them as their in-group members.

Integration is the process and outcome in which sojourners and immigrants participate in a host society and learn about the host culture and at the same time maintain their original culture and identity. Many existing studies have found that the integration (i.e., attempt to involve in a larger society and at the same time to maintain one's original identity and custom) leads to better psychological well-being for sojourners and immigrants (e.g., Eyou, Adair, & Dixon, 2000; Peeters & Oerlemans, 2009; Singh & Singh, 1996; Zheng, Sang, & Wang, 2004). Kiley (2003) conducted a longitudinal study of Indonesian postgraduate students studying in an Australian university and found that changes which students experienced can be clustered into three main groups: Transformers, Strategists and Conservers. *Transformers* (25% of the group) reported having undergone significant change in the way that they viewed the world and their learning compared with when they started. *Strategists* (approximately 50%) realized that there were certain skills and attitudes required of them if they were to be successful in their new learning environment. These students also reported that they were aware of the need to revert to other, more culturally appropriate, ways of interacting on their return home. *Conservers* (approximately 25%) reported that they were keen to increase their knowledge and skill, but at the same time they did not want to change who they were and the way they viewed the world.

Integration of diverse cultural values and skills may be advantageous not only for the members of ethnic minority groups but also for a host society. Sowell's (1994) approach in his book *Race and Culture* suggests that the unique and distinctive skills and

values are the capital of an ethnic group and its members which enables them to perform better than others. For example, Italian immigrants were often similarly successful in the field of wine production. The Chinese succeed everywhere as retailers and restaurant owners. The ethnic groups bring their unique and distinctive skills and values to a host society and integrate them with the skills and values of a host society. This integration of the unique is the key to the prosperity and increasing productivity of both ethnic groups and the society they live in. As such, integration may increase richness and productivity of a society and simultaneously lead to the advancement of ethnic groups.

Separation is chosen when sojourners and immigrants avoid the interaction and relationship with host members and place a great value on holding on to their original culture. Sojourners and immigrants isolate themselves from the larger society and stay within the social network of coethnics. Separation can only be pursued when "other members of one's ethnocultural group share in the wish to maintain the group's cultural heritage" (Berry, 2006, p.36). Obviously, separation is possible only when the dominant society does not expect them to participate in the mainstream society and it is possible for them to live and socially function without contact with host members.

Marginalization is the process and outcome in which sojourners and immigrants neither acculturate to the dominant society nor retain their own cultural identity. According to Berry and Sam (1997), marginalization has been most often associated with conquered and colonized indigenous people who had been segregated and discriminated. The members of the colonized group lost their own culture because a colonial administration prohibits them from continuing their customs and norms. At the same time,

they fail to gain membership of the dominant culture group because of prejudice against them. As a result they become alienated from both cultures.

Under the combination of discrimination and assimilationism, when the members of non-dominant ethnic groups assert their cultural and ethnic identities, they are discriminated by the members of the dominant group. The experience of discrimination results in coercive pressure to give up the original cultural identity so that they can disguise themselves and blend in the culturally dominant group. However, even if they give up their cultural identity, the dominant group is so discriminative that they refuse to accept them as in-group members. As a result of losing cultural identity and being rejected by the dominant group, sojourners and immigrants experience marginalization—they "become alienated from the dominant culture as well as from their own minority society" (Del Piland & Usasco, 2004, p. 170).

Ethnic minority group members would experience marginalization as far as they perceive that the dominant group discriminate them and impose coercive pressure to assimilate. For example, Hispanic manufacturing workers who were adjusting to their jobs were categorized as marginalized because they were "unlearning old cultural habits" (Amason, Watkins, & Holmes, 1999). Other studies of sojourners and immigrants draw an association between acculturative stress and marginality (Hjelm, Nyberg, Isacsson, & Apelqvist, 1999; Hovey, 2000b; Smart & Smart, 1995). Almost all of the studies reviewed reported a correlation between marginalization and psychopathology (e.g., Berry & Sam, 1997; Gilbert, 1983; Smart & Smart, 1995; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980).

Kim's Theory of Cross-Cultural Adaptation

The cultural adjustment process is conceptualized as cross-cultural adaptation by Kim (2001) with the emphasis on the sojourners and immigrants' fitness to a host society. This assumption about the experiences of sojourners and immigrants is hinged upon Social Darwinism perspectives. Prior to describing Kim's theory, I will briefly outline Herbert Spencer's notion of Social Darwinism.

Spencer's Social Darwinism. Herbert Spencer, a 19th century philosopher, promoted the idea of Social Darwinism. Social Darwinism is a belief that the strongest (economically, physically, technologically) or fittest to circumstances should survive and flourish in society, while the weak and unfit are destined for extinction (Hofstadter, 1955). Social Darwinism is an application of Spencer's understanding of the Darwin's biological theory of *natural selection* to social, political, and economic issues. Spencer extended his understanding of Darwin's notion of biological natural selection into realms of sociology and proposed the concept of "survival of the fittest" and evolution in his *The Principles of Biology* (1864/2002).

In Spencer's view, social evolution is the process whereby society and individuals change from the simplest of forms to the most complex (Borgatta, 1992). Spencer theorizes that society and individuals are to evolve from small homogeneous groups into large heterogeneous groups in which greater specialization and differentiation are created over an extended period of time (Hofstadter, 1955). Although diversity increases through evolution, not all diversity survives. The key to survival is adaptation of individual characteristics to environmental circumstances. The strongest or fittest should survive and flourish in society, while the poorly adapted to the circumstances are destined for

extinction (Eiseman, 1973). In Spencer's view, evolution is a progressive movement toward a final state of “equilibrium." Equilibrium, according to Spencer, is the state where individual beings change their characteristics and habits until they are perfectly adapted to circumstances and no more change is called for (Taylor, 2007).

Throughout its long history, Social Darwinism has been applied to justify economical, political, and/or technological projects of modern society. First, it has been used to justify colonialism (Hawkins, 1997). Colonialism was seen as natural and inevitable, and given justification through Social Darwinian ethics - people saw natives as being weaker and more unfit to survive, and therefore felt justified in seizing land and resources. At its worst, Social Darwinist ideas, though in different forms, were also applied by the Nazi party in Germany to justify their eugenics programs (Hawkins, 1997). In its most extreme forms, Social Darwinism has been used to justify eugenics programs aimed at weeding "undesirable" genes from the population; such programs were sometimes accompanied by sterilization laws directed against "unfit" individuals.

Kim’s axiom of cross-cultural adaptation. The fundamental idea of Kim’s (2001) cross-cultural adaptation theory is that sojourners and immigrants are to adapt themselves to fit in the dominant culture. Kim’s theory (2001) proposes an axiom stating: “Cross-cultural adaptation involves both acculturation and deculturation, and eventual possible outcome of which is assimilation (p.90). Kim (2001) defines acculturation as “the acquisition of the native cultural practices in wide-ranging areas, particularly in areas of direct relevance to the daily functioning of the strangers—from attire and food habits to behavioral norms and cultural values” (p.51).

Deculturation theory. Kim (2001) theorizes that, along with acculturation, deculturation takes place for sojourners and immigrants. According to Kim (2001), as long as sojourners and immigrants are at least minimally in contact with host members and host environment, deculturation "has to occur" (p.51). Kim (2001) claims;

> Adaptation in the new environment is not a process in which new cultural elements are simply added to prior internal conditions. As new learning occurs, deculturation (or unlearning) or at least some of the old cultural elements has to occur, in the sense that new responses are adopted in situations that previously would have evoked old ones. The act of acquiring something new is inevitably also the act of "losing" something old (p.51).

Kim's idea of deculturation can be interpreted as the assumption that learning new behaviors automatically causes losing the old behaviors. Kim (2001) postulates that losing the old habits of behavior is "inevitable" during learning the new behaviors. This argument is grounded in the assumption that individuals have no choice other than abandoning their original cultural habits.

Kim (2001) assumes that sojourners and immigrants always end up giving up an element of their original cultures when certain elements of original cultures are called into question. Kim (2001) argues that:

> Strangers in a new environment are confronted with situations in which their mental and behavioral habits are called into question, and they are forced to suspend or even abandon their identification with the cultural patterns that have symbolized who they are and what they are. Such inner conflict, in turn, makes individuals susceptible to external influence and compels them to learn the new cultural system (p.50).

Kim (2001) regards the motive for maintaining the home culture as the detrimental force which inhibits sojourners and immigrants from adapting to a host society. Kim (2001) states that "a rigid identity orientation engenders closed-mindedness and a defensive and critical posture" (p.111). Kim (2001) argues that, in order to

participate in a host society, sojourners and immigrants need to minimize their desire to maintain their original culture in the face of cultural adjustment and acquire the ability to openly accept a new identity which is ascribed by a host culture.

Functional fitness. Kim (2001) proposes the notion of *functional fitness*. Here we can clearly see the influence of Spencer's notion of Social Darwinism on Kim's theory. Kim's (2001) notion of functional fitness refers to "suitability of strangers' internal capabilities to meet the external challenges of the environment" (Kim, 2001, p.185), and the capability to "carry out everyday-life activities smoothly and feeling comfortable in a particular environment" (p.185). Kim's conceptualization of functional fitness implies the assumption that sojourners and immigrants are considered to be well-adapted into a host society when they develop the ability to satisfy the demands, needs, and expectations posed by a host society. Kim (2001) theorizes that it is essential for sojourners and immigrants to acquire "host communication competence" (Kim, 2001) in order to adapt to a host society, in other words, in order to develop the ability to satisfy the demands of a host society and fitness to a host society. In Kim's conceptualization, host communication competence refers to "the overall capacity of the stranger to receive and process information appropriately and effectively (decoding) and to design plans to initiate messages or respond to others (encoding) in accordance with the host communication systems" (Kim, 2001, p.73) and it consists of three components (i.e., cognitive, affective, operational) (see Kim, 2001). Kim (2001) believes that acquisition of communicative competence of a host society is a requirement for cross-cultural adaptation.

Summary and Critique. In sum, Kim's theory of cross-cultural adaptation postulates that it is necessary for sojourners and immigrants to adapt and transform themselves to become a better fit in a larger society. In Kim's understanding, cross-cultural adaptation is the process whereby sojourners develop the fitness to a host society. According to Kim, fitness to a host society is the most important for sojourners and immigrants to live better in a larger society. From this viewpoint, Kim believes that the maintenance of their originality is detrimental for her idea of successful cultural adaptation. Kim contends that, in order to fit into a group of local people, it is unavoidable for sojourners and immigrants to "unlearn" some of their original elements and swallow up the communicative competence of the local cultural group.

Fundamentally, Kim's notion of cross-cultural adaptation follows Spencer's Social Darwinism perspective of adaptation and "hyperselectionism" (Gould, 1980) perspective on evolution. According to Gould (1980), hyperselectionism misconstrues the very point of Darwin's proof of evolutional theory. Gould (1980) argues that hyperselectionists viewed "each bit of morphology, each function of an organ, each behavior as an adaptation, a product of selection leading to a 'better' organism" and "held a deep belief in nature's 'rightness' in the exquisite fit of all creatures to their environments" (Gould, 1980, p.50). To contrary, Darwin was aware of "messier universe" (Gould, 1980). Gould (1980) emphasizes that Darwin sees "the best proof of evolution is imperfect design" and "messiness and tinkering, not perfect adaptation, are the true marks of historicity." (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p.45). Summarizing Gould's (1980) argument on Darwin's notion of evolution and adaptation, Morson and Emerson (1990) state "biological structures, like social entities, are at once designed, undesigned,

and ill-designed—they change in an imperfect way, and they give rise to by-products"(p.46).

Based on Gould's (1980) understanding of Darwin's evolution theory, Kim's understanding of adaptation seems inaccurate. Kim believes that adaptation means the process through which people increase fitness to a host environment and become "well-designed" entities. However, Darwin realized that "natural selection was not the only force at work, and that not everyone fits." (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p.46). Darwin was aware of messier universe. Adaptation is not the process which leads to a perfect, better, right and well-designed organism which fits to its environment. Adaptation is the messy process in which biological structures including social entities change in an imperfect way.

Zaharna's Theory of Self-Shock

Zaharna's (1989) theory of self-shock describes sojourners' intercultural communication of identity. While Berry (e.g. 1997, 2008) and Kim (2001) concentrate on cultural and ethnic identity, Zaharna's (1989) approach includes personal identity as well. Zaharna (1989) proposes the theory of self-shock to explain how identity confusion occurs for sojourners in intercultural contexts. The emphasis of this theory lies in the notion that sojourners' discomfort is caused by not only uncertainty about an unfamiliar culture and its members, but also *uncertainty and confusion about self*. She (1989) argues that "the strained relations with the Other and the behavioral ambiguities ultimately filter down to a strained relationship with the Self" (p.511). She argues that "the sense of 'wrongness' is no longer ambiguities about the Other or about behavior, but rather about the Self" (p.511).

Zaharna (1989) defines self-shock as "the intrusion of new and, sometimes, conflicting self-identities that the individual encounters when he or she encounters a culturally different Other" (p.511). In her paper, Zaharna (1989) rephrases self-shock into expressions, including "the sense of wrongness … about the Self" (p.511), a feeling that "we cannot predict our own behavior" (p.511), "loss of communication competence vis-à-vis the self" (p.512), "feelings of self-doubt" (p.512), "alienation from self" (p.514), "a devastating sense of losing one's own soul" (Wacaster & Firestone, 1978, p.273), and feeling that "something is different, not quite right, about me" (p.516).

Zaharna (1989) maintains that "self-shock rests on the intimate link between Self, Other, and behaviors" (p.517). Zaharna (1989) describes what happens to this linkage in intracultural and intercultural situations. In intracultural situations, we know the meanings of behaviors and the others share those meanings of behaviors; thus, the link among them is secured and stable (Zaharna, 1989). In some intercultural settings, sojourners and interactional partners do not share the same meanings and understandings of a given behavior and sojourners' language skills and cultural knowledge are limited. Consequently, the meanings of sojourners' behaviors become ambiguous and at the same time sojourners are more likely to misunderstand the behaviors of interactional partners. As a result, the intimate relationship between self, behavior, and others becomes strained and loses its stability and consistency. According to Zaharna (1989), such instability in the linkage between self, Other, and behavior results in self-shock.

Zaharna (1989) explains that, because intercultural settings are subject to inconsistent relationship between identity, behavior, and others, sojourners likely experience self-shock in the following three dimensions: (1) loss of communication

competence vis-à-vis self, (2) distorted self-reflection in the response of others, and (3) challenge of changing identity-bound behavior. These three types of inner struggles evolve into self-shock.

First dimension. Zaharna describes the first dimension as follows. In the first dimension of self-shock, the individual may find his or her behavior producing an inconsistent self-image because they have language problems and/or lack in the knowledge of the host culture. The first dimension of self-shock is grounded in the theory of self-perception (Bem, 1972). In the intercultural settings, sojourners are more likely to observe that their behaviors fail to confirm their own self-expectations because of language barriers and cultural differences (Zaharna, 1989). Zaharna (1989) posits that sojourners experience psychological discomfort because they cannot meet their own self-expectation for their own behaviors.

Second dimension. As to the second dimension, Zaharna (1989) theorizes that self-shock occurs when sojourners perceive that the reflection of their self-images in others' eyes is so disturbed that they cannot recognize themselves. Zaharna's argument on this second dimension is grounded in Cooley's (1902) concept of looking-glass self. As Cooley (1902) explains, we observe ourselves through others' eyes. We use the responses of others to form our identities. Because we cannot know for sure how others actually see us, we have to rely on our imagination to take the perspective of others.

When individuals are in intercultural settings, they are likely to assign an inaccurate or different meaning to others' responses than what he or she really intended. As a result, they perceive distorted and inaccurate reflection of their qualities, capabilities, feelings, thoughts and intentions in the others' eyes. As symbolic self-completion theory

(Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1987) explains, our identities are established when they are validated by others. When we cannot recognize ourselves in others' responses, we are unable to validate our identities. This discomforting situation evolves into self-shock. Zaharna (1989) contends;

> Over time, the ambiguities multiply and again reflect upon the self. The responses of the Other do not confirm the individual's self-identities. We encounter the maze of distorted reflections. We try to see ourselves as Others see us. Yet, we are not able to take the perspective of the different Other, nor are we able to understand the behavioral responses of the Other. We may know that the Other is responding to us, but we cannot recognize ourselves in those responses. The reflection is distorted, the image blurred (p.513).

Third dimension. In the third dimension of self-shock process, the key notion is that, when two cultures are radically different, interculturally competent behaviors do not necessarily confirm our identity. As one gradually adapts his or her identity-bound behavior to a host culture, their intercultural communication competence develops and he or she is able to have smooth interaction with host members. One's identity has cultivated, defined, and maintained in the context of home culture. When there are radical differences between the two cultures, appropriate and effective behavior in accordance with a host culture may contradict a sojourner's identity and fail to confirm identity. With regard to this dilemma, Zaharna (1989) postulates that "the more the individual struggles to reduce behavioral ambiguity with the Other by adopting the behavior of the Other, the more one challenges the Self-behavior link, and the more internal ambiguity he or she may create within the Self" (p.517). In intercultural contacts, sojourners accommodate their behaviors to become interculturally competent at the expense of the consistent sense of self. The dilemma between intercultural need and intrapersonal needs cause them stress.

Summary. In sum, Zaharna (1989) proposes that sojourners' psychological discomfort comes from the sense of wrongness (e.g., uncertainty, confusion) about self and she introduces the notion of *self-shock*. Self-shock rests on the intimate link between Self, Other, and behaviors. Zaharna (1989) argues that sojourners are likely to experience self-shock when they observe that; (1) their behavior produces inconsistent self-image and fails to confirm their self-expectations, (2) the reflection of their self-image in others' eyes is so distorted that they cannot recognize themselves there, and (3) the new behaviors they acquire through cultural learning and acculturation does not match or confirm their self-identities. I find her use of shock as problematic. She uses the term "shock" to describe the identity confusion of sojourners. Sojourners' experience of identity confusion is a chronic condition. As she describes as three-dimension process, identity confusion is the persistent feeling which slowly leads to profound psychological discomfort. The notion of shock, however, is concerned with sudden and temporary reaction to a given situation. Therefore, it is questionable to use the term "shock" to conceptualize persistent identity confusion.

Alienation

Research on alienation suggests the theoretical relationship between alienation and identity discrepancy. I will briefly review the sociological and psychological research on alienation starting from Karl Marx and including Seeman's categorization. In this section, I will review sociological and social psychological approach to alienation, discuss alienation from self as opposed to alienation from society, and describe how identity discrepancy can lead to alienation from self through the irreconcilable dissonance within multiple identities

The concept of alienation is one of the most frequently used terms in sociology, especially in theory and research on individual and social structure. It is one of the five "essential unit ideas of sociology" (Nisbet, 1966). The phenomenon of alienation has long been studied in sociology and social psychology. The researchers have attributed alienation to a variety of societal conditions and problems, including organizational systems (e.g., Michaels, Cron, Dubinsky, & Joachimsthaler, 1988; Suárez-Mendoza & Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, 2007), adolescences' mental health (e.g., Carroll, & Anderson, 2002; Smith, Calam, & Bolton, 2009), parental problems (e.g., Baker, 2005; Baker, 2006), child abuse (e.g., Abdulrehman, & De Luca, 2001; Johnston, Walters, & Olesen, 2005), problems of ethnic minority group members (e.g., Loo & Rolison, 1986; Ruef, Litz, & Schlenger, 2000).

Alienation is the process whereby people become foreign to the world they are living in and to themselves. The sociological paradigm views alienation as natural consequences of complex society. Sociological approach to alienation argues that "deviance from a particular norm may be attributable, not to an individual in conflict with that norm, but rather (in many cases) to an individual exhibiting behavior that conforms to a different social norm" (McGuire & McDermott, 1987, p.101). Thus, alienation may result not only in individuals who are in conflict with specific norms of a culture, but also in individuals who are seen to be well-adapted to a society and its norms.

Conceptualization of alienation

Alienation, however, is also "the most frequently misused, abused and misconstrued term in sociology" (Fischer, 1976, p.35). It thus seems desirable to discuss its conceptual background by tracking back to its origin. This section presents an original

conception, a traditional sociological conception, and a contemporary conception of alienation. It is not the aim of this paper to give an exhaustive exegesis of the concept of alienation. This section aims to provide an overall idea of alienation.

Hegel's approach. The history of alienation as a concept could be dated back to early theology and philosophy. However, Schacht (1970) regards Hegel as the first to use this term systematically. Hegel presented the idea of alienation in his theory of the dialectical progression of self-consciousness. According to Schacht (1970), Hegel uses the term in two distinct senses: in the sense of separation or discordant relations and in the sense of "surrender." Alienation in the first sense refers to a separation or discordant relations between an individual and the social substance (social, political, and cultural institution) or between an individual's actual condition and essential nature.

In ceasing to identify with the social substance, an individual loses universality, and when this happens, he or she no longer possess essence as a result of identifying with social substances. He or she, therefore, alienates him or herself from essential nature. An individual objectifies him or herself in the social substance. Thus, when the social substance is separated from an individual, such objectified self is alienated from their essential nature; therefore, an individual become alienated from self.

Marx's approach. Although the concept of alienation is central in the work of Hegel, it is Karl Marx who has had the greatest impact upon the conception of alienation as a sociological construct. It is the beginning of the transition from alienation as a philosophical concept to alienation as a socio-psychological concept. According to Israel (1971), Marx, who borrowed from Hegel, conceived of human nature as having an essence, and active and creative being, and this would be realized under the condition of

freedom. Under the capitalistic structure, however, an individual is transformed into a passive object in relation to the means, the products of production, and in his or her relationship to others. Therefore, he or she is separated from his or her own essential nature as an active and creative being.

In Marx's writings, alienation is the condition in which person's "own act becomes to him [her] as alien power, standing over and against him, instead of being ruled by him." (cited from Fromm, 1955, p121). Marx's theory of alienation is organized around his fourfold concept of alienated labor. Due to private ownership and control over the work process, people are alienated from the work activities, from the product of their labor, and from themselves. Finally, as a result of being alienated from one's own humanity, people become alienated from other people. The sociological and psychological theories on alienation are originated from this Marx's theory about the alienation of labor.

Weber's approach. The conceptions of alienation within the sociological tradition have appeared in writings of influential sociologists such as Max Weber and Emile Durkheim. Weber (1905/2001), in his description of development of bureaucracy, emphasized the rationalization of an individual's role toward more efficiency in formal organization. The emphasis on the value of technical efficiency gives rise to the development of bureaucracy which in turn separates the individual's work roles from the total products of the whole organization. This process of bureaucratization results in dehumanizing and depersonalizing an individual in society. And this emphasis upon rationality, impersonality, and objectivity has an alienating effect upon an individual.

Marx was concerned with the alienating process within the economic structure and Weber was concerned with alienation within the process of bureaucratization.

Durkheim's approach. Durkheim (1951) focused upon the anomic situation resulting when economic progress frees "industrial relations from all regulations." The concept of "anomie" was treated extensively in his influential work, *Suicide* (Durkheim, 1951). Conceiving society as an organism controlled by normative regulations, Durkheim argued that an individual is a creature whose desires are unlimited. "The more one has the more on wants, since satisfaction received only stimulates instead of filling needs" (Durkheim, 1951, p.248). The society acts as an external regulatory force and sets limits on individual desires. When social regulations break down such as in the case of industrialization, the social control of society upon individuals is no longer effective, and the individuals are left to their own devices. Durkheim calls such a situation as anomie—a condition of relative normlessness in a society. For Durkheim, anomie does not refer to a state of mind but a property of social structure.

Whereas for Marx and Weber, alienation was powerlessness, for Durkheim it was normlessness. Durkheim considered anomie as resulting from a state of under-regulation of social norms, while Marx regarded alienation as resulting from a state of over-regulation of social norms. The former will lead to a feeling of normlessness, whereas the latter leads to a feeling of powerlessness.

Merton's approach. Robert K. Merton (1957) defined anomie as a "breakdown in the cultural structure, occurring particularly when there is an acute disjunction between the cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them" (Merton, 1957, p.162). In other words, anomie results

when there is a discrepancy between the goals of the society and the institutionalized norms or means to achieve those goals. Durkheim defined anomie as a gross lack of sufficient normative regulations in the social structure. Merton, on the other hand, defined anomie as a result of lack of capacities of members to achieve social norms or goals.

Parsons's approach. Parsons (1951) contends that alienation results from a discrepancy between social roles and individual need-dispositions. In his book *The Social System*, Parsons used the concept of alienation in connection with the process of socialization or the acquisition of value orientation patterns of the individual in the formation of basic personality structure. Parsons (1951) notes that "alienation is always a possible product of something going wrong in the process of value-acquisition through identification" with significant others (p.233). According to Parsons, there are two types of alienation: primary and secondary alienation. Primary alienation is "the generalized alienation from the value patterns involved in the role-expectation." This "would motivate the actor to avoid conformity with these patterns" (Parsons, 1951, p.234). Secondary alienation is "a consequence of the fact that a personality with a give value-orientation pattern in (the individual's) character is faced, in a specific role, with role expectations which are uncongenial to his need-disposition and that, therefore, he is motivated to try to avoid conformity with them" (Parsons, 1951, p.234). In sum, Parsons (1951) defined alienation in terms of the opposition to conformity to role expectations within the society, a variation away from the model personality type.

Seeman's categorization. Employing the social-psychological framework and focusing on individuals, Seeman (1959) identifies six dimensions of alienation:

powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, value isolation, self-estrangement, and social isolation. The six dimensions are presented below.

Powerlessness refers to "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks" (Seeman, 1959, p.784). In other words, it is "a low expectancy that one's own behavior can control the occurrence of personal and social reward" (Seeman, 1972, p.472). Seeman traces the usage of this conception back to Marx and Weber. However, he emphasizes that powerlessness here is not viewed from the objective aspect of social condition but from the perception of an individual.

Meaninglessness refers to "a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behavior can be made" (Seeman, 1959, p.786). It is "a sense of the incomprehensibility of social affairs, of events whose dynamics one does not understand and whose future course one cannot predict" (Seeman, 1972, p.472). Seeman points out that this dimension of alienation is what Mannheim (1940) saw as a consequence of functional rationalization in modern organization.

Normlessness refers to "a high expectancy that socially unapproved means are necessary to achieve given goals" (Seeman, 1959, p.788; 1972, p.472); "the view that one is not bound by conventional standards in the pursuit of what may be, after all, quite conventional goals" (Seeman, 1972, p.472). This conception is derived from Durkheim's and Merton's conception of anomie. Dean (1961) categorized normlessness into two subtypes: purposelessness (i.e., "the absence of values that might give purpose or direction to life, the loss of intrinsic and socialized values, the insecurity of the hopelessly disoriented" (p.754); and conflict of norms.

Value isolation refers to "the assignment of low reward value to goals or behavior that is highly valued in the given society" (Seeman, 1959, p.789; 1972, p.473). It is the rejection of commonly-held values in the society. Seeman (1959) cites the alienated artist or intellectual who rejects the standards of success or attractiveness as examples of value alienation.

Self-estrangement refers to "the degree of dependence of given behavior upon anticipated future rewards, that is, upon rewards that lie outside the activity itself" (Seeman, 1959, p.790). According to Seeman, "to be self-estranged is to be engaged in activities that are not rewarding in themselves." Seeman cited a case of the worker who is estranged when carrying out unfulfilling and uncreative work as an example. Here Seeman refers to Fromm's work, *The Sane Society* (1955), as the most extensive treatment of this dimension of alienation.

Social isolation refers to a "low expectancy for inclusion and social acceptance"; it is expressed typically in a feeling of loneliness or a feeling of rejection or repudiation (Seeman, 1972, p.473). Seeman points out that this sense of social isolation is what is often found among minority members, the aged, the handicapped, and other kinds of "strangers." This dimension was added in his recent article on alienation (Seeman, 1972).

Fromm's approach. Fromm (1955) sees alienation as the disease of modern human being, who is estranged from oneself, from his or her own feelings, from his or her own fellow men and from nature: "alienation from both inside and outside ourselves" (p. 43). Fromm's (1955) conceptualization of alienation recognizes individuals' failure to achieve conformity to social expectations and further elaborates on the internal struggles of self. As a psychoanalyst and a social theorist, Fromm's work provides extensive and

insightful treatment of alienation in his book *The Sane Society* (1955). Fromm (1955) writes;

> Alienation as we find it in modern society is almost total; it pervades the relationship of man to his work, to the things he consumes, to the state, to his fellow man, and to himself. Man has created a world of man-made things as it never existed before. He has constructed a complicated social machine to administer the technical machine he built. Yet this whole creating of his stands over and above him. He does not feel himself as a creator and center, but as the servant of a Golem, which his hands have built. The more powerful and gigantic the forces are which he unleashes, the more powerless he feels himself as a human being. He confronts himself with his own forces embodied in things he has created, alienated from himself. He is owned by his creations, and has lost ownership of himself." (pp.124-125).

> By alienation is meant a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as an alien. He has become, one might say, estranged from himself. He does not experience himself as the center of his world, as the creator of his own acts—but his acts and their consequences have become his masters, whom he obeys, or whom he may even worship. The alienated person is out of touch with himself as he is out of touch with any other person. He, like the others, are experienced as things are experienced; with the senses and with common sense, but at the same time without being related to oneself and to the world outside positively. (Fromm, 1955, pp.120-121).

Fromm (1955) argues that alienation of the modern society is caused by conformity to anonymous authority. People feel alienated from themselves as a result that they conform themselves to anonymous authority. According to Fromm, when the authority is overt, we do not become alienated because we know who orders, forbids, and control us (e.g., police officers, teachers, bosses, priests), we are aware that we are not a part of the authority, and consequently we can rebel against it. Fromm (1955) states:

> Authority in the middle of the twentieth century has changed its character; it is not overt authority, but anonymous, invisible, alienated authority. Nobody makes a demand, neither a person, nor an idea, nor a moral law. Yet, we all conform as much or more than people in an intensely authoritarian society would. Indeed, nobody if an authority except “It.” What is It? Profit, economic, necessities, the market, common sense, public opinion, what “one” does, thinks, and feels. The laws of anonymous authority are as invisible as the laws of the

> market—and just as unassailable. Who can attack the invisible? Who can rebel against Nobody? (pp.152-153)

The mechanism through which the anonymous authority operates is conformity (Fromm, 1955). Despite the absence of clear command, people conform themselves to meet the needs and expectation of the authority or a larger society. Fromm (1955) argues:

> I ought to do what everybody does, hence, I must conform, not be different, not "stick out"; I must be ready and willing to change according to the changes in the pattern; I must not ask whether I am right or wrong. But whether I am adjusted, whether I am not "peculiar," not different. The only thing which is permanent in me is just this readiness for change. Nobody has power over me, except the herd of which I am a part, yet to which I am subjected. (pp.153-154)

Alienation caused by conformity to anonymous authority represents the possible conditions of immigrants and ethnic minorities. When the members of ethnic minority groups experience anonymous pressure to conform into the mainstream society, they assimilate themselves into the mainstream society. On the overt behavioral level, they might be seen to be "well-adapted"; they behave in the appropriate and effective manners and function reasonably and practically within the larger society. In their minds, however, they may lose the sense of self and experience themselves as strangers or aliens.

Du Bois's double-consciousness. A sociologist Du Bois proposed the concept of double-consciousness to conceptualize the dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's self caused by forced conformity and coercive pressure to fit into a dominant society. W. E. B. Du Bois was the most prominent intellectual leader and political activist on behalf of African Americans in the first half of the twentieth century. Du Bois (1903/2009) introduced the term "double consciousness" into the study of African American psychology. African Americans are forced to confront white Americans' prejudice and the racial discrimination against them. This racial discrimination made

African Americans view themselves through the eyes of white Americans, and then caused them a dilemma between awareness of self and awareness of how white Americans perceive them. Du Bois (1903/2009) called this dilemma as double-consciousness.

In "*Of Our Spiritual Striving*", DuBois (1903/2009) says double-consciousness is "sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity" (p. 8). This produces what Du Bois coins "two-ness"—"an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder" (p.8). These two views are often in conflict with one another, as the American view, in general, has despised and dehumanized African Americans. Du Bois (1903/2009) says that their struggle is that they want to "merge his double self into a better and truer self" and they wish "neither of the older selves to be lost" while merging this double self. Du Bois states African Americans simply wish "to be a both Negro and an American, without being cursed and spit upon by his fellows, without having the doors of Opportunity closed roughly in his face" (p.9).

For African Americans in the early twentieth century, the society they lived in would not allow them to merge their double self and maintain both African and Americans selves. The danger of double consciousness resides in the emergence of alienation from self, which in turn may result in depression. Because their double-consciousness was problematic under the circumstance of racial discrimination, they conform and/or change one's identity to that of how others perceive the person, and as a result, his or her identity is divided into two dissonant facets.

Miscellaneous. Clark (1959) conceives alienation as resulting from a discrepancy between individuals' understanding of (a) their actual role performances and (b) their perceived role expectations in a social situation. Wegner (1975) theorizes that alienation results when there are some incompatibilities between an individual's social roles or the social context and his or her personal characteristics such as self-image, values, goals, and needs. Otto and Featherman (1975) contends that alienation involves "discordance in the individual's perception of the real and the ideal, 'the world that is' contrasted with 'the world that (he feels) should be'" (p.702).

Alienation from self

The review of literature on alienation shows that people experience alienation as a separation between an individual and the social substance (social, political, and cultural institution) and/or estrangement from self. As previously discussed, Hegel regarded alienation as discordant relationships between an individual and the social substance or between an individual's actual condition and essential nature. Marx argued that people become alienated from work activities, from the product of their labor, and from themselves. Fromm (1955) discusses that in a modern society people experience "alienation from both inside and outside ourselves" (p. 43). Clark (1959), Wegner (1975), and Otto and Featherman (1975) discuss alienation as dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's self.

Alienation from self appears as a feeling such as, "I cannot be myself," "I feel as if I was someone else," or "nobody around me understand or appreciate who I really am." Given the close link between society and self, alienation from society ultimately result in alienation from self—an internal experience that is rooted in dissonance between within

self. A feeling of being alienated from self is the eventual result when a person experiences various forms of alienation through social interactions and social processes. Alienation from self is not made up within self as a person lives alone without any interaction with others or environment. People feel being alienated from self because they are engaged in social interaction and communicative process and they are influenced by external and social conditions (e.g., forced conformity). Without social interaction, they would not feel alienated from self.

Alienation from Self and Multiple Identities

Alienation from self takes place as a result of social interaction; therefore, it is social communicative process. Social interaction can be a complicated process consisting of multiple perspectives of one's identity. Alienation from self is a result of discordant relationships among multiple perspectives of one's identity in social interactions. People feel alienated from self when they recognize irreconcilable identity discrepancy, in other words, dissonance between multiple perspectives of their identities (i.e., one's self-perceived identity, one's presentation of identity, expectation, and perspectives of audiences on one's identity). In some social interactions, multiple perspectives of one's identity can be intertwined in a disharmonic way. We all possibly experience identity discrepancies in social interactions. Such dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's identity can be either intentional or unintentional (e.g., Berger & Luckman; 1967; Goffman, 1959) and reconcilable or irreconcilable. When people conceive that multiple perspectives of their identity are irreconcilably dissonant with each other, they are likely to feel being alienated from self. I will discuss four conditions in which people are likely to experience irreconcilable identity discrepancy and as a result alienation from self.

Rationalization. First, identity discrepancy may lead to alienation from self depending on how an individual recognizes, interprets, and rationalizes the dissonance between multiple perspectives of their identity. The significance of individual's rationalization and justification about such dissonance is suggested by Festinger's (1957) Cognitive Dissonance Theory. This theory suggests that when an individual experiences the dissonance between one's multiple cognitions, he or she is motivated to reduce cognitive dissonance by altering one of the cognitions. According to Festinger (1957), we hold a variety of cognitions about the world and us and we have motive to hold all of them in harmony. Where an individual's two cognitions are inconsistent, cognitive dissonance is evoked. An example is the situation where people smoke (behavior) and they know that smoking causes cancer (cognition).

Because the experience of dissonance is unpleasant, we are motivated to reduce or eliminate it, and restore or achieve consonance. According to Cognitive Dissonance Theory, the dissonance can be reduced in one of the three ways: individuals can: (1) change one or more of the attitudes, behavior, beliefs so as to make the relationship between the two elements consonant; (2) acquire new information that outweighs the dissonant beliefs; and (3) reduce the importance of the cognitions (i.e. beliefs, attitudes). For example, when a person smokes while he is aware that smoking causes lung cancer, he can quit smoking, acquire information such as "research has not proved definitely that smoking causes lung cancer," or convince himself that a short life filled with smoking and sensual pleasures is better than a long life devoid of such joys.

Festinger's Cognitive Dissonance Theory suggests that rationalization and justification of cognitive dissonance plays an important role. Cognitive dissonance is

manageable if he or she is able to rationalize or justify it. One's psychological discomfort can be reduced as long as he or she is able to rationalize and justify his or her cognitive dissonance about his or her behavior and attitude. In other words, cognitive dissonance can remain and cause greater psychological discomfort when a person cannot change any of his or her attitudes, behaviors, or beliefs, rationalize or justify the dissonance.

Grounded in Festinger's Cognitive Dissonance Theory, identity discrepancy can be regarded as the cognitive dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's identity. As this theory suggests, when this cognitive dissonance causes tension or unpleasantness, a person can manage psychological discomfort if he or she can alter one's self-perceived identity, one's self-observed performance, or one's perception of others' perspective, or rationalize and justify the dissonance. On the other hand, the cognitive dissonance may lead to alienation from self when the dissonant cognitions about self exist in a disharmonic manner and a person cannot or does not want to alter any of them or cannot find reasonable rationalization or justification for the dissonance. Alienation from self does not occur when multiple perspectives of one's identity are different from each other yet they can coexist in a harmonic manner.

Significance of identity element. A second factor is the significance of one's identity elements. When a certain identity element (e.g., funniness) is highly important for him or her, identity discrepancy may be more likely to cause alienation from self. When it is not important for him or her, the discrepancy may be less likely to cause alienation from self. When a person considers one's identity, performance, and others' perspective as separated aspects of him or her, the experience of this discrepancy would not lead to the feeling of being alienated from oneself. However, when a person considers

one's identity, performance, and others' perspective as bound, united, or connected components of self, the experience of this discrepancy would lead to the feeling of being alienated from oneself. When a person internalizes the incoherent self-observed performance and one's perception of how others may see him or her into one's self-perceived identity, it may lead to alienation from self in the long run. Even when a person considers them as united, he or she would not experience alienation from self if he or she can find stability within the discrepancies.

Social forced conformity. A third factor is forced conformity. Here I refer to Fromm's work as an underpinning. Alienation from self may be a result of social conditions such as receptivity of a host society. Alienation from self emerges when the overall larger social contexts force conformity pressure. Specifically, people experience alienation from self when social conditions force them to mutate their identity in order to fit in their performance and others' perspectives which are respectively discrepant with their self-perceived identity. People may feel alienated from self when they believe that social and situational conditions prevent them from fully performing their self-perceived identity, and/or when they believe that others ascribe contradicting identities to them.

From this standpoint, we can see that Kim's (2001) idea about successful cross-cultural adaptation can possibly result in alienation from self. Kim (2001) theorizes that successful acculturation includes the development of "suitability of strangers' internal capabilities to meet the external challenges of the environment" (Kim, 2001, p.185), and "willingness to accept the identity of the host culture" (Kim, 2001, p.111). Kim (2001) conceptualizes the former as *functional fitness* and the latter as *identity flexibility*. Based on my understanding of the relationship between social forced conformity pressure and

alienation, these two conditions which Kim theorizes as important factors for successful cross-cultural adaptation are found to be contributors to alienation from self.

Double-consciousness. The forth condition is double-consciousness (Du Bois, 1903/2009). This condition is closely related to alienation as result of a force of conformity pressure (Fromm, 1955). As previously stated, double-consciousness refers to "sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity" (Du Bois, 1903/2009, p. 8). People experience alienation from self when the others' perspectives of their identities override their self-perceived identities and they see themselves only through others' perspectives of them. As people experience coercive pressure such as discrimination or prejudice, they gradually internalize others' perspective to their identities and lose their sense of self.

Issues about Alienation from Self

There are two important issues that are central to my conceptualization of alienation from self. First, it is important to note that I do not argue that alienation from self is negatively correlated to "successful" social experiences. A person who "successfully" performs what is expected of himself or herself may still experience alienation from self. The pursuit of the ideal or ought self (Higgins, 1987) can cause alienation from self. Cooper (2003) argues that "the actual self, consisting of our real feelings and experience, becomes twisted, distorted and stretched into a mold of the "appropriate self" (p. 130), and consequently "we gradually become a stranger to ourselves" (p.130). As a result of striving to become ideal or ought self, one's identity mutates into "an ideal person." and his or her self-perceived identity has become alien

and foreign to self. For example, a celebrity may be considered successful and mainstream by all standards may still experience great discrepancies between their self-perceived identity and their performance and between their self-perceived identities and their perception of how others may see them.

Second, I do not consider alienation from self as a result of a discrepancy between authentic and inauthentic identity because there is no authentic or inauthentic identity. Identities are not fixed, pre-existing, or isolated phenomenon. Identities are socially constructed and interpersonally negotiated. Mead (1934) argues that through social interaction people develop Me-self by internalizing the perspectives of generalized others about them. Individuals' very understanding of identity is a result of social interactions, and thus, is subject to negotiation through social processes.

Summary: Alienation from Self

To summarize, alienation from self is the result of the social interaction in which the multiple perspectives of one's identity contradict each other. As such, a discrepancy between one's self-perceived identity, one's self-observed performance, and one's perception of others' perspectives of his or her identity is closely related to alienation from self. People recognize identity discrepancy when they perceive their performances to be discrepant with their self-perceived identities and/or when they perceive others' perspectives of their identity to be discrepant with their self-perceived identities. When they perceive identity discrepancy, or dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's identity, to be irreconcilable and thus problematic, they may have feelings of alienation from self, such as "I cannot be myself," "I feel as if I was someone else," or "nobody around me understand or appreciate who I really am."

Identity discrepancy may lead to alienation from self under certain circumstances. First, people feel alienated from self when they perceive the multiple perspectives of their identities to be contradictory to each other and they run out of the resources and reasons to rationalize and justify the cognitive dissonance within self (Festinger, 1954). Second, people are more likely to experience alienation from self as a result of identity discrepancy when the identity elements about which they experiences discrepancy are essential and central to idea of who they are. Third, people feel alienated from self when their multiple identities cannot coexist within self because of externally imposed conformity pressure (Fromm, 1955). Fourth, people experience alienation from self when they overly internalize how others see them to their identities over the long period of time and let the others' perspectives override their self-perceived identities. They feel alienated from themselves when they see themselves only through others' perspectives of them (i.e., Du Bois's double consciousness). Under these conditions, identity discrepancy may lead to irreconcilable dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's identity, which likely results in alienation from self.

To my knowledge, alienation from self has been rarely discussed among intercultural communication researchers. Although Communication Theory of Identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003), Identity Negotiation Theory (Ting-Toomey, 1993, 2005), and theory of Self-Shock (Zaharna, 1989) acknowledge that people tend to experience identity discrepancy in intercultural situations, they do not discuss the possibility that sojourners may experience alienation from self as a result of intercultural contact. In spite of the theoretical association between identity discrepancy and alienation from self, these three theories seem to limit

their scopes to identity discrepancy (e.g., identity gap, identity inconsistency). Intercultural communication researchers pay little attention to sojourners' alienation from self in intercultural situations.

Research Question

I have reviewed studies on self-presentation, identity negotiation, identity in acculturation theories, and alienation/alienation from self to explore intercultural communication of identity. These studies suggest that sojourners in intercultural interactions are likely to experience identity discrepancy—a discrepancy between one's self-perceived identity, one's self-observed performance, and one's perception of how others may see him or her.

As research on self-presentation suggests, international students are motivated to regulate their self-presentation in order to exert interpersonal influence on others, to initiate and develop relationship with others, to play a given role in the social situation, and to verify and validate their self-image. However, because their communicative competence is limited and they do not share the same meaning systems with Americans, they are more likely to experience a discrepancy between the impression that they desire others to have of them and the impressions that they think others hold when communicating with Americans.

Theories and studies related to intercultural communication of identity have offered consistent notions that sojourners are likely to experience a discrepancy between one's self-perceived identity, one's self-observed performance, and one's perception of how others may see him or her in the intercultural interactions. Both Communication Theory of Identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, &

Ribeau, 2003) and Identity Negotiation Theory (Ting-Toomey, 1993, 2005) consistently suggest that sojourners in intercultural interactions are likely to experience identity discrepancy. Identity Negotiation Theory assumes that sojourners are motivated to negotiate (i.e., assert, define, modify, challenge, and/or support) their identities to restore identity consistency.

Acculturation theories address identity issue as follows. Berry (1990, 1994, 1997, 2006, 2008) posits that acculturation strategies are determined by the orientation of the members of non-dominant cultural groups and influenced by the orientation of the dominant cultural group. The orientation is concerned with: (1) maintenance of heritage culture and identity; and (2) intergroup relationship sought by groups (Berry, 1997, 2008). Acculturation strategies of non-dominant groups include assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization, whereas the orientation of the dominant group toward the non-dominant group includes melting pot, multiculturalism, segregation, and exclusion. Kim (2001) considers cross-cultural adaptation as the process which leads to a perfect, better, right and well-designed organism which fits to their environment. For Kim (2001), successful cross-cultural adaptation requires losing their originality and acquiring communicative competence of the dominant cultural group. Zaharna's (1989) theory of self-shock postulates that sojourners in intercultural situations are likely to experience the strained relationships or the loss of stability among self, Other and behaviors. Her notion of the unbalance among self, Other, and behaviors can be translated into a discrepancy between sojourners' self-perceived identity, one's self-observed performance, and one's perception of how others may see him or her in the intercultural interactions.

There are two issues that I would like to clarify in terms of identity discrepancy. First, it is important to emphasize that identity discrepancy is almost unavoidable in any kind of social interactions and some people intend to create identity inconsistency (e.g., Goffman, 1959). Although Hecht and colleagues have recognized the notion that identity discrepancy is inevitable in social interactions, Zaharna (1989) assumes that self-shock or identity discrepancy is peculiar to intercultural interactions. It is important to note that identity discrepancy is not peculiar to intercultural communication; rather, it is almost inevitable in any kind of social interactions because various and multiple perspectives and expectations are likely to intertwine in social interactions.

The second issue that I need to clarify is the fact that there are two types of identity discrepancy: desired and undesired discrepancy. Desired identity discrepancy is less problematic, whereas undesired identity discrepancy is problematic. Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical approach to self-presentation recognizes that desired and thus less problematic identity discrepancy. An individual may control expression of his or her personal identity to fit in a given situation. Ting-Toomey's Identity Negotiation Theory and Zaharna's Self-Shock, on the other hand, focus on the undesired and thus problematic identity discrepancy—the identity discrepancy which takes place against a person's intention.

As we have seen in concepts of alienation and alienation from self, undesired and problematic identity discrepancy potentially results in alienation from self. Identity discrepancy leads to alienation from self when: (1) people cannot rationalize the cognitive dissonance between multiple perspectives of their identity; (2) identity elements are essential and significant for their self-concept and self-esteem; (3) they are

forced to mutate their identity in order to fulfill social expectations or coercive pressure; and (4) their self-perceived identity is dominated by other-perceived identity.

The present study focuses on intercultural communication of personal identity of Japanese international students in the United States. The various approaches consistently suggest that, when sojourners communicate their identities in intercultural situations, they are likely to observe that their performances do not accurately present their identities and/or they believe that the interactants from different cultural backgrounds do not accurately perceive their identities. In other words, theories and past studies suggest that sojourners in intercultural situations are likely to experience undesired identity discrepancy. Given this consistent notion about sojourners' intercultural communication of identity and identity discrepancy, the present study examines the following research question: *How do Japanese international students experience their self-perceived identity, self-observed performance, and their perception of Americans' perspectives of their identity in intercultural interactions?* In order to explore intercultural communication of personal identity, I focus on: (1) how an individual Japanese international student in the U.S. perceives his or her own personal identity in intercultural situations; (2) how a Japanese student observes his or her own presentation of identity in intercultural situations; and (3) how a Japanese student imagines the Americans around him or her think of who he or she is in intercultural situations.

Intercultural Experience of Asian International Students

This study focuses on the intercultural experiences of international students. International students are sojourners who are "relatively short-term visitors to a new culture whose permanent settlement is not the purpose of the sojourn" (Ady, 1995, p.93).

International students move across cultural boundaries for the purpose of academic pursuit. Some international students are academically privileged and intelligent in their home countries. They rank in the top levels of their native country schools, and their expectations about academic performance in a new educational environment may be unrealistically high (Mori, 2000). International students are unique with respect to the motivation to stay. Although most international students are in the United States temporarily to fulfill their educational objectives (Yang & Clum, 1994), some students have an indefinite or definite plan to stay in a host country permanently after they achieve their academic goals.

Among various ethnic groups of international students, this study focuses on Japanese international students. Intercultural experiences of international students vary across the countries of origin, in other words, it varies depending on the degree of similarity/difference between their home and host cultures (Pedersen, 991; Sheehan & Pearson, 1995). The existing studies have reported that, in the case of international students in the U.S., acculturative stress may be more severe for students from Asian countries than European countries because of a greater cultural gap between the Asian culture and the host culture (Guclu, 1993; Parr, Bradley & Bingi, 1992; Yang & Clum, 1994). International students from collectivistic cultures experience more difficulties with relationship development with US American students and lower probability of smooth adjustments compared with those from individualistic cultures similar to the host culture (Olaniran, 1996). Furthermore, students' skin color also contributes to their adjustment experiences. Past studies on international students in the United States have presented evidence that white students (e.g., European students) experience less discrimination and

less acculturative stress or mental health problems such as depression than non-white students (e.g., Asian, African, Central/South America, Middle Eastern) (Yeh & Inose, 2003; Constantine, Anderson, Berkel, Caldwell, & Utsey, 2003). Overall, in the United States, it has been found that international students from Asian countries such as China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan tend to experience higher level of acculturative stress than those from other regions such as Europe and South/Central America.

The common problems and concerns of Asian international students have been reported by many researchers. While there is a general consensus regarding adjustment issues of international students, there are some discrepancies in the magnitude of each. Past studies have found common problems and thus the sources of stress experienced by international students as follows: (a) language difficulties; (b) adjustment to educational system and academic culture including in-class communication and relationships with advisors; (c) isolation from family and friends; (d) interpersonal problems including loneliness due to lack of friends; (e) homesickness; (f)financial problems; (g) racial discrimination; (h)adjustment to social customs and norms; and (i) dietary issues (e.g., Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Church, 1982; Lin & Yi, 1997; Mori, 2000; Brinson & Kottler, 1995; Leong & Chou, 1996; Poyrazli & Grahame; 2007; Yakushko, Davidson, & Sanford-Martens,2008; Zahi, 2002) .

Language Problems

Language problems seem to be the major issue among Asian international students. Language proficiency is an important tool and resource which allows and facilitates them to live well in a host society. In other words, language problems serve as the source of other problems such as difficulties with academic life, interpersonal

problems, and cultural adjustment. International students are often less proficient in English, especially in conversational English. Almost all international students are required to pass the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL); however, this test assesses reading skills rather than oral comprehension and the ability to communicate orally (Mori, 2000), and passing the TOEFL does not ensure that students will be able to accurately understand sentences that are rapidly spoken, truncated, mumbled, or that include idioms and jargon. Language skills may be a significant source of stress because language has such a significant effect on the social and academic performance of a student (Chen, 1999; Zahi, 2002). Chen (1999) suggested that lack of English language proficiency may limit a student's desire to seek out social interactions and thus create negative feelings about their ability to be successful in their new environment.

Academic Life

Academic life is the largest part of an international student's life. Because of the U.S. immigration regulations, they need to enroll at least nine credits per semester and maintain good records to secure their visa status. Many international students face an unfamiliar educational system and different academic culture. International students report that they find it very difficult to communicate in class because they are not accustomed to conversational English such as slang, idioms, jargons (e.g., Day & Hajj, 1986; Mori, 2000; Singaravelu & Pope, 2007; Stoynoff, 1997; White, Brown, & Suddick, 1983). Yeh and Inose (2003) argue that Asian students are unfamiliar with and often uncomfortable with questioning and challenging their advisors and professors. Chinese international students report the difficulties and dissatisfaction with teaching styles in MBA courses, which are deeply rooted Anglo-American norms and values (Currie,

2007).Coming from the country where power distance (Hofstede, 1980, 1991, 2001) is valued, Asian international students are not used to challenging the authority of their advisors. They are usually taught to be compliant, remain quiet in class, and withhold expressing their thoughts or asking questions until invited to do so by their teachers. For these international students to measure up to their professors' expectations, they need to abandon the classroom behavioral norms appropriate in their home countries and quickly find ways to adapt to new Western norms of academic behavior. Research shows that interaction with faculty members facilitates greater academic achievement among international students (Anaya & Cole, 2001). For international graduate students, the relationship with their advisors is one of the most relevant and salient predictor of their stress (Rice et al., 2009).

Isolation from Family and Friends

Another feature of the lives of international students is isolation from family and friends (e.g., Sheehan & Pearson, 1995; Sandhu, 1994; Sodowsky & Carey, 1987). Asian international students arrived in the U.S. from a greater distance. They must separate from their significant others in their home countries (i.e., family, friends, and partners). Compared to domestic students, international students have fewer opportunities to return to their homes for visits with family and friends. From the social support perspective, they are physically deprived of their traditional sources of social support (Pederson, 1991). Hechanova-Alampay, Beehr, Christiansen, and Van Horn (2002) found that international students reported less social support than domestic sojourners. Isolation from family and friends means not only that they are lonely but also they lack in the source of social support which people normally use to cope with their stress and problems.

Moving to a new environment deprives sojourners of these support systems; hence they commonly experience feeling of being uprooted, loss and homesickness (Pedersen, 1991). As they spend more time in a foreign country, their concerns and problems are caused by the experiences which are so unique to sojourners and international students that their families and friends at home could not understand (Thomas & Althen, 1989). As a result, international students may find it difficult to receive emotional support which they need to cope with their acculturative stress from their families and friends at home.

Interpersonal Relationships

Problems and difficulties regarding interpersonal relationships have also been reported as a major concern among international students. The studies suggest that students who were more satisfied with their interpersonal support networks had less perceived discrimination, perceived hatred, and negative feelings caused by change (e.g., Perrucci & Hu, 1995; Prieto, 1995; Schram & Lauver, 1988; Surdam & Collins, 1984). Bochner and his colleagues (Bochner, McLeod, & Lin, 1977; Furnham & Alibhai, 1985; for a review see Furnham & Bochner, 1986) identified three distinct types of social ties held by international students: (1) the mono-cultural network comprising of close friendships with other co-nationals, which tends to be the international students' primary social network; (2) the bicultural network comprised of locals including academics, students, and advisors, which tends to be their secondary network; and (3) the multicultural network involving internationals from other countries, which tends to be the third network.

Connections with locals have been found to serve instrumental functions, facilitating students to learn social norms of a host culture, improve conversational skills

in a host language, and ultimately reach their academic and professional goals. Relationships with domestic students and faculty members tend to lower stress (Abe, Talbot, & Geelhoed, 1998; Mallinckrodt & Leong, 1992). International students are more likely to have positive experiences and achieve their educational goals, if they have satisfying and pleasant contact with locals (Prieto, 1995). On the other hand, international students who have less contact with locals report feeling more alienated and less well-adjusted than those who have more contact with domestic students (Perrucci &Hu, 1995; Schram & Lauver, 1988; Surdam & Collins, 1984).

Language barriers may be a primary contributor to the communication difficulties faced by international students. Self-confidence in English is likely to increase students' confidence to interact with Americans (Klein, Miller, & Alexander, 1971, 1980; Ying & Liese, 1990, 1994). Kang (1972) found Chinese students who felt unsure about their English skills were hesitant to interact with Americans for fear of miscommunication. Similarly, Barker, Child, Gallois, Jones, and Callan (1991) found Asian students in Australia attributed their reluctance to engage with tutors and academic staff to language difficulty.

However, language is not the only explanation for the interpersonal difficulty. Ying (2002) found that, for Taiwanese international students, formation of friendships with Americans cannot be predicted solely by language ability; rather the association among English speaking ability, extraverted personality, ability to understand English, and size of the Chinese student population on campus. Chen (1996) explained that the combination of limited language skills and a heavy load of academic work result in loneliness of international students because they had no time to make new friends. Ying

(2002) found that the size of coethnic student population on campus influences on Taiwanese international students relationships with American students. They are more likely to form friendship with Americans when the availability of Chinese students on their campus is limited. In the absence of readily available coethnics for their support network, Taiwanese students were more likely to turn to Americans for friendship.

Cultural differences in conversational styles are another explanatory factor. For example, research found that Chinese international students are likely to have difficulty fitting in with the American style of social conversation, which features more direct expression of feelings, assertive expression of opinions, and expectations of sharing at least some personal information, because most Chinese people interact with people with beliefs about the virtues of humbleness, emotional restraint, self-effacement, and saving face (Ho, 1989; Kim, Atkinson, & Umemoto, 2001). Moreover, cultural differences in friendship pattern make it difficult for Asian international students to develop significant friendships with the local American students (Aubrey, 1991; Bulthuis, 1986; Chen, 2006; Huang, 2008; Pedersen, 1991).

Research has found that attitudes and behaviors of domestic students toward international students serve as an obstacle for the development of friendships between them. Ward's (2001a) literature review finds that domestic students are largely uninterested in initiating contact with their international peers despite the desire of the latter for more cross-national interaction (Ward, 2001a, p.3). Brebner (2008) found that domestic students in New Zealand appear to be reluctant to initiate contact with international students. The domestic students reported that they do not need friendship with international students. They attribute their lack of interest to befriend Asian students

to the fact that they have families and friends in the local communities which they can comfortably rely on and their observation of "the proliferation of ethnic enclaves" (Brebner, 2008) When there is a substantial size of international students from one country, domestic students may come to think that international students must feel comfortable and satisfied with their coethnic friends, and thus they think there is no great need to develop relationships with them on the side of international students. Despite the willingness of Asian international students to have increased contact with local people, various factors prevent them from establishing close and intimate relationships with local people. Over time, they become disappointed with the relationships with local people. Combined with their experiences of racial/ethnic prejudice and discrimination (Helpern, 1993; Hayes & Lin, 1994; Robinson & Ginter, 1999), they may be discouraged them from attempting to from deep, significant relationships with Americans (Bulthuis, 1986; Robinson & Ginter, 1999).

For many Asian international students in the U.S., other co-ethnic students are accessible in the local community, and thus, it is possible to develop relationships and networks with them. Many international students gravitate towards being with people of the same nationality (Furnham & Alibhai, 1985). Research reveals that most international students seek help for solving personal problems from co-ethnic students (Pedersen, 1975). Co-ethnic relationships function as psychological buffer and facilitate the maintenance of their original cultural identity (e.g., Bochner, 1982; Cemalcilar, Falbo, & Stapleton, 2005; Lee, Koeske, & Sales, 2004). The relationships with co-ethnic international students nurture a continued sense of self, a feeling of belonging, and the continuation of cultural values (Church, 1982; Kang, 1972; Klein et al., 1980). Studies

have revealed that those who have higher amounts of emotional support from co-ethnics tend to experience less acculturative stress associated with negative attitude toward local people (e.g., Ye, 2005). Although social support from co-nationals may serve as a protective function and psychological buffer, they may also inhibit interaction with host-nationals. Previous research has supported international students' strong preference for co-ethnics, and its negative consequence for association with Americans (Church, 1982).

In addition to the connections with local people and co-ethnic people, international students have connections with the students from the other countries. The role of multicultural ties in students' psychological adjustment has been examined by several researchers (e.g., Bochner, 1982; Kashima & Loh, 2006; Schmitt, Speaks, & Branscombe, 2003; Zhai, 2002). International students may be more willing to form relationships with other international groups rather than the groups from the host culture (Schmitt, Speaks, & Branscombe, 2003). Bochner (1982) argues that such multicultural network has been said to have a social and recreational function. Some international students have indicated that increasing the interaction between international and U.S. students would be helpful (Zhai, 2002). Kashima and Loh (2006) find that a greater number of ties with local people as well as multicultural people were associated with the better psychological adjustment.

Financial Problem

Financial problems are another stressor for some international students. Many studies have found and discussed that financial concern is one of common source of stress for international students (e.g., Brinson & Kottler, 1995; Church, 1982; Leong & Chou, 1996; Lin & Yi, 1997; Mori, 2000; Poyrazli & Grahame; 2007;Yakushko,

Davidson, & Sanford-Martens,2008; Zhai, 2002). Financial concerns can be greater for international students than domestic students because they are not allowed to work outside the university, and on-campus jobs are typically in short supply. In many instances, international graduate students may not have obtained assistantship support for their tuition expenses. In addition, since they are not qualified for federal financial aid, many international students accelerate their programs to graduate as soon as possible (Cadieux & Wehrly, 1986). When expected financial support was threatened, some international graduate students experienced this as an acute threat to their security, resulting in anxiety for them. Financial support is often limited for international students. Such additional pressure to obtain financial support contributes to their stress (Mori, 2000). There is evidence that receiving financial support such as scholarships from their academic program lowers stress for many international students (Mallinckrodt & Leong, 1992).

Racial Discrimination

Ethnic and racial discrimination still seems to remain on U.S. university campuses (Biasco, Goodwin, & Vitale, 2001; D'Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Hodson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2002; Hurtado, 1992; Rankin & Reason, 2005). Constantine, Kindaichi, Okazalo, Gainor, and Baden (2005) found that Asian international students experienced prejudice and discrimination. European international students perceived less discrimination than did the international students from other regions of the world such as Asian, African, and South American international students (Poyrazli & Lopez, 2007; Sodowsky & Plake, 1992). Ying et al. (2000) compared Chinese international students with Chinese American students, and found that Chinese international students were

more likely to be separated from mainstream culture and more likely to experience discrimination than were Chinese American students. Other studies found that international students with lower levels of English proficiency experienced higher level of perceived discrimination (Poyrazli & Lopez, 2007; Sodowsky & Plake, 1992). Schmitt, Spears, and Branscombe (2003) found that, under the stress of feeling of being discriminated, international students seek out identification with other international students to counteract the negative effect of discrimination on their self-esteem. Further, the combination of racial discrimination and homesickness can produce feelings of loneliness, alienation, depression, and anxiety for college students, particularly ethnic minority students including international students (Fisher & Hood, 1987; Leong & Ward, 2000; Stroebe, Van Vliet, Hewstone, and Willis, 2002; Zheng & Berry, 1991).

Change in Status

International students often represent the educational elite population of their country. They typically enjoy high status in their societies (Allen & Cole, 1987; Svarney, 1989). Often these students also have a fairly high standard of living in their home countries (Oropeza, Fitzgibbon, & Barón, 1991). Svarnery (1989) maintains that "in this new environment they may be without the honor and prestige that they enjoy in their home countries" (p.230). Coming to the United States as international students threatens both their financial and social status that these students have experienced up to their time of overseas relocation. This change in financial and social status can cause deep feelings of loss, grief, and resentment (Oropeza, Fitzgibbon, & Barón, 1991). Such drastic changes in social standing and financial capacity are potential sources of stress.

In sum, Asian international students experience significant challenges and stress. The studies reviewed here found that the primary problems encountered by Asian international students include language problems, adjustment to educational system and academic life, isolation from family and friends, lack of local friends, excessive reliance on co-ethnic students, homesickness, financial problems, and racial discrimination. International students have to overcome these unique problems as well as those typically confronted by domestic students. As a student, they share the similar concerns with American students who relocate across states. Their experiences as a sojourner in cross-cultural transition add several unique dimensions to their experiences such as racial discrimination, language barriers and culture shock (Arthur, 1997, 2004; Hayes & Lin, 1994). International students have these extra challenges and more stress mainly because their native languages and cultures are often vastly different from those of the host society. They grapple with adjusting to new social customs and norms, defining their role as foreigners, the ignorance of host nationals about the international student's home culture, difficulty in making new social contacts, problems with verbal and non-verbal communication, occasional racial discrimination and relationship problems (Church, 1982).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD

This research utilizes qualitative research methods. Creswell (1998) outlined rationales for using a qualitative research approach in his book on qualitative inquiry and research design. He suggests that qualitative research methods are most appropriate when (a) the research question starts with *how* or *what* so that initial approach to the topic describe what is going on, (b) the topic needs to be explored – including when theories are not available for certain populations and need to be developed, (c) there is a need to present a detailed view of the topic, or a close-up view does not exist, (d) the researchers wishes to study individuals in their natural setting, (e) there is an interest in writing in a literary style – bringing the writer into the study directly, (f) audiences are receptive to qualitative research, and (g) the researcher wishes his or her role as an active learner who can tell the story from the participants' view rather than as an "expert" who passes judgment on participants.

My research purpose is to understand the intercultural communication of personal identity of Japanese international students. More specifically, I am interested in finding how they perceive their own personal identity, how they observe their presentation of identity, and how they perceive the feedbacks from others to their presentation of identity. My aim is to produce "thick description" (Geertz, 1973). I find these criteria proposed by Creswell (1998) are a good fit for my research agenda. A qualitative research method is a useful tool to explore this research topic.

Intensive or in-depth interviewing has been a useful data-collection method in various types of qualitative research. Fundamentally and essentially, an interview is an example of metacomunication between an interviewer and an interviewee (Briggs, 1986),

and importantly, it is a directed conversation (Lofland & Lofland, 1984, 1995). Intensive interviewing "fosters eliciting each participant's interpretation of his or her experience" (Charmaz, 2006, p.25). As Schutz (1967) indicated, it is impossible to perfectly understand how and why the participants experiences a certain phenomenon because perfect understanding would mean that we had entered into the other's stream of consciousness and experienced what he or she had. It is not possible to experience what the participant has experienced. If we could do that, we would be the participant. Perhaps the closet we can come is to take the participants' perspectives of their experiences. Understanding of Japanese students' experiences means to observe, describe and reflect on their experiences from their perspectives. As Vygotsky (1987) says, every word that people use in telling their stories is a microcosm of their consciousness. A researcher can see the experiences from the perspective of participants by closely looking at how they select constitutive details of experience, reflect on them, and give them order when they tell stories.

Data Collection

Finding the participants

The participants of this study are Japanese international students in the United States. I choose this group of international students because of the importance of *metacommunicative competence* and concern about *communication hegemony* (Briggs, 1986). Briggs (1986) claims that the interview is an example of metacomunication between an interviewer and a participant, and thus its process and result are greatly influenced by how both interviewer and participants interact with each other. The responses provided by a participant are jointly produced by an interviewer and interviewees. Briggs (1986) contends that an interview is a metacommunicative event

which requires metacommunicative competence. He maintains that the interview must be seen as an intercultural encounter where interviewers and interviewees frequently come from two different social and cultural backgrounds. Difference of metacommunicative competence between interviewer and participants may have a great impact on interview (Briggs, 1986). The greater the distance between the cultural and communicative norms of researcher and participants, the more likely that misinterpretation and distortion of respondents' thoughts and answers will occur. Interviewers should have in-depth understanding of and acquire the metacommunicative competence of the community of their respondents, and conduct interviews based upon the metacommunicative competence of the respondents. Furthermore, interviewers' unfamiliarity with the metacommunicative competence of respondents' community may distort the respondents' thoughts. The interview procedure is subject to the imposition of the researcher's own communicative pattern. Briggs (1986) conceptualizes this problematic attitude of interviewers as *communicative hegemony*. Communicative hegemony must be prevented from the interview; otherwise, it is impossible to understand the focused research phenomenon from the insiders' perspectives of respondents.

As an interviewer, I am an international student from Japan who moved to the United States after completing a Master's program in Japan. I am familiar with the metacommunicative competence of Japanese people. By interviewing Japanese students, I can conduct the interviews solely based on the common metacommunicative competence of both the interviewer and the interviewees. Consequently, it addressed the risk of communicative hegemony (Briggs, 1986). Moreover, it is not easy to articulate the issues about identity. Talking about this topic requires a great deal of reflection upon

their feelings and experiences. If I include international students from the other countries than Japan (e.g., China, Korea, and Taiwan), I have to interview them in English because it is the only common language between me and them. It may be difficult for some of them to articulate the subtlety of their particular experiences in English. It will be more difficult for those who have lived in the United State for relatively short period of time. If I interview them in English, it may result in producing superficial information. Interviews about such complicated matter should be conducted in the interviewees' native language. Hence, the present study focuses on Japanese international students.

The participants were found in two sites: A larger-scale university and a smaller-scale university in the U.S. Midwest. Hereafter, I call the former as "L-University" and the latter as "S-University." I found and recruited participants in several ways. First, I was invited to a party to celebrate the returning of a former Japanese student to the U.S. where I met Aya, a senior student of S-University. I also participated in the weekly meetings of a Japanese Students Association and introduced myself to the members and got to know them. I asked them if they were interested in participating in this research. From those who showed interest, I obtained their email addresses to schedule the interviews. I contacted them and scheduled four interviews with Junko, Yoko, Kana, and Hiromi. Maki is a friend of mine whom I have known for seven years. Maki then introduced me to her friend Satoshi. I found Tarou, Kouta, Kenji, Yasuko, Sayaka, and Sakura through Facebook. Tarou introduced me to Tetsuya, and Sayaka introduced me to Miho and Makoto. Miho introduced me to Akiko and Tomoko (All pseudonyms).

None of the Japanese students whom I approached rejected the request to participate in this study. When I sent a request message via email, I received positive

responses with messages which indicated their willingness, such as “I would love to participate in your study if it will help your study” “I find your research topic very interesting and important. I would love to participate in your study.” “I would love to participate in your study if it will make contribution to better understanding of Japanese students in the Untied States.”

Participants

There are a total of eighteen participants in this study. The participants are the students of Japanese nationals who currently attend a college or university in the United States. My initial requirements were that the participants must be Japanese nationals, who were born and raised in Japan and whose primary language is Japanese. There are six male and twelve female participants. Their ages range from twenty to thirty-four. There are eleven undergraduate students, five graduate students, one ESL but soon-to-be graduate student, and one post-doctoral researcher. Participants’ length of stay in the U.S. ranges from seven months to eight years and nine months. With regard to their hometowns, three participants are from Tokyo, three participants are from Yamaguchi, two are from Okayama, two are from Kagoshima, two are from Aichi, and remaining six students come from Gifu, Chiba, Hyougo, Shimane, Hiroshima, and Nara respectively. Ten students have prior-experiences living abroad and eight students do not have such experiences. Among the ten students with prior experiences, five students stayed in English countries such as Australia, US, or Canada for less than one month. As for the other five, Maki went to high school for one year, Kenji studied English for three months, Makoto studied Chinese in China for five months, Sakura studied English in Canada for

nine months, and Tomoko studied English in the U.S. for two months. The background information of the eighteen interview participants are outlined in Tabel 1.

There are ten international students, six exchange program students, one English school student, and one post-doctoral researcher. In this study, I differentiate international students from exchange students. International students are those who seek bachelors, masters, or doctoral degrees from a U.S. university. On the other hand, exchange students are those who take a one-year's leave of absence from their universities in Japan and study at a U.S. university for one year. Their course work is the same as American students: They take regular courses and receive grades. However, they do not study in the U.S. for a degree. The L-University has affiliations with several universities in Japan and have exchanged their students over years.

The Japanese students in S-University used the same commercial study abroad agency called (pseudonym, RGS) located in Japan. RGS is a commercial intermediary agency that mediates between Japanese students and the U.S. university and provides the students and their families with comprehensive support for preparation, living in the U.S., and job search after graduation. The students and their families pay at least 6,600,000 yen (approximately 71,000 US dollars) for the comprehensive expenses including the support service, full tuition until they complete the academic program, dormitory rent, food, airplane ticket, and so forth. Every May, they send a group of new students to S-University. Until the semester starts in August, they spend three months studying English at an ESL school to pass TOEFL scores. Students' campus life is arranged and regulated by this agency for the first year. They all have to live in the on-campus dormitory and they are not allowed to own a car for safety concerns. From the second year, students are

Table 1. Background Information of the Interview Participants

	Pseudonym	Gender	Age	Status	Academic level	Length of Stay	Past experience
1	Aya	Female	22	International	Senior	4yrs+9mos	No
2	Maki	Female	26	International	Master's	8yrs+9mos	Yes
3	Junko	Female	22	International	Junior	3yrs+9mos	No
4	Tarou	Male	23	Exchange	Master's	7mos	No
5	Kouta	Male	20	Exchange	Junior	7mos	No
6	Kenji	Male	21	International	Senior	2yrs+9mos	Yes
7	Sayaka	Female	22	Exchange	Senior	7mos	Yes
8	Yoko	Female	22	International	Senior	3yrs+9mos	Yes
9	Kana	Female	22	International	Senior	3yrs+10mos	Yes
10	Hiromi	Female	21	International	Sophomore	2yrs+10mos	Yes
11	Miho	Female	20	Exchange	Sophomore	7mos	No
12	Yasuko	Female	21	Exchange	Junior	7mos	Yes
13	Sakura	Female	23	Exchange	Master's	7mos	Yes
14	Makoto	Male	24	ESL	Master's *	7mos	Yes
15	Akiko	Female	34	International	PhD	7mos	No
16	Tomoko	Female	34	International	PhD	2yrs+7mos	Yes
17	Satoshi	Male	22	International	Senior	4yrs+7mos	No
18	Tetsuya	Male	31	Pos-doc	Post-Doc	2yrs+9mos	No

* Makoto will start Master's program from the coming semester

given freedom to choose their residence. All five participants from S-University used this agency.

Interview setting

The eighteen interviews took place between January 14th of 2010 and February 20th of 2010. All eighteen interviews took place individually. Only a single participant and the interviewer (myself) were present at the location. Fifteen interviews took place in private or semi-private places. The interview with Kana took place at her apartment. I interviewed fourteen participants in a group study room in the university library. A group study room is a locked private room where students use for the group work or individual study. Two rooms are connected with a glass window so the people in the next room are visible. The visibility and presence of the people in the next room did not influence the interview sessions. Because the interviews are conducted in Japanese and the people in the next room were American students, we both assumed that they did not understand what we were discussing. In the room, there is a table in the center, with four to six chairs in a room. The participant and I sat down at table facing each other at approximately three feet distance. Three interviews took place in a public place on campus. The interview with Junko took place in a cafeteria and I interviewed Aya and Maki at lounge areas in a university building. We chose an isolated area to keep distance from other students for better recording quality. It was a public place; however, speaking in Japanese protected the privacy of the content.

Developing Interview Protocol

Before I present the interview protocol, this section describes the process of designing interview protocol. I describe and explain how I prepared questions about

identity discrepancy and self-alienation. In order to design the interview protocol for this study, I conducted three pilot interviews with former Japanese international students. For the pilot interviews, I tried some questions and asked them for feedback regarding how difficult it was for them to answer each question. I studied their feedback to improve the interview protocol so that interviewees for the real study would have less difficulty in talking about the subtle and potentially complicated experiences about identities.

Questions about identity discrepancy. I needed to prepare the interview questions to ask about the consistency between and among one's self-perceived personal identity, one's self-observed performance, and one's perception of how others may see him or her. One way to prepare the interview question is to study the existing approaches to identity discrepancy. Jung and Hecht (Jung, 2003; Jung & Hecht, 2004) developed the quantitative measurement for identity gap. Although these were not designed for interview questions, they provided useful direction for the preparation of interview questions. The following is the scale of identity gap developed by Hecht and his colleagues:

Personal-enacted identity gap scale:

1. When I communicate with my communication partners, they get to know "real me."
2. I feel that I can communicate with my communication partners in a way that is consistent with who I really am.
3. I feel that I can be myself when communicating with my communication partners.
4. I express myself in a certain way that is not the real me when communicating with my communication partners.

5. I do not reveal important aspects of myself in communication with my communication partners.
6. When communicating with my communication partners. I often lose sense of who I am.
7. I do not express the real me when I think it is different from my communication partners' expectation.
8. I sometimes mislead my communication partners about who I really am.
9. There is a different between the real me and the impression I give my communication partners about me.
10. I speak truthfully to my communication partners about myself.
11. I freely express the real me in communication with my communication partners.

Persona-relational identity gap scale:

12. I feel that my communication partners see me as I see myself
13. I am different from the way my communication partners see me.
14. I agree with how my communication partners describe me.
15. I feel that my communication partners have wrong images of me.
16. I feel that my communication partners have correct information about me.
17. I feel that my communication partners portray me not based on information provided by myself but information from other sources.
18. I feel that my communication partners stereotype me.
19. I feel that my communication partners do not realize that I have been changing and still portray me based on my past Images.

20. I feel that my communication partners know who 1 used to be when they portray me.
21. When my communication partners talk about me. I often wonder if they talk about me or someone else.
22. I feel that there is no difference between who I think I am and who my communication partners think I am.
23. My communication partners like the things about me that I like about myself.

There are two problems about applying these identity gap scales to the present study. First, this scale uses a term "real me." Given the notion that there is no real or false me in the social interaction (Goffman, 1959), I found it problematic to ask them about "real me."

The second issue was discovered through the pilot interviews. I applied some of the scale items to my interview questions. However, these closed-ended questions do not work well in the interview settings. During the pilot interviews, it was obvious that one interviewee had a hard time answering each question. So I asked for her feedback. She told me, "Honestly, I don't know. I don't pay attention to such details when I communicate with someone." She also told me that, "Maybe I felt this and that at some point, somewhere. But when I am asked like this, I can't remember all of it." So for this study, I decided not to apply any of the items from Hecht and his colleagues' identity gap scale to my interview protocol.

In order to explore the experiences about personal identity, I first tried the question, "Do you experience anything related to your identity?" This question was unsuccessful. To answer this question, the participants talked about ethnic or cultural

identity, for example, their experiences as being Japanese in the United States. The response to this question was limited to their experiences about ethnic and cultural identity. This question did not help me to explore their experience about personal identity such as capability (e.g., intelligence, competence) and personality (e.g., friendliness).

Given all of the trials, I needed to prepare questions which use more specific terms than identity and which ask specifically about capability (e.g., intelligence, competence) and personality (e.g., friendliness). To achieve this goal, I came up with the following questions:

1. Have you ever felt that you cannot express your natural personality and character? Why is it difficult? How do you feel? How do you deal with the situation?
2. Have you ever felt that you cannot fully exercise your capabilities? Why is it difficult? How do you feel? How do you deal with the situation?

I tried out these questions with a couple of interviewees. I found these questions successful in the following ways: (1) I did not see the awkward reactions that I had seen in the pilot interviews; (2) these questions successfully directed the interviewees' attention inwardly to their personal identity; and (3) these questions facilitated the interviewees to talk more about each experience in detail. For each of the four questions, I asked follow-up questions to figure out: (1) Where?; (2) When?; (3) With whom?; (4) Why did that happen?; (5) Which dimension of identity?; and (6) How do they feel?

Questions about alienation from self. As previously described, there are six dimensions of alienation: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, value isolation, self-estrangement, and social isolation (Seeman, 1959). The measurements of self-estrangement or self-alienation are premature (Seeman, 1991). Seeman (1991) contends

that self-estrangement "is perhaps the most difficult to formulate both conceptually and operationally" (p.339). Likewise, it was challenging for me to ask interviewees about experiences of alienation from self for several reasons. First, self-alienation is an academic concept with which people are not familiar. As sociological and psychological terminology, self-alienation is translated to 自己疎外 or 自己異化 (see Appendix 5) in Japanese. However these are not everyday terms. Before I designed the interview protocol, I asked my Japanese friends, by email or phone, to see what these terms meant to them. As for自己疎外, all of them interpreted that it means "to separate oneself from others." Even if it consists of two terms 自己 (self) and 疎外 (separation), they do not interpret as "separation from self." Instead, all of them interpreted the terms as "separating myself from others" because 疎外itself means separating oneself from the others or world. All of them said they had never heard of 自己異化. I had to decompose into two terms自己 (self) and 異化 (alienation). However, they had never heard of異化 (alienation). None of them could figure out what自己異化 means.

I conducted three pilot interviews with non-student Japanese residents in the U.S. to figure out how to ask Japanese students about experiences of self-alienation. I asked them three questions in Japanese to see how their respective wordings would work.

1. Have you ever felt you are someone else?
2. Have you ever felt that you are alien to yourself?
3. Have you ever felt that a part of you gets separated from yourself?

All of them answered that they never felt that way. One of them maintained that these questions sound like "having mental disease" and one of them told me that she has felt frustrated with herself but she has never had "such schizophrenia-like mental condition."

The point is that they do get frustrated with themselves but their frustration is not extreme or serious to the extent that it can be expressed in these three questions. These three pilot interviews told me that these questions seemed to remind them of schizophrenia because schizophrenia is 精神分裂 in Japanese. 精神 means *mind* and 分裂 means *separation*. The expressions of "someone else" "alien to yourself" and "separate from yourself" seemed to remind them of schizophrenia (精神分裂). Thus, I needed to further elaborate the questions about self-alienation to make it more subtle so that it would not remind them of schizophrenia (精神分裂).

Based on the findings through my conversation with Japanese friends of mine and the findings from the pilot interviews, I decided to ask only one question: "Have you ever felt that you are someone else?" to examine if one has ever felt alienated from him- or herself in intercultural interactions.

Interview Protocol

Interview protocol begins with a series of closed questions for the participant's demographic and background information (see Appendix 1, 2, 3, &4). These types of information are important for me to understand an interviewee's experience in his or her distinctive context (Mishler, 1986). Thus, demographic and background information is collected using close-ended question sheets which each participant fills in with a pencil. Demographic information includes age, gender, marital status, hometown in Japan, length of residence in the U.S., educational history, current academic status, and major. In addition, the close-ended questionnaire collected information about future plans after graduation and past experiences of living abroad. Future plans may influence their motivation to commit themselves into the larger society of the United States, and it may

subsequently influence their intercultural experiences. Past experiences of living abroad may also influence their intercultural experiences because such experiences are positively associated with their readiness to intercultural encounters.

An interview starts from the question about the participants' reasons for coming to the United States to study (i.e., why did you decide to come to the United States to study?). Japanese students' intercultural experiences should be more or less influenced by how they originally made a decision to study aboard. Followed by the question about the reason, a series of the general questions about their general life satisfaction (i.e, How do you like your life in the United States?), self-perceived cultural differences (i.e., What kind of cultural differences have you found?), problems (i.e., What do you find troublesome?, What kind of difficulties and problems have you experienced?), concerns (i.e., Do you have any concerns?); academic life (i.e., How are your classes in the United States?), and sense of fulfillment (i.e., When do you think you are doing well in the United States?; Do you feel at home here?; What is enjoyable for you?
When do you feel sense of achievement?)

After we talk about general issues and I get familiar with the background information of each participant, I move on to questions about their experiences related their personal identity and the consistency between and among one's self-perceived identity, one's self-observed performance, and one's perception of others' perceived on his or her personal identity. The questions start from the relatively broad questions; (a) When do you feel frustrated about yourself; and (b) Please compare you in the US and you in Japan. How do you feel about the differences? Then, the focused questions are asked:

1. Have you ever felt that you cannot express your natural personality and character?
2. Have you ever felt that you cannot fully exercise your capabilities?
3. Have you ever felt that you cannot express your feelings and thoughts?

The next aspect is interpersonal relationships with: (a) American acquaintances and friends; (b) local Japanese people; (c) international students from the other countries; and (d) family and friends in Japan. I am interested in their intimacy, frequency of contact with their American or Japanese friends, the size of the three types of social network in the United States (i.e., those with Americans, local Japanese, and other international students), satisfaction about the current situation regarding interpersonal relationships. Particularly as for the relationships with family and friends in Japan, I will ask them how to stay in touch with them (e.g., telephone, internet). While they talk about their relationships with Americans, I naturally ask about their self-assessed level of English proficiency. Moreover, I will also pay attention to their romantic relationships since they may have a highly significant impact on their overall intercultural experiences. The following are questions regarding interpersonal relationships:

4. What is your relationship with American friends like?
5. What is your relationship with Japanese friends like?
6. What is your relationship with international students from the other countries like?
7. Are there any difficulties in communicating with Americans?
8. When do you think that you are not communicating well with Americans?
9. When do you think that you are communicating well with Americans?

Finally, I asked several questions about their overall experiences in the United States, including growth, change, maintenance of Japanese culture, and the idea about living in a foreign country, and how they stay in touch with people and culture in Japan.

10. Do you think you made a good decision to come to the US? In what way?
11. Do you think you have grown since you came to the US?
12. Do you think you have changed since you came to the US?
13. Is there anything that you try not to change about your *Japaneseness*?
14. Please tell me the important things for Japanese to remember when they move to and live in the US.
15. How do you stay in touch with people in Japan and Japanese culture and society?

Interview procedure

The interactional goals of interviewer and interviewees may also influence interview process and outcomes (Briggs, 1986). Interviews may change depending on interviewees' motivation and orientation toward the interview such as willingness to participate in the interview and share their stories with an interviewer (Briggs, 1986). Prior to the interview, the interviews were informed that the purpose of the interview is to collect data for my dissertation which aims to understand the difficulties that Japanese international students experience in the United States. Therefore, it is obvious that my interactional goal is data collection for this research, and the interviewees' interactional goal is to cooperate in this research for the academic data collection.

Each interview was conducted in Japanese, the native language of both the interviewer and interviewees. After the interviewees consented to participate and gave me permission to record the interview, I began recording. Each interview started with filling

in the demographic and background information questionnaire with the pencil. Once they completed the questionnaire, I asked questions to clarify and amplify the information. Immediately followed by the questionnaire, I started asking the prepared open-ended questions one at a time.

The interview is semi-structured because the purpose of this study is to explore and understand the phenomenon. Semi-structured or "unstructured interview" (Fontana & Frey, 2005) attempts to "understand the complex behavior of members of society without imposing any a priori categorization that may limited the field of inquiry" (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p.706).The interview is guided by the prepared protocol, in which all of the interview questions are open-ended. However, all of the eighteen interviews were closer to casual conversations among acquaintances or friends than formal research interviews. I tried to talk with the interviewee in a casual manner for the purpose of making them feel comfortable enough to share more of their experiences, thoughts, and feelings.

Instead of using a sheet of paper listing questions, I used a stack of 3"x 5" flash cards. For the first five interviews including the three pilot interviews, I used a list of questions on paper to guide the interviews. I noticed that that this form of interview protocol did not work well because I had to look down on the sheet and look for the next question, which damaged the flow of interaction between me and the interviewees. Therefore, I switched to the stack of flash cards with one question per card. By using flash cards, I could maintain eye contact with them and show them my attentiveness. The absence of a sheet of paper on the desk might help me create a more casual atmosphere in the interview setting.

As many have argued (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997; Fontana, 2002; Herts, 1997; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; Schreurich, 1995), interviewing is not merely the neutral exchange of asking questions and getting answers. The interviewer is a human being. Scheurich (1997) observes that the interviewer is a person who is historically and contextually located, inevitably carrying conscious or unconscious motives, desires, feelings and biases. The interviewer is not a neutral tool which only follows pre-programmed script (e.g. close-ended questions, coding scheme) and produces standardized records. Scheurich (1997) maintained, "The conventional, positivist view of interviewing vastly underestimates the complexity, uniqueness, and indeterminateness of each one-to-one human interaction (p.241).

After Douglas (1985) first advocated the empathetic approach in interviewing that encourages interviewers to honestly reveal their stances (e.g., personal feelings and private situations), there is a new empathetic approach (Fontana & Frey, 2005). This new empathetic approach in interviewing sees that it is time to stop treating the interviewee as a "clockwork orange," (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p.696) that is, "looking for a better juicer (techniques) to squeeze the juice (answers) out of the orange (living person/interviewee). With the new empathetic interview, the interviewer becomes "an advocate and partner in the study, hoping to be able to use the results to advocate social policies and ameliorate the conditions of the interviewee" (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p.696). The empathetic approach is a moral method because it attempts to restore the sacredness of humans before addressing any methodological concerns (Fontana & Frey, 2005).

The interviews conducted in this study can be categorized in the empathetic approach (Fontana & Frey, 2005). Throughout the interview, I revealed my personal

experiences and private feelings as an international student to the interviewees as an attempt to have one-to-one human interactions with the interviewees. I considered interviewing Japanese international students as an opportunity for me to make the voices of Japanese international students heard by scholars whose interests include intercultural communication, acculturation, and second language acquisition, as well as the practitioners in the field of international student services and psychological counseling.

Global assessment of the interviews

Eighteen interviews were conducted for this study. The interview time ranged from 1 hour and 1 minute to 2 hours and 7 minutes. The average is 1 hour and 22 minutes. The length of transcripts ranges from 536 lines to 1524 lines (average of 39 character per line), and the average is 769 lines. All of the participants were well-engaged in the interviews and willing to share their experiences and thoughts with me. All of the eighteen interviewees appeared to have a lot to say about their experiences in the United States. For each interview question, the interviewees shared a lot of information. Their answers to my one-line question were transcribed to at least two or three lines. Sometime their answers are transcribed to more than ten lines.

The overall feedback from the interviewees implies that rapport between me and the interviewees was successfully established, and this study successfully obtained the in-depth information about the experiences and thoughts of Japanese international students. Out of the eighteen, eleven interviewees (Aya, Junko, Tarou, Sayaka, Yoko, Kana, Sakura, Makoto Akiko, Tomoko, and Satoshi) commented that they enjoyed the interview or had great time talking with me. For example, Sakura revealed the details of her difficulties in class which she rarely shares with her Japanese friends here. The fact

that I went through the same agony as a graduate students encouraged her to share them with me. Sakura, Sayaka, Yasuko, Miho, and Kouta confided to me that there was a sensitive issue about the relationships among the other Japanese students. Miho talked about a painful experience in class in a tearful voice. Akiko told me that the interview with me was like a counseling session for her and it helped her release her stress and discover what her problems really are. Satoshi vented his complaints and criticism about Americans and American society in Japanese. Junko shared about her experience of racial discrimination with me.

From the standpoint of seeing the interview as a communicative performance of interviewees (Briggs, 1986), I could see that they all have a great deal of Japanese communicative competence to verbally articulate their experiences and feelings, as well as they have a willingness to share their personal experiences and private feelings with me. Before the interviews, I had met the Japanese students from S-University once at a Japanese Student Association meeting. However, for the students from L-University, the interview was the point of initial contact. Regardless of the unfamiliarity between us, they willingly opened up themselves and talked a lot about their experiences. Given their high communicativeness in Japanese, it is not difficult for me to imagine how much they are frustrated when they cannot communicate well with Americans.

A few interviewees shared their emotional experiences less than the others. It seemed that Kouta kept his guard up in the beginning of the interview and he was answering each interview question as if he was at a job interview. He used a very formal and polite register of Japanese. Unlike most western languages, Japanese has an extensive grammatical system to express politeness and formality. The person in a lower position is

expected to use a polite form of speech, whereas the other might use a more plain form. This position is determined by a variety of factors including job, age, experience, or even psychological state (e.g., a person asking a favor tends to do so politely). Broadly speaking, there are three main politeness levels in spoken Japanese: the plain form, the simple polite form (丁寧語 *Teineigo*) and the advanced polite form (敬語*Keigo*). In the beginning of the interview, Kouta used the simple polite form (敬語*Keigo*) in which verbs end with the helping verb -masu, and the copula desu is used. While he was talking about the differences he has found in the value of hierarchy between Japan and US, he commented that he values the hierarchical relationship and he is always very careful to use appropriate speech style when talking to someone older and superior. It is highly possible that he was trying to be polite to me because he was conscious that I am older and a doctoral candidate. Tetsuya was willing to participate in this interview research; however, his lifestyle does not fit these questions. While the majority of the interview questions are concerned about interactions with Americans, Tetsuya is a post-doctoral researcher in pharmacy and has no American colleagues. He has a very minimal level of interaction with Americans in his life (e.g., ordering at restaurant, conversations with car mechanics). Therefore, it was difficult for us to talk about significant intercultural interactions which involve the experience of his self-perceived personal identity. The interview with Yoko had an interesting start. I asked her about her reason for coming to the United States and she gave me a very articulate answer. When I told her, "Wow, you are very clear and articulate." She replied, "This is how I've trained myself to talk at job interviews." She is about to graduate and is preparing for a job search, which includes practicing job interviews. Throughout the interviews, there is a touch of self-glorification

in her attitude because she emphasized the positive sides of the experiences and how well she handled the situation. For example, I asked, "Have you experienced any difficulties in the U.S?" She said, "I have, but after all, I think I did good job. I am not saying that I did not have difficulties at all, but I managed to overcome and people helped me, and here I am. I am doing well now." Her attitude made me feel as if I was playing the role of an interviewer at her job interview

In this study, I treat an interview as a communicative event between me and the Japanese international students, instead of thinking of it as a mere one-way interaction of exchanges between a series of questions and answers. Both an interviewer and the participants are engaged and perform in the social interactions. This perspective was proposed by Briggs's (1986) book, *Learning How to Ask*, and exercised in the study of Miller, Wang, Sandel and Cho (2002). Briggs's (1986) basic point is that, while interviewers attempt to gather information about phenomena, the interview itself is a type of metacommunicative event and performance. Briggs (1986) suggests that researchers should pay attention not only to what people say, but to when and how they say it verbally and nonverbally.

Social roles and interactional goals of both an interviewer and an interviewee also influence the interview process and outcomes (Briggs, 1986). In this study, both of us were clearly aware that I played the role of interviewer and they played the role of interviewee. However, it is important to note that both interviewer and interviewees do not just inhabit one social role, that is interviewer and interviewees. Since an interview is a Metacomunication (Briggs, 1986), other social roles probably come into play during their question-answer interactions. For example, in the current study, the interviewer's

social role as a Ph.D. candidate and the interviewees' social role as undergraduate students may influence the interview process and outcome.

The interviews are communicative events between two current Japanese international students in the U.S. I (i.e., the interviewer) am an international student from Japan. Before the interview started, I briefly introduced myself to each participate telling them I am a doctoral student in communication and have lived in the U.S. since 2002. Most of them were surprised that I have lived in the U.S. for eight years, and some of them commented about my cross-country transition (e.g., "You must be accustomed to living in the U.S."). Given that length of stay, I possibly might strike them as an experienced or expert international student who has no problem living in the U.S. However, as the interview proceeded, I shared my past and current difficulties in my studies and friendships, and I believe that they got an idea that I still struggle after I had lived in the U.S. for nearly eight years. In this way, the interview became the approximation of the naturally occurring conversation between two current Japanese international students.

The fact that I am also an international student helped them share more of their experiences. The knowledge that we have been through similar experiences might make them expect and assume that I would probably understand what they are talking about. When a participant and I had the same or similar experiences, I told them that I had similar experiences. This sharing process motivated them to talk more about it. When a participant is not sure about a reason for his or her action or feeling, I could create a cooperative conversation by saying something like "I hear you. I am always wondering why, too. Why do you think it is so hard?" This question made them think and analyze

the experiences from the objective perspective, and they mention some possible reasons even though they mentioned they were not sure about the reason. Interestingly, they ended up talking about themselves and they mentioned a reason or two for their own experiences. As such, my status allowed me to create a more natural conversation instead of a one-way exchange of question and answers between me and them, and the natural conversation provides them with an occasion to reflect and analyze their experiences. As the fact that most of the interviews lasted more than one hour proves, the interviewees were willing to share about their experiences with me. I assume that the knowledge that I am also an international students and the sharing process contributed to this success.

I became aware of how the fact that both the interviewer and interviewees are Japanese nationals and Japanese native speakers influences the interview process. First, it allowed them to talk about the negative features of American people and society. I assumed that they would hesitate to talk about such topics toward an American interviewer. Since I am a Japanese national, they seemed to consider that it would not be inappropriate to disclose their complaints about Americans. As a result, this study finds that the Japanese international students perceive the behaviors of American students toward them to be problematic (i.e., unfriendly, unwilling to communicate).

Secondly, interviewing about their intercultural experiences in Japanese helped the interviewees to disclose more of their internal states such as feelings and inner thoughts. With regard to feelings, speaking in Japanese allowed them to vent their accumulated frustration, which leads to better understanding of their emotional struggles. With respect to disclosure of their inner thoughts, the interviewees experienced the situation in English and they described it in Japanese during the interviews. This enabled

them to verbalize their unspoken thoughts and feelings that they had in their minds during the interaction with Americans. During the interaction they had the inner thoughts which they were speaking to themselves in Japanese. However, they would not and/or could not disclose such inner thoughts toward the interlocutors in English. They kept them in their minds. At the interviews, they revealed the inner thoughts that they had in Japanese in the intercultural communication with Americans. As such, interviewing in Japanese provided me with the access to the inner world of each interviewee.

Data Analysis

Ethnographic analysis

The data set (i.e., interview transcripts, observation notes, audiotapes) is analyzed using an ethnographic analysis approach (see Creswell, 2006; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The purpose of an ethnographic approach is to describe the characteristics of the phenomenon under study and develop an understanding of the focal phenomenon (e.g., Green, Dixon, & Zaharlick, 2002; Hammersley, & Atkinson, 1995). An ethnographic approach can elicit rich descriptions of the phenomenon of interest for several reasons. First, the data is analyzed in holistic manner (Creswell, 2006). The whole phenomenon under study is understood as a complex system that is more than the sum of its parts, and researchers focus on the complexity of the phenomenon that cannot meaningfully be reduced to a few discrete variables and cause-effect relationships (Creswell, 2006). Second, an ethnographic approach appreciates the diversity among the participants as much as the common themes and patterns. The final reports should cover all of the findings including both common and unique features. Third, an ethnographic approach places a greater emphasis on analyzing data from the perspective of the participants. It is participants' descriptions, not the researchers' analytical schemes, which provide an

explanation for their actions. Unlike a grounded theory approach, an ethnographic approach strongly requires that researchers should not apply any analytic schemes to analyze data. For them, the axial coding of a grounded theory method is a "top-down" process of inquiry. The relationships between phenomena are found only when the participants' descriptions of certain experiences demonstrate the relationships. The final product of an ethnographic approach is a rich, accurate, and holistic description of the phenomenon under study (Geertz, 1973). The ethnographic approach to interview transcriptions is interested in neither the abstraction of the complexity of studied worlds nor the presentation of empirical relationships which provides explanations for people's actions.

The present study analyzes the interview transcripts using an ethnographic approach for the following reasons. The primary reason is a research purpose. The goal of this research is to provide rich, accurate and "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) of Japanese international students' intercultural communication of identity consisting of the experiences about their respective self-perceived personal identities, their self-observed performances, and their respective perceptions of others' perspectives. I am interested in understanding this issue from the perspectives of Japanese international students and in a holistic manner. To that extent, the purpose of this paper is not to propose an abstract theory about the phenomenon or to abstract the complexity of their experiences by distilling the textual data to a set of concepts. Likewise, my goal is to describe the complexity as it is, and therefore does not delve into theory development or drawing theoretical relationships. Thus, this study utilizes the ethnographic approach to analyze the data set.

All interviews are conducted in Japanese. I personally transcribed the audio-recorded interviews verbatim and analyzed the Japanese transcripts. The data analysis was conducted in Japanese. For the presentation of findings, I translated the quotations of the interviews to English. Throughout the data analysis, I strictly utilize an emic approach to analyze the data because it allows that data to be interpreted from the perspective of Japanese international students, where participants attribute meaning to their communicative actions (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The fact that I am an insider of this group helps me to analyze the data using the emic approach.

Analysis process

The first step of the data analysis was to catalogue the information of each interview transcript. Each participant talked about a variety of subjects during the in-depth individual interviews. I catalogued incident-by-incident and theme-by-theme. I catalogued the interview transcripts in order to organize the information. I did not perform this procedure to distill textual data to a set of categories or concepts. Using Microsoft Excel software, I made a table consisting of four rows. The first row is for theme (e.g., communication with Americans). The second row is a brief summary of each event or comment or key phrases in their remarks (e.g., Americans ignored me, "I feel as if I was a different person"). The third row was kept blank until I could identify the common concept. The fourth row was for excerpts with its line number. I used line numbers as a guide when I needed to go back to the transcripts for a closer examination. This process helped me organize the findings in terms of the incidents, themes or similarities/differences. I invested substantial amount of time for this process by going back and forth between the catalogues and transcripts and comparing the participants.

Comparative perspectives helped me to find the salient issues in each interview. Sometime it was not until I analyzed the next interview that I noticed a significant theme in the first interview. This process helped me to get to know and understand each participant. I am familiar with the eighteen participants to the extent which I remember each participant's characteristics and main experiences.

As I catalogued the information, I identified the experiences which involved the consistency/inconsistency between and among one's self-perceived personal identity, one's self-observed performance, and one's perception of others' perspectives (i.e., how one believes others may see him or her). To examine *how* Japanese overseas students experience identity discrepancy, I analyzed events of identity discrepancy case-by-case. I focused on the following components of the events: (1) scene and/or setting; (2) interactants; (3) the aspects of self-perceived personal identity; (4) the description of self-observed performance; (5) the description of Japanese students' perception of Americans' perspectives; (6) the reasons for identity discrepancy; and (7) feelings about identity discrepancy. I paid attention to the interviewees' paralanguage messages (e.g., tone, speed, laughs) and body gesture during the interview in order to figure out how much each experience affected the interviewees and the intensity of the feelings they have about the experiences. I integrated the audio data and observation note with textual data (i.e., interview transcripts).

The purpose of this study is to describe the experiences from the perspective of Japanese international students. Therefore, it is of great importance to focus on how the interviewees themselves interpret and describe their experiences and events. It is necessary to separate the researcher's interpretation from the interviewees' interpretation

of the events. For this reason, I attempted to bracket my assumption or interpretation from this analysis process. Specifically, in some cases, I could assume the causal relations between their experiences and the latent contextual factors (e.g., personality, status as a one-year exchange student), which the interviewee themselves did not mention in the interviews. I exclude this assumption from the findings.

Data analysis began during the interview sessions. While I talked with them and closely studied all of the interview transcripts, I came to realize the common patterns among the participants with respect to their communication and relationships with American students. They were noticeable because the same or very similar issues and features reoccurred among the eighteen participants and each participant had a lot to talk about it.

Finally, in order to ensure trustworthiness, a third set of interviews were conducted with participants. This third set of interviews served as a member check to confirm the accuracy of the researcher's interpretation (Morse, 1989). I validated and confirmed the results with the participants. All participants agreed with the findings.

CHAPTER FOUR: COMMUNICATION WITH AMERICANS

This study finds the four problems that Japanese international students have in terms of the communication with Americans. The relationship with the dominant group members is one of the features of intercultural experiences of sojourners and immigrants. Ward and colleagues explain that cultural adjustment is broadly divided into two categories: psychological and sociocultural (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1992; Ward, 2001). Psychological adjustment refers to feelings of well-being or satisfaction during cross-cultural transitions. Sociocultural adaptation refers to the ability to 'fit in' or execute effective interactions in a new cultural milieu.

Making friends with Americans is beneficial for Japanese international students for several reasons. First, it provides them with opportunities to use English. Acquisition of English is a prerequisite for their academic and daily life. Second language learners can learn a lot about the target language through the face-to-face interaction with native speakers. For the one-year exchange program students, learning English is their primary purpose to come to the US. Second, they are able to learn a lot about American culture through the time they spend with American students. Third, having good friends around is comforting regardless of the situation. As the literature shows, international students are likely to suffer from loneliness because they are apart from their family and close friends in their home countries (e.g., Sheehan & Pearson, 1995; Sandhu, 1994; Sodowsky & Carey, 1987). Their loneliness may be eased by making friends with American students, Japanese students, or other international students. Existing studies have found a positive correlation between sojourners' relationships with local people and their

psychological well-being (Abe, Talbot, & Geelhoed, 1998; Mallinckrodt & Leong, 1992; Perrucci & Hu, 1995; Prieto, 1995; Schram & Lauver, 1988; Surdam & Collins, 1984).

Making friends with Americans is a matter of personal choice. Of course some international students can live happily without any American friends. They can enjoy themselves with people from the same country. In fact, one of the interviewees for this study mentioned a friend of hers who has no American friends and hangs out with only Japanese students. Some international students want to make friends with American students for any reason they have. In the present study, all of the Japanese students have good American friends, and/or want to make more friends with American students.

This study finds that interethnic communication between American and Japanese students is messier than what theories or theoretical models have described (e.g., Kim, 2001). The reality regarding communication with Americans cannot be explained simply by international students' limited English language ability or their communication apprehension. Based on their personal experience in the U.S., Japanese students described the problems which they experience in interactions and relationships with American students. This chapter presents the problems that Japanese students experience and notice in communication and relationship with Americans. Since they are students, the Americans with whom they have contact are mainly American college students. The four features emerged with regard to Japanese students' experiences of intercultural communication with Americans students: (1) the problematic behaviors of Americans toward Japanese students; (2) the relationship with Japanese-connected Americans; (3) the lack of common topics; and (4) the difficulty in joking and laughing together with Americans.

The Attitudes and Behaviors of American Students

Studies have discussed problematic behaviors and attitudes of local people toward sojourners and immigrants and many of them discuss racial discrimination and prejudice (e.g., Biasco, Goodwin, & Vitale, 2001; Constantine, Kindaichi, Okazalo, Gainor, & Baden, 2005; D'Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Hodson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2002). Existing studies have paid attention to such intergroup behaviors and attitudes of local people toward sojourners and immigrants. Focusing on language issues, studies regarding language attitude (see Cargile, Giles, Ryan, & Bradac, 1994) have documented that standard American English speakers tend to evaluate accented speakers negatively with respect to status, attractiveness, and dynamism (e.g., Bodtker, 1992; Cargile, 1997; Cargile & Giles, 1998; Hewstone & Giles, 1984; Giles, Williams, Mackie, & Rosselli, 1995; Gill. 1994; Mulac, Hanley, & Prigge, 1974). As such, existing studies have recognized that local people tend to hold problematic behaviors and attitudes toward sojourners and immigrants.

The Japanese international students in this study talked about their unpleasant experiences with American students. During the interviews, quite a few interviewees mentioned that American students have unfriendly behaviors toward them, and such experience significantly discourages Japanese students from making friends with them. In this study, three aspects are found with regard to Americans' behaviors toward international students: (1) unwillingness to communicate; (2) unfriendly reactions; and (3) problematic speaking behaviors.

When interpreting this finding, it is of great importance to be aware of the following four issues. First, the description of American students' behaviors is not

actuality; rather, it is what and how Japanese students perceive and believe. Second, from the present data set (i.e., interviews with Japanese students), true motives or intentions of American students remain unknown or uncertain. Various explanations can account for their behaviors. Third, Japanese students may simply misunderstand American students' behaviors. Fourth, it is because they are Japanese that they view American students' behaviors in that way. The international students from other countries (e.g., France, Germany) may not find the same behaviors of American students as, for example, unfriendly.

Unwillingness to Communicate

Second language acquisition literature has recognized the importance of willingness to communication of second language learners to initiate conversation and improve their communicative skills (Clément, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998). Researchers have placed too much focus on the willingness of second language learners and they have paid less attention to the native speakers' willingness to communication with non-native speakers. There are not studies of native speakers' willingness to communicate with non-native speakers.

The interviewees talked about their experiences of American students' unwillingness to communicate with international students. Before she came to the U.S., *Sayaka* was told about the difficulty making friend with Americans from the former participants in the same exchange study abroad program. Her experience is consistent with theirs. She said:

> It [my life in the US] is fun. It is fun but I was told that it is difficult to make friends with Americans… They told me things like, "Americans and Japanese are not on the same wavelength," "Americans had the different rhythm of talking," "they are not interested in Japan," "it would be hard to make friends unless they

> are very interested in Japanese culture," and "Americans would give you the cold shoulder if you falter in your speech or you have to ask what they tell you again in the conversation." I think these are all true.

After she has lived in the U.S. for seven months, she comes to agree with the former exchange students on how difficult it is to make friends with Americans because they are not interested in international students. Sayaka narrated an event in which American students show her unwillingness when she talked to them:

> We are taking the same class. No matter how hard I try to talk with them, they give me the cold shoulder. After that, I saw the same person talking to the other who can speak English. I guess they were irritated with my English because I cannot speak fluently and spontaneously.

Sayaka's experiences tell us that the difficulty in communicating with American students cannot be explained only by the international students' apprehension or social anxiety. Sayaka did make an effort to initiate conversation with American students. However she perceived American students to be unwilling to talk with her. As she perceived such American unwillingness, she became more apprehensive to initiate conversation with American students.

Junko has both American and Japanese friends equal in number. According to her, she is closer to her American friends than Japanese friends. She describes her relationships with her Japanese friends as "more like acquaintances." Over the weekend, she hangs out with her American friends. She has close American friends with whom she shares her personal matters. The weekend with them going out and having a party is her favorite part of her life in the U.S. In class, she occasionally asks her classmates for clarification when she cannot understand instructors' English. Some students are willing to help her, but others are not:

> Some classmates did not help me at all when I asked questions. I couldn't understand a teacher so I immediately asked this person, "What did the teacher just say?" This person said, "I don't know." In my mind, I was like, "You are lying! It is not true that you do not know! You are an American. I know you knew what the teacher said!"

Junko found this American student to be rude to her because he or she refused to help her out. This is nothing but Junko's observation and interpretation. In reality, this person might have had no idea about what the teacher said and he or she was being completely honest to tell her, "I don't know." But in this situation, Junko perceived a mean intention in this person's behavior and took it personally.

An exchange student *Miho* talked about her painful experiences in which she was isolated in the French class. She was tearful as talking this event:

> One time, it has happened only once, in the French class, we paired up with the classmates to practice. The person next to me who everyone would expect to pair with me asked another person. I felt a bit sad…I had to change my seat to pair up with someone else. I was sad that time. I felt that it is not good that I cannot communicate in English. Anyway, the number of the students in the class is odd so I was the extra for pair practice. I joined the pair and we practiced as a group of three. Afterwards, we had to do the pair practice again. So I naturally expected that I could work with the same pair and so I approached to them. But they gave me the cold shoulder. I thought they wanted me to go away. I might have think too much but it was hurting [tearful voice].

In this French class, American students' behaviors hurt Miho's feelings. Most probably, they had no mean intentions toward her. Taking into account that this took place in a French class, it is possible to assume that they were motivated to learn French with someone more fluent than her. That being said, it is still important for American students to carefully think about the consequences of their behaviors. These events can be seen as an indicator that some domestic American students do not welcome international students to their classes.

Interestingly, Miho put herself in the American students' places and she reflected how she treated Chinese international students at her part-time job in Japan. Miho said:

> It [The experience of being avoided in the French class] hurts but I think about it. We would not want to work together with someone whom we can't understand. When I worked a part-time job in Japan, Chinese international students worked together. They didn't seem to understand Japanese well. Because they didn't understand Japanese, it was difficult for me to communicate with them. I have no intention to discriminate against them whatsoever, but I needed to mentally prepare when we were on the same shift. I thought, "Ah, okay, I have to work a bit harder today." So well, I can understand American students' feeling that they don't like international students.

Having been treated unkindly by American students, Miho reflected on her past behavior toward Chinese international students in Japan and tried to rationalize American students' behaviors toward her. Based on her rationalization, she said, "I can understand American students' feeling that they don't like international students." Here it is important to note the two things: (1) Miho's experience in this French class made her think about her own behavior toward Chinese international students in Japan; and (2) she interprets American students' behaviors from their perspectives and shows her observation of their behaviors.

Similarly, *Aya***,** a senior student, has experienced American students' unpleasant attitudes toward her:

> When I explain cultural differences in class, the students who aren't trying to understand can never understand what I am trying to say. There are the students who listen to me with the attitude of "Whatever. That Asian is saying something," right?...I can see it through their arrogant attitude that they are not listening to me. There are the students who sincerely listen to me, ask me questions, and show their interest. I think, "They are trying to understand me." But if they are not trying to understand, there is no way that they can understand me.

Aya has observed American students' indifferent listening behavior in class when she was explaining Japanese culture. In the same way with Miho, Aya also said she could

understand why the American students behave unfriendly toward international students. She talked about her possible behavior toward a foreigner in Japan:

> Perhaps, if a strange foreigner talks to me when I'm busy and frustrated, I would be irritated a little bit. It is okay if I have time to spare, but if I am asked for directions when I am in hurry, I would tell them to ask someone else, I think. I probably would. So I kind of see why they do that to me. I can understand their feeling a little bit.

Aya also interprets American students' attitudes toward her from their perspectives and rationalizes their attitudes. She imagines how it would bother native speakers to talk with non-native speakers, and demonstrates understanding for them.

As these personal accounts show, international students' unfamiliarity with English or culture is not the only reason why they cannot make friends with Americans. It is challenging for international students to make friends with American students because they perceive some American students to be unwilling to communicate with international students. No matter how they want to talk with them and make friends with them, it is difficult to communicate with American students because they perceive their unwillingness.

Unfriendly Reaction

Along with unwillingness, the Japanese students in this study mentioned unfriendly behaviors of American students. According to them, American students tend to react toward their imperfect English in an unfriendly manner. Many international students cannot speak English as fluently as native speakers do. When international students talk, American students sometimes have to ask for clarification. They could ask in either a friendly or unfriendly manner. The Japanese students in this study gave me vivid descriptions of how unfriendly American students tend to react toward them. When

Hiromi talked to American students, they sometime reacted to her saying "What?" with aggressive tone. She is now scared of such a reaction.

> It is easier to talk to Americans in the situation like Conversation Café because they voluntarily attend to communicate with international students. But in the classroom, they [American students] don't know how much I can speak English and how to talk with me. They sometime give me "What?" reaction. I can't talk to them because I am scared of that reaction. So I don't know how to approach and talk to them.

Conversation Café was originally created for bible study by four American female college students of S-University. Now Conversation Café is a speech event (Hymes, 1974) in which the purpose is, for international students, to practice English communication skills, and for the American participants, to help them learn English. They meet weekly at church and engage in casual conversations. The majority of American participants are the elderly members of the church and international student participants come from all over the world.

As Hiromi said, it is easier for international students to communicate with Americans in English at Conversation Café than American students in class. American students in class tend to react to their influent English in an unfriendly manner, while the American participants in Conversation Café tend to react in a friendly manner Therefore, Hiromi finds it easier to talk with Americans at Conversation Café.

The difference of the reaction toward international students between the Americans at Conversation Café and American students in class stems from the different purpose they have for a communicative event (Hymes, 1974). The American participants in Conversation Café engage in conversations with a clear motive to help international students learn English, whereas most American students in class do not have that kind of motive when communicating with international students. As Hymes (1974) posits, the

purpose of a communicative event at Conversation Café generates friendly behaviors of Americans.

Sayaka maintains that she hesitates to initiate conversations with Americans due to the following reason:

> I am concerned by their reactions. When they asked me "What?" while I am speaking English, I overreact to it thinking "Oh no! Did I make a mistake now?" Although she might just mishear and there is nothing wrong with my English, I still repeating what I just said over and over in my head and think "Was that wrong?" I am scared of them denying my English.

Sakura has the similar experience:

> One day, one of my classmates talked to me like "What do you think about this part here?' but I didn't know exactly how to respond so I barely managed to say "It was interesting." That was all I could say. That person gave me the look telling me "That's all you can say?" It was very scary. Since then, I have been no good at it.

Additionally, *Junko* is sometimes discouraged from talking to Americans because she is scared of being stopped from trying to communicate with them. She said, "When I cannot speak well, sometime Americans terminate our conversation. They tell me to stop speaking. They say, 'That is okay now.' So this fear stopped me from talking to Americans."

As we have seen in these three excerpts, Japanese students have received unfriendly reactions from American students toward their imperfect English, and they are afraid of Americans' cold reaction. This fear stops them from approaching Americans and initiating conversations with them. The dialogues between them were short ones consisting of only a few words. Yet, these experiences have had a great impact on them. The American students' behaviors were quite memorable for them.

Problematic Speaking Behavior

In addition to unwillingness to communicate and unfriendly reaction of American students, the Japanese students in this study find Americans' speaking behaviors as problematic. They think that Americans' speaking style makes it difficult for them to understand them and communicate with them.

They don't know how to talk. *Hiromi* mentioned that American students hesitate to talk to international students because they do not know how to talk with them. She described her observation of apprehension and hesitation of American students to talk to international students:

> It seems that they [American students] don't know how to initiate a conversation with me. I have been told it is not true…I guess, from their standpoint, the international students are incomprehensible. They really don't know what to do with us. Then they have no need to talk to us, so they won't bother to talk to us.

Hiromi believes that American students don't know what to do or how to communicate with international students. If they were interested in communicating with international students, they would make an effort to get to know international students; however, according to her, because American students have no desire or need to talk with international students, they do not bother to make an effort to talk with international students.

Speaking fast. Tarou, Sayaka, and Kouta reported that American students do not speak slowly even though they clearly are international students whose English proficiency is limited. They are not satisfied with how American students communicate with them. In the beginning of her study aboard experience, *Sayaka* was extremely frustrated to the extent that a glance at English got on her nerves:

> I was like, "I don't understand this at all! Why is everything in English?" I thought, "Speak more slowly! Can't you see that I can't speak English?" I was wishing that they'd had more consideration.

Sayaka is frustrated because, in her opinion, American students were so inconsiderate that they keep speaking fast although it is apparent that she cannot speak English. Similarly, *Kouta* pointed out the problem about American students in discussion group:

> American students can chatter to each other because they can speak English. But I wished they would have taken into consideration the situation. I was present there as an international student, too. I wished they would have been more attentive to the situation around them.

Kouta mentions that American students do not pay enough attention to that fact that there is an international student who is non-native English speaker in their discussion group. He expects more consideration from them. *Tarou* commented that American students should take into consideration that international students cannot communicate well in English:

> It is difficult [to make friends here]. I should not expect that I can make friends with anyone. It is easier for me to make friends with Americans who take Japanese language or take part in JSA…[It is difficult] because of cultural differences. I doubt they understand our hardships. I wish they could take it into consideration that we are not familiar with English and speak more slowly! When I ask them to speak slowly, they speak slowly for two or three minutes but five minutes after they start speaking fast.

Tarou pointed out that, when he asked Americans to speak slowly, they spoke slowly only for the first couple of minutes, and they started talking fast again. Here he tried his best to overcome his communication problem by asking them to speak slowly; however, it does not work because of Americans' speaking behaviors.

Tarou, Sayaka, and Kouta interpret that American students were speaking fast because they are inconsiderate. It is important to note that the American students' intentions or motives are unknown. Neither they nor I know that what the American

students' intentions were. It is impossible to rule out the possibility that American students are in fact considerate about international students' communication difficulty; however, they were speaking fast because they do not have the ability to speak slowly—at a rate comprehensible to international students. It is important to consider Americans' conversation forms. According to Carbaugh (2005), Americans tend to talk as quickly as possible and they talk as a quicker pace, pauses being short, and spontaneous verbalization is preferred to carefully prepared comments. Therefore, although these students interpret that Americans speak fast to them because they are inconsiderate, Americans usually talk quickly and thus, consideration or inconsideration may not account for Americans' speaking fast toward Japanese students.

Everyone should be able to speak English. Closely related to the problem with speaking fast, *Satoshi* and *Kenji* mentioned that Americans tend to blindly believe that everyone should be able to speak English fluently. Both of them are international students who have lived in the U.S. for longer than two years. Kenji has lived here for two years and nine months and Satoshi has lived here for four years and seven months. Thus, I assume that their observations were based on a great deal of intercultural experiences. I first present their remarks and then discuss my interpretation. First, *Satoshi* describe his observation of how Americans tend to speak to international students and foreigners as follows:

> Since I came to the U.S., I don't mean to say that their hospitality is bad, but I have seen that many people here do not understand about foreigners despite the fact that there are a lot of international students and foreigners. This is a multiethnic society. Regardless, they do not understand the different ethnic groups. The Japanese tend to treat foreigners nicely because they are not used to them and they consider very carefully about what they should do with them. Japanese people worry if it would be okay or rude to say this and that. I am not sure if it is because they are too used to foreigners or they do not care at all, but Americans

> speak to foreigners very fast and then say, "Huh? You didn't get what I said?" [Aggressive tone]. They do this as if there is nothing wrong with it. Of course some Japanese people may be like that, too, but I believe they would not talk like that when it is obvious that the person is a foreigner. When the foreigner doesn't understand, I think they would kindly say, "Oh you couldn't understand, okay." [Friendly tone] and repeat more slowly or explain so that the foreigner can understand. But I've seen Americans being like that quite often, although this is a multiethnic society and they are used to international students.

Here Satoshi argues that Americans are supposed to be great at speaking with foreigners because they live in the multiethnic environment in which there are a lot of international students and foreigners. Yet, Satoshi finds Americans' speaking style toward foreigners as problematic. *Kenji* described his observation of Americans' expectation toward foreigners:

> Japanese people do not expect the foreigners in Japan to speak perfect Japanese. Japanese is a minor language, so if they can speak Japanese only a little, Japanese people are impressed with it. But the US is so culturally mixed that it is taken for granted that everyone can speak English. Even if the Japanese can speak English, there is nothing impressive about it. People take it for granted. They don't get impressed with it. I see that people here have that kind of attitude.

Kenji compares Japanese people with Americans and believes that Americans expect everyone to speak fluent English because it is multicultural society. Unlike Japanese people, for many Americans, an encounter with foreigners is an ordinary event. Kenji rationalize that this is why Americans take it for granted that everyone can speak English. Because he feels such pressure/expectation, Kenji feels pressured to speak perfect English.

Satoshi and Kenji's comments here focus on communication behavior of Japanese people toward a certain group of foreigners—the foreigners who speak Japanese language. Their remarks are concerned with how Japanese people tend to behave as native speakers toward non-native Japanese speakers, not foreigners in general who do

not speak Japanese in interactions with them. Here they considered Japanese people as native speakers in intercultural communication with non-native Japanese speakers. Their observation does not address how Japanese people behave toward foreigners who communicate with them in, for instance, English. Then, they compare Japanese people with Americans in terms of the attitudes and behaviors as native speakers toward non-native speakers of Japanese and English respectively.

Satoshi and Kenji have observed that Americans take it for granted that foreigners in the U.S. are supposed to be able to speak English. On the other hand, they believe that Japanese people have very low expectations that foreigners in Japan speak Japanese. Kenji has observed that Japanese people are impressed with foreigners who speak Japanese even if they are not fluent. On the other hand, Kenji has observed that Americans are hardly impressed with foreigners who speak English, even if they are fluent. Kenji believes that American people take it for granted that everyone in the U.S. can speak English. Satoshi has observed that Japanese people tend to speak to foreigners slowly—at a rate comprehensible to foreigners. When foreigners try to speak Japanese, Japanese people tend to treat them gingerly because, in his opinion, they are not accustomed to encounters with foreigners. On the other hand, he has observed that Americans speak to foreigners fast—at a rate incomprehensible to foreigners because he believes they are accustomed to encounters with foreigners.

Their observation implies that the native speakers' attitudes and behaviors toward non-native speakers can differ depending on their perceived ethnolinguistic vitality (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977) of their native languages. English is one of the major languages in the world, while Japanese is a minor language. For many Americans, the novelty of

foreigners speaking English has worn off, and on the other hand, for Japanese people, foreigners speaking Japanese are novelty. It still is a rare event for many Japanese people when they encounter with the foreigners who can communicate in Japanese.

Bourdieu's (1991) notion of linguistic capital and Communication Accommodation Theory (Gallois, Giles, Jones, Cargile, and Ota, 1995; Gallois, Ogay, Giles, 2005) may be relevant to explain the differences between Americans and Japanese people which Satoshi and Kenji have observed regarding the attitudes and behaviors as native speakers toward non-native speakers. Bourdieu (1991) introduces the concept of *linguistic capital* and sees a given language or communicative practice as a symbolic power and profit enjoyed by its speakers in the same way as other forms of capital like economic or social capital does. English is one of the most spoken and mainstream languages in the world. Apparently, Americans as English speakers are given more symbolic power and profit than Japanese speakers. Difference of attitude and behavior between Americans and Japanese people may be explained by the ownership of linguistic capital. As Communication Accommodation Theory (Gallois, Giles, Jones, Cargile, and Ota, 1995; Gallois, Ogay, Giles, 2005) posits, Americans are less inclined to accommodate their speaking behaviors so as to converge to non-native speakers than Japanese people because they are given more linguistic capital and powerful as English speakers and Japanese speakers are not given much linguistic capital.

It is important to take into consideration settings of this event (Hymes, 1974). Various situational conditions could account for Americans' behaviors in given events. Neither Satoshi nor Kenji describes the settings in which they witnessed Americans speaking fast or aggressively; therefore, I cannot specify the situational conditions which

influence such Americans' behaviors. It is possible that an American person was in hurry or on duty. For example, it is highly possible that an American person was too busy (e.g., on duty, in hurry) to speak slowly or take time to patiently listen to accented English.

Both Satoshi and Kenji find Americans' attitudes and behaviors as problematic and unfriendly for international students. They attributed the reasons for Americans' behaviors to Americans' biased assumption that everyone should be able to speak English fluently and poor understanding of appropriate communication behaviors toward non-native speakers. It is important to be aware of the possibility that Kenji and Satoshi's interpretation may be inaccurate.

It is also interesting to find that Japanese international students think of Japanese people and society positively once they move abroad. Seemingly, Satoshi was somewhat glorifying Japanese people's attitudes and behaviors toward non-native Japanese speakers. He might have a different opinion regarding Japanese people's attitudes and behaviors toward non-native speakers, if he had not moved across borders to come to the United States.

Intercultural interest or experience. Two students discussed the importance of intercultural interest and/or experiences in communication attitudes and behaviors of American students toward international students. Sakura and Aya argued that they tend to have more problems communicating with American students without intercultural interest and/or experiences. *Sakura* pointed out that whether or not American students have experiences of studying abroad make big differences in their behaviors toward international students:

> American students without the experiences of studying abroad are not willing to talk to us. When they are bored with a conversation, they give us a cold look on

> their faces. I was hurt very much at first. I made an effort to talk to them in class but they gave me that cold look as the conversation becomes boring. They didn't talk to me or even look at me in the next class…Americans students without the experiences ignore me. It is obvious that they are not interested. It really makes me feel guilty so that I feel like apologizing to them for taking too much time of theirs [Laughs].

She categorized American students into two groups: the students with intercultural experiences and the students without intercultural experiences. Unlike the former group of students, the students without intercultural experiences are not well-engaged in the conversation with her even when she makes an effort to talk to them. She was hurt to the extent which she felt guilty and motivated to apologize to them. .

Aya also explained that the past intercultural experiences make a significant difference in people's attitudes toward her:

> I get along pretty well with the Americans who have been around the world and traveled around to Africa, Afghanistan, Asia, and Australia. They have willingness to accept different cultures, you know. So they try to understand what I say as much as possible even if they cannot understand me 100%. But if Americans have stayed here and never got out of this country for their entire lives, their mindset has been American mindset for all the time. So I think they listen to me as if it is a story about another planet. I guess that is why it is difficult to communicate with them.

In a similar way to Sakura, Aya noticed the differences in communication behaviors and mindsets between the Americans with intercultural experiences and those without intercultural experiences. She believes that the Americans with intercultural experiences are motivated to accept cultural diversity and understand her English, whereas she finds it difficult to communicate with the Americans without intercultural experiences because they have little interest in cultural diversity.

Miscellaneous Issues

Along with three primary issues, this study finds additional issues regarding communication with Americans: (1) self-imposed expectation; (2) difficulty making friends with American classmates; (3) school work and transportation; and (4) asking American students and instructors for help. These issues can be secondary; however, they are equally significant to understand Japanese students' communication with Americans.

Self-imposed expectation. This study finds that Japanese students tend to impose expectations or pressure on themselves regarding relationships with domestic students. Miho and Hiromi are frustrated with their interpersonal relationships in the U.S. because they do not have enough American friends. Both of them believe they *have to* make more friends with Americans. They believe that, as an international student, they are supposed to improve their English skills and make friends with American students. *Hiromi* shared her frustration. She thought she should make more American friends:

> I should make more [American] friends and speak English more. It has been already two years [Laughs]. I should not stay in this way…I'd rather rely on Japanese. But I feel odd fretfulness that I can't remain like this arises inside...The feeling that "Why did I come here?" If I enjoy hanging out with my Japanese friends, I don't need to be here. Of course, I came here to study, but learning English is another purpose for me. So I am questioning, "Something is not quite right." But if I overreact, I would get depressed. So I try to do whatever I can do now.

Miho showed a great deal of frustration with herself during the interview. She criticized her lifestyle in the U.S., and considered her participation in this program as a waste of time. She said, "Since I came here, I have thought, 'Why did I come here?' very often." Given her lack of socialization with Americans, she thought, "I should have stayed in Japan, if I live like that." She thought that she ought to spend more time with and talk with Americans because she is an exchange student in the U.S.:

> I worry if I go back to Japan without learning anything. I've begun thinking about that recently. These days, I hang out with Korean and other Asian students a lot. Then I recently realized that if I just hang out only with Koreans, then maybe it would be much better if I had been to Korea. It is closer to Japan and costs less to live there. My parents would feel safer because it is closer to Japan. I live in the U.S. but I never use English. Well I do use it but I never talk to native speakers. It is not quite right to hang out with Koreans and the other Asian students only because I can get along better with them…I do use English but I limit myself within a circle of Asians. I think I have been wasting my valuable opportunities by going with the flow.

As such, Hiromi and Miho are frustrated with their interpersonal relationships because they cannot fulfill their self-imposed expectation as international students. They feel obliged to make friends with Americans not because someone suggests they should, but because they are motivated to meet their own self-imposed expectation concerning relationships with American students.

For both Hiromi and Miho, I can see that their self-imposed expectation has a negative impact on them. The motive to make friends usually helps international students to develop relationships with American students. In their cases, self-imposed expectation about friendships with Americans causes frustration, apprehension, and anxiety, which lead to inability to initiate interactions with Americans. As such, ironically, it is more difficult for them to make friends with Americans because they have higher expectation regarding making friends with Americans.

Difficulty making friends with American classmates. Japanese students meet American students in various social occasions. As previously described in the section of Japan-connected Americans, many exchange students made friends with American students predominantly through social gatherings of those who have an interest in Japan, including Japanese Student Association, Conversation Club, and Anime Club. Unlike

these exchange students, Makoto met his two best friends within his social network without Japanese-connection.

A classroom is the primary place where international students can make friends with American students. Both Junko and Satoshi have become close friends with a couple of their classmates. Kenji met his friends in his classes. However, for some Japanese students, it is uneasy to make friends with American classmates for several reasons. Having experienced both undergraduate and graduate in the US, Maki mentioned that it is difficult to make friends in undergraduate courses because they are taught in a large classroom and students rarely have interactions in class. Yoko claimed that she cannot make friends with Americans at school because there are few female students in her department and classes.

Hiromi, Sayaka, and Satoshi pointed out differences across majors. Both Hiromi and Sayaka commented that it is easier to make friends in less serious classes such as dancing or sport than serious classes such as criminal justice or Native American history. *Hiromi* said:

> I think the students in dance major or that kind of majors are more energetic and outgoing. They can enjoy group work, for example, discussing what kind of dancing they imagine from one word. It is easier for them to become friends. But [in my major] for group works, we always discuss very serious topics. When we discuss domestic disparities, I don't know what to say so I become intimidated and quiet and it becomes the impression that the American students get about me. So they do not talk to me.

From a different perspective, *Satoshi* also pointed out differences across majors. He observes that, "There are good majors and bad majors." Good majors, according to him, include anthropology and linguistics in which students study about culture and foreign languages. A "good major" is comfortable for international students because

American students in these majors understand cultural diversity. On the other hand, he categorized education and business as "bad majors" based on his observation and his friends' experiences. The American students in "bad majors" are likely to be unfriendly to international students because they do not need to learn and understand about cultural diversity and foreign language.

School work and transportation. This study also reveals another aspect about Japanese students' relationships with Americans. Some of them cannot make friends simply because they are too busy with study. *Akiko* is an example of this case. The issue of American friends instantly occurred to her when I asked, "How do you like your life in US so far?" Akiko's account tells us that the difficulty of making friends with Americans cannot be explained only by the lack of English proficiency or communication apprehension on the part of international students. Akiko said:

> Well… Simply put, it is like mosaic of joy and pain. I sometimes feel that I am glad that I came and the other times it is just painful. I've found one thing difficult. My adviser always suggests me that I should make friends. I agree with him. But it is not as easy as it sounds. To make friends, I should go eat out together with the classmates. Most of them are 20's. They have a lot of time on their hands. They need to take only one or two classes per semester and work as teaching assistants. They are laid back about time…When I joined them one time, I found that we worry about the same problems. So I want to go eat with them more often. I want to go many places with them. But I can't speak English. I have to take more classes than they do because of regulations with my student visa. One American student who takes two classes is so overwhelmed that he said "I want to commit suicide!" The person who cannot speak English takes three classes. Because there are only eight students in the class, my turn for presentation comes around so fast and often. It keeps me very busy. To secure my visa status, I have to do well in my classes. For this reason, I don't have time to hang out with friends. Then my English conversation skill never gets better. Then I get caught in a big dilemma. I want to make friends with them and I want to brush up my English, but if I focus on them, then I cannot do well in my classes. If my grades are bad, then it may risk my visa status. So I end up taking care of my immediate needs. When I put the first priority on studying, then my classmates tell me something like "Akiko is filled with desperation" and "She is always studying studying studying. Unlike her, I am lazy" I don't think it is about laziness [pause].

> Anyway, after class they basically either go home or have coffee together. Because I don't have a car, I cannot leave when I want to go home. So once I go somewhere, I have to stay here for hours until the person who took me there leaves.

Akiko is highly aware that it is important for her to make friends with Americans. She has found that it is fun to go out with them, and she wants to hang out with them more. First of all, it is yet difficult for her to speak English. Along with English problems, a variety of situational constraints prevent her from spending time with her American classmates. To summarize her account, she wants to go out with American classmates more often but she does not have time because; (a) student visa regulations require her to take more classes than American students; (b) a small class makes her busy preparing frequent presentation; (c) she has to get good grades to secure her visa status; and (d) she cannot leave whenever she wants because she does not own a car. As she said, she is caught in the dilemma between her desire to spend more time with them and her need to study. Akiko's story demonstrates that international students' relationships with local people cannot be explained only by limited English proficiency or communication apprehension. Their school work and transportation problems also account for their interpersonal problems.

This fact has been often overlooked by scholars. Intercultural communication researchers tend to attribute a lack of friends to international students' language problems, psychological problems (e.g., apprehension, unwillingness, anxiety) and/or intergroup attitudes and behaviors (e.g., prejudice, discrimination) (see Kim, 2001). However, in reality, international students have few American friends simply because they are too busy with school work. No matter how willing they are to make friends with Americans, they do not have time to develop relationships with them.

Asking American students and instructors for help. Tarou mentioned two additional issues regarding communication with Americans. He pointed out the difficulty of asking for help and his concern for Americans. *Tarou* said:

> I hesitated to approach professors and ask questions because people didn't understand my English. I was being withdrawn. Because my English is not good enough to understand, if I ask questions, I thought I would bother the professor. So I couldn't go. The friends around me greeted me though… I couldn't approach them and ask questions in the beginning. We have assignments using D2L [Desire to Learn] sometimes, don't we? I didn't know how to use D2L at all. I was lost. But I could not ask anyone for help till the end of semester…I was scared that I would not understand what they said even if I managed to ask questions. I was scared… I thought it would be painful and bothersome for this person to talk with me who cannot speak English. I found out later that I was completely wrong.

First, Tarou could not ask questions about study to his professors because: (1) he was afraid that he might not understand their answers; and (2) he did not want to bother them with his influent English. Second, he could not ask questions about "D2L" to his classmates. D2L [Desire to Learn] is computer program that L-University uses to facilitate on-line communication between an instructor and students (e.g., an instructor distributes assignments and study materials) and record grades. Thus, his question about D2L is important for his study work; yet, he could not ask American students or an instructor for help. In these two situations, he was scared to ask questions because he was worried that, "I would not understand what they said even if I managed to ask questions" and "it would be pain and bothersome for this person to talk with me who cannot speak English."

Tarou cannot ask questions, even when it is important for his study work, because he thinks he would bother his American professor and classmates with his impaired English ability. He voluntarily took perspectives of American instructors and classmates and imagined that it would be bothersome for them to carry on a conversation with

influent non-native English speakers like him. Presumably, he was not told by his American instructors or classmates that it is pain for them to talk with him. Also, unlike the other cases of interpersonal communication in this study, Tarou did not perceive Americans' attitudes or behaviors as problematic. He later found out that his imagination was wrong. His interpretation: "I thought it would be painful and bothersome for this person to talk with me who cannot speak English" is a product of imagination which he creates in his head without any evidence. He believes that it should be bothersome for native speakers to communicate with influent non-native speakers.

Tarou's difficulty of asking for help seems to be closely related to a Japanese norm which values power distance (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984) and hierarchical relationships. Japan is known as high power distance culture (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984). Predominantly, Japanese people accept and value hierarchical structure and they regulate their social behaviors based upon concern for power difference and hierarchical order. Japanese cultural norm expects them to respect powerful people. For example, employees should accept superiority of their bosses, students should respect teachers at school, and children should see their parents as superiors and respect them. I assume Tarou values hierarchical relationships between himself and American instructors. In his understanding, American instructors are superiors so he needs to behave respectfully. I assume that Tarou considers both American instructors and classmates as more powerful superiors and himself as a less powerful subordinate. I presume that in his relationships with American classmates and instructors, he views Americans as native English speakers who have more linguistic

power (Bourdieu, 1991) and himself as non-native English speakers who have less linguistic power (Bourdieu, 1991).

My interpretation about his behavior is based on the combination of his assumption that it should be bothersome for native speakers to communicate with influent non-native speakers and his perspectives of his relationship with American instructors and classmates. Tarou hesitated to ask American students and instructors for help probably because he referred to Japanese norms about hierarchical relationships and presumed that it would inappropriate for subordinates (i.e., English non-native speakers) to bother superiors (i.e., English native speakers and instructors) by forcing them to deal with his influent and unclear English.

Some people might argue that Tarou could not ask American students and instructors for help possibly because he saw them as out-group members so that he was unwilling to ask strangers for help. It might have influence on his behavior to some extent; however, I interpret that it is less likely that such intergroup dynamics was salient in his motive. Based on Tarou's comment, I assume that it is more likely that his hesitation in asking for help was regulated by his perceived power difference between native English speakers and non-native English speakers.

Summary: The Attitudes and Behaviors of American Students

This study finds that it is difficult for Japanese students to make friends with American students because they find American students' attitudes and/or behaviors as problematic. The important point of the finding is, regardless of Americans' motives, Japanese students find American students' attitudes and/or behaviors to be problematic. Specifically, the following primary issues were mentioned by the Japanese students in the

present study: (1) unwillingness to communicate; (2) unfriendly reactions; and (3) problematic speaking behaviors.

With regard to this finding, it is necessary to understand the following four issues: (1) the description about American students' attitudes and behaviors is what and how Japanese students perceive; (2) true motives of American students remain unknown; (3) Japanese students may simply misunderstand American students' attitudes and behaviors; and (4) it is because they are Japanese that they view American students' attitudes and/or behaviors in that way.

It is important to note that regional characteristics may have an influence on the interethnic attitude and/or behavior of American students, as perceived by Japanese students. Even through the U.S. is known to be a multiethnic society, regional variance does exist: some regions are less multiethnic and culturally diverse than the others. Both S-university and L-university are located in the U.S. Midwest where the majority of the population is Caucasian. According to the US census of 2008, 78% of the population in this state is Caucasian. This region is less multiethnic than large cities such as Los Angeles and New York. It is reasonable to assume that quite a few American students have never had contact with non-native English speakers before they come to college. This regional characteristic may explain the attitudes and/or behaviors of American students toward international students in these two universities.

In this section, I will propose one, among many, potential explanation why the Japanese international students in this study find these problems in American students' attitudes and/or behaviors. A study about intercultural conversations between Finns and Americans has provided a very similar pattern. Carbaugh (2005) demonstrates the

examples in which Finnish exchange students find American students as superficial. Finnish students find Americans as friendly but superficial because one day Americans friendly greet or engage in chitchat with them but the next day they just wave and walk by quickly or act like they do not know them. Interestingly, according to Carbaugh (2005), an American male student finds it difficult to hear Finns saying that Americans are superficial and he is fed up with this comment of Finnish students. Presumably these Americans are not trying to be superficial, nor would they claim a value in superficiality. Regardless of American students' motives, Finnish students find them as superficial. Carbaugh (2005) discusses that Finnish students interpret American students' behaviors based on their communicative norms and conclude that they violate Finnish expectations, which is "once one engages in this kind of conversation with another, a 'communicative relationship' has been established, such that one is expected to talk—even if briefly—with the other on meeting her again" (Carbaugh, 2005, p.41).

I assume that Japanese international students find American students' behaviors as problematic because they rely on Japanese communicative norms when they observe and interpret American students' behaviors. If they do not interpret American students' behaviors based on Japanese norms, they would not find unwillingness, unfriendliness, or problematic speaking style in Americans students' communication behaviors toward them. As a Japanese national, I am aware that, for Japanese people, concern for others is an important criterion of interpersonal communication skills. According to Japanese norms, people are expected to take into consideration others' feelings and be compassionate in interpersonal interactions. Japanese people highly value an attempt to take others' perspectives, consider the possible effects and consequences of our action on

others, and minimize the possibility to hurt others. Each individual has a different perspective and background; therefore, we need to be aware that it is always possible that our actions could hurt others' feelings even if we do not have mean motives and intention to hurt them.

Given my personal observation of Japanese communicative norms, I assume that the Japanese students in this study interpreted American students' behaviors as problematic because they relied on such Japanese norms which values consideration for others. Most probably, while interacting with American students, they had concern about American students' perspectives or feelings. I presume that Japanese students expect the American students to reciprocally give them the same consideration. However, I have observed that Americans place less value on the consideration for others than Japanese people. Americans tend to think that people can do to others whatever they want to do as long as they do not have mean or evil intentions or motives. If someone gets hurt by their actions, it is his or her weakness that hurts him or her because the others do not have evil motives. Given such cultural differences, Japanese students might perceive that American students' behaviors lack consideration for others. Specifically, they perceive American students to be unwilling to communicate with them, display unfriendly reactions, and have problematic speaking style which makes it difficult for Japanese students to communicate with them. I assume that Japanese students find American students' behaviors as problematic because they persist in Japanese norms which value consideration about others in communication with Americans students.

Japan-Connected Americans

The present study finds the pattern that Japanese students gravitate *toward* a small community of American students, that is, a group of the American students who have an interest in Japanese language and culture. L-University has a well-established Japanese program. They have a minor Japanese program and very active and popular study abroad programs with several universities in Japan. Quite a few students in Japanese language classes go to Japan for a short summer program, one-semester program, or academic year program. There is also an established Japanese Student Association on campus where Japanese and Americans students collaborate to introduce Japanese culture to a university community. This study finds that Japanese students are closer to those American students who are interested in Japanese language and culture.

More than two Japanese students in this study call these American students as 日本つながりのアメリカ人 (*Nihon Tsunagari no Amerika-jin*). I translate this into "Japan-connected Americans" because *Nihon* means Japan, *Tsunagari* means connection and *Amerika-jin* means Americans. Thus, Japan-connected Americans refer to the American students who have an interest in Japanese language and culture, and/or take Japanese classes at school.

The eight interviewees said that their American friends are Japan-connected Americans. All of the six exchange students in this study claimed that most of their American friends are Japan-connected Americans. For example, during the first semester, *Sakura* made friends with Americans through the social club called "Conversation Club." The Conversation Club was created by a couple of Japanese exchange students as a weekly social gathering where both Japanese and Americans students engage casual

conversation and learn English and Japanese. Consequently, the majority of her American friends are Japan-connected Americans. *Tomoko* usually goes to dinner or drinking with Japanese friends, Asian international students, and/or American students who once studied in Japan. *Tetsuya* used to hang out a lot with American students who are the members of Japanese students association; however, since they relocated after the graduation, he does not hang out with them anymore. Although it is common among the Japanese students in this study to become friends with Americans who have an interest in Japan, several students (i.e., Maki, Junko, Kana, Satoshi, Yoko, and Makoto) have become friends with other Americans than Japan-connected Americans.

The Japanese students in this study described their relationships with Japan-connected Americans focusing on the relational equity regarding an opportunity to learn and practice Japanese and English languages and intercultural sensitivity of Japan-connected Americans. Given such benefits, Japanese students become closer to Japan-connected Americans and, overall, they appreciate the relationships with Japan-connected Americans; however, several students pointed out the problems as well.

Relational Equity: Language Learning

Japanese students and Japan-connected American students build relationships based on their reciprocal interests—learning a foreign language (i.e., Japanese for American students and English for Japanese students). They have an interest in each other's culture and they look for an opportunity to practice Japanese and English with its native speakers respectively. For these Japanese students, the relationships with Japan-connected American students serve as opportunities to practice English as well as help American students study Japanese language.

Kouta said, "I think they want to learn Japanese with us and we want to learn English with them. Most of my American friends are like that." In addition to Kouta, two international students (i.e., Kenji and Tomoko) and a post-doctoral researcher (i.e., Tetsuya) also reported that their American friends are Japan-connected Americans. *Kenji*'s close American friend, James, is an American student who studies Japanese. He said:

> James is interested in Japan and he asked me to teach him Japanese. That was how we met. Then we have become friends…We hit it off and it did not take long before we became close friends. He wanted to know about Japan and I wanted to learn English. So our give and take matched.

*Tarou'*s American friends are mainly Japan-connected Americans. He described the activities he usually does with them as follows:

> I go to the movie with them. When one of my American friends has a concert, I go there. I go eat out with them. These are the things that we often do together. And I am often invited by American students who study Japanese and they asked me to teach them Japanese. We study at the Union. In that case, I teach them Japanese and they teach me English in turn. We often study languages…We talk about how difficult it is to learn a foreign language.

Studying Japanese and English is a primacy activity that Tarou and his Japan-connected American friends normally engage. Tarou maintains relationships with them as an opportunity to learn and practice English as well as teach Japanese to American students. As they study English and Japanese together, they share their difficulty in learning a foreign language. As such, for Tarou, his relationships with Japan-connected Americans offer not only an opportunity to practice English language but also emotional support.

The relationships between Japanese international students and Japan-connected Americans can be explained by Equity Theory (Adams, 1963, 1965). Equity Theory

explains relational satisfaction in terms of a person's perceptions of fairness/unfairness within a relationship and posits that people are happiest in relationships where the give and take between them and partners are about equal. During a social exchange, an individual assesses the ratio of what is output from the relationship to what is input in the relationship, and also the ratio of what the other person in the relationship outputs from the relationship to what is input into the relationship. The relationships between Japanese students and Japan-connected Americans are built upon equity of benefits. Japanese students can learn and practice English with American students, whereas American students can learn Japanese culture and language in relationships. To illustrate, Kenji describes his relationship with James, "our needs matched." Their give and take are in perfect match in their relationships.

Communicating in English

People may presume that Japanese international students gravitate toward American students who are learning Japanese because they share the common speech code (Hymes, 1974) —Japanese. People may assume that Japanese international students selectively interact with American students who are learning Japanese because they want to communicate in Japanese with American students.

These assumptions are wrong with most Japanese international students in this study. The only exception is *Yasuko* who has an American boyfriend who is learning Japanese and they communicate in Japanese only. Yasuko seldom speaks English in the United States. The majority of the interviewees reported that they communicate mainly in English because Japanese proficiency of most American students is much lower than their English proficiency. Their friendships with Japan-connected Americans are not

developed and maintained by Japanese student's desire to speak Japanese. *Tarou*, *Kouta*, and *Kenji* develop and maintain relationships because they want to learn English, their American students want them to teach Japanese, and they want to help their American friends learn Japanese. It is not because they want to speak Japanese.

Sayaka describes her social network to be limited to Japan-connected Americans. She wants to communicate with them in English. She does not want to communicate with them in Japanese. I asked her about the problems that she has found in the relationships with her American friends. She said:

> Problems…well…problems. Well, maybe it is not a problem but, with Americans who can speak Japanese very well, for example Ryan, unfortunately, we talk only in Japanese. I do not want to waste my time in the United States so I want to talk in English. If American students are very fluent in Japanese, they want to talk with me in Japanese. But I don't like it…One day I was hanging out with Ryan. I told him, "It is difficult for me to speak English so I want to work harder." He told me, "Alright, then we should talk in English." From then, we talked only in English. So I guess they would understand that I want to speak in English if I ask them.

Speaking with them in Japanese is a problem for Sayaka. Apparently, sharing a speech code—Japanese—is not a reason for her to develop and maintain relationship with American students. She wants to speak only in English with them.

Japanese students communicate with Japan-connected Americans predominantly in English. They teach them Japanese; however, they communicate in English. They are motivated to improve their English conversation skills through communication with native English speakers. However, they cannot make friends with any Americans because they find problems in the attitudes and/or behaviors of American students. Conversations with Japan-connected American students are valuable opportunities for them to speak

English. It is a wrong assumption that Japanese international students gravitate toward Japan-connected American students because they can communicate in Japanese.

More than Language Learning

Studying Japanese and English together is a part of their connection; however it is not all they do together. They do more than language exchange. *Tarou* described what he and his American friends often do together in addition to learning English and Japanese together:

> We also talk about food, where to eat. And they give me the information about good restaurants. Oh wait, what we talk about the most is about our dreams for the future. Americans really like to talk about their future plans and dreams. I find it very interesting. I tried to think about my dream, too. Everyone has a dream for future. I think it is great.

Seemingly, Tarou and his Japan-connected American friends do what friends usually do. He emphasized the fact that he and his American friends talked a lot about their dreams and future plans. *Kouta* mentioned that his friendship with Americans are beneficial for him because, "They are good at changing everything to something fun." *Sakura* described her relationships with Japan-connected Americans as follow: "We go to a movie and eat out together. That is mostly all we do…We don't talk about our personal issues. It's partly because of my English problem. I can't talk about my deep and internal issues at all."

Learning language together is a primary feature of relationships between Japanese international students and Japan-connected Americans, and as Equity Theory (Adams, 1963, 1965) postulates, their relationships have been strengthened through their mutual and fair interests. However, as we can see in Tarou, Kouta, and Sakura's comments, their relationships have evolved to friendships which offers them more than an opportunity to

practice English language. Tarou and Kouta appreciate their friendships with American students because American students inspire them with their telling about future dreams and they give them fun time.

Problems with Japan-Connected Americans

During the interviews, some Japanese students mentioned problems with spending time with Japan-connected Americans. They all really appreciate the hospitality, kindness, and tolerance of American students; however, they find the shortcoming in this relationship. *Miho* is disappointed to find that there is little opportunity to come across Americans:

> There are fewer chances for contact with American students than I had heard. When I just came here, as I told you, I stayed at home all the time. So it might account for fewer chances. But Sayaka started Conversation Club and I attend often recently. But it [the social network] doesn't extend from there. It is only within a small group of people. I can make a few acquaintances here and there, but it doesn't extend from there at all.

Similarly, *Tomoko* is aware of both pros and cons about becoming friends with Japanese-connected Americans:

> It is hard to get a chance to become friends with Americans. I guess it would be easier to make friends with Americans who are interested in Japan, but if I hang out only with them, my world won't expand.

When describing her American friends, *Sayaka* emphasized, "*Only* Americans who are interested in Japan." For Sayaka, Japanese connection is a salient feature to characterize her friendship. She said that she came to see an American as a friend of hers when she is invited to hang out together without the intention of learning Japanese from her. She is sincerely grateful to her Japanese-connected American friends. Yet, she is wishful to make a couple of friends from other Americans than Japan-connected

Americans. She said, “I want to be a bit more fluent. I also want a couple of American friends without Japanese language and such.”

Intercultural Sensitivity

The interviewees emphasized the understanding and tolerant attitudes and behaviors of Japan-connected American students toward their impaired English skills. *Tarou* showed his great appreciation for his friendship with Japan-connected Americans students:

> American students who take Japanese classes are *extremely* nice. They are so nice because they have experienced the same difficulties as ours. When I speak English, they put their thought in it and respond slowly and with simple English words. They sometimes mix some Japanese in it, too.

Sakura compared the American students *without* the experience of study abroad and the American students *with* the experience of study abroad and greatly appreciates the latter. She described the positive features about Japanese-connected American students:

> On the other hand, American students who take Japanese language are very nice. They listen to me. I guess they understand how difficult and important it is to learn foreign language because they learn Japanese. I think that they know how hard it is for us to speak in English…even when I cannot speak well, they patiently try to understand me.

Under the stress and anxiety of communicating in English with the native speakers, communication with these Japan-connected Americans serves as a psychological buffer for them.

They emphasized that Japan-connected Americans have more tolerance, patience and sensitivity for them. According to them, Japan-connected Americans and Americans with overseas experience and intercultural interests patiently listen to their imperfect English and speak slowly and clearly for them. They have observed that the majority of

American students do not possess such abilities. Through the personal experience of becoming non-native speakers of given language, these American students learn or improve intercultural communication competence which can serve as great support for non-native speakers.

Summary: Japan-Connected Americans

This research finds that the Japanese international students in this study have developed friendly relationships with Japan-connected Americans—the Americans who have an interest in Japan. Based on Japanese students' remarks, communication and relationships between them are characterized by *communicative ability* of Japan-connected Americans as well as *reciprocal motivation for communication*. Surely, there are more characteristic components in their communication. These two are the features that the Japanese students in this study mentioned during the interviews.

First, Japanese international students develop and maintain friendships with Japan-connected American students because Japan-connected Americans have acquired communication ability which helps Japanese students to speak and understand English, including: (1) patiently listening to influent English speaking, (2) slowly and clearly speaking; and (3) showing interest, appreciation and understanding of Japanese culture. According to Japanese students, it is through personal experiences of learning a foreign language and/or studying abroad that Japan-connected Americans have acquired these abilities along with understanding of difficulty in communicating in a foreign language. The Japanese students in this study appreciate such communicative ability of Japan-connected American students. Their description about Japan-connected Americans helps

us presume what kind of abilities the other American students seem to lack from the standpoint of Japanese students.

Second, their relationships are initiated, developed and maintained on the basis of mutual interest—American students can learn Japanese from Japanese students and Japanese students can learn English from American students. As Equity Theory (Adam, 1963, 1965) postulates, people are happier in a relationship when interests of interactants mutually meet. Japanese students seek for an opportunity to speak English with native speakers for their practice as well as friendships with American students. As described first in this chapter, it is difficult for many Japanese students to communicate and develop relationships with the majority of American students (i.e., non-Japan-connected Americans). They gravitate toward Japan-connected Americans with a motive to practice English as well as make friends with Americans.

American students may have various motives for becoming friends with Japanese students. To illustrate some of possible motives, they gravitate toward Japanese students because: (a) they like Japanese people; (b) they feel more comfortable being around Japanese students than other Americans; (c) they need help with their homework for Japanese classes; and (d) they want to practice and learn Japanese language and culture (e.g., anime, music). Regardless, Japan-connected Americans have motives to be friendly toward Japanese students and develop and maintain relationships. Perhaps, their relationships can develop because they share reciprocal interest.

Relationships between Japanese students and Japan-connected Americans represent Berry's (1990, 1994, 1997, 2006, 2008) model of acculturation strategy. Berry (e.g., 1990) theorizes that the orientation for acculturation is concerned with the two

issues: (1) the degree of maintenance of heritage culture and identity (i.e., "to what extent are cultural identity and characteristics considered to be important, and their maintenance strived for"); and (2) the degree of interest in intergroup relationships (i.e., "to what extent should they become involved in other cultural groups, or remain primarily among themselves") (Berry, 1997, p.9). Depending on the answers to each of two issues: (1) , Berry describes four patterns of acculturation strategy of non-dominant group (i.e., assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization) and four patterns of acculturation strategy of dominant group (i.e., melting pot, multiculturalism, segregation, and exclusion)

Japanese students' relationships with Japan-connected Americans that they described in this study represent Japanese students' integration strategy and American students' multiculturalism strategy. There is mutuality between Japanese students' American students in terms of interest in intergroup relationships. As for the issue of maintenance of heritage culture and identity, since the connection between Japanese students and American students is build upon Japanese culture and language, it is apparent that the maintenance of Japanese culture and identity is of great importance for both of them in their relationships.

Lack of Common Conversation Topics

Another feature that the Japanese students in this study describe about their communication and relationships with American friends is the lack of common conversation topics. For them, it is difficult to initiate conversations and develop relationships because they do not have common topics that they can talk about. *Kenji* stated, "It is difficult to become close friends [with Americans] if we don't have

something in common." *Tarou* found it difficult to communicate with Americans when there is no shared topic between them; "I cannot find a common topic. Finally I managed to find one. American football." *Tomoko* said it is hard to find a common topic with Americans:

> I can make friends with Japanese in no time, but it is difficult to make friends with Americans because it is hard to find a common topic. I can't talk about TV. I am not able to talk about politics…Yet, I have no motivation to thoroughly check TV shows on Youtube. It is hard to get a chance to become friends with Americans. I guess it would be easier to make friends with Americans who are interested in Japan, but if I hang out only with them, my world won't expand.

Tomoko found it difficult to make friends with Americans because it is hard to find a common topic. Thus, as an alternative solution, she mentioned making friends with Americans who are interested in Japan because it is easier for her to find a common topic with them.

Pop Culture

Aya and Tomoko mentioned that the lack of shared knowledge about pop culture becomes a problem for them to have casual conversations with Americans. *Aya* found it difficult talking with Americans due to the absence of shared knowledge about pop culture such as TV and movies:

> One time in a class on broadcasting, we discussed about culture. They were talking about the TV programs from their childhood and they suggest we make a show similar to one of their childhood TV shows. I am like "What?" because I do not have knowledge. The knowledge about that TV show. I have to go home and do research for it. When they start talking about that kind of stuff, I just can't catch up with them. It would take too much time if I asked them about it every single time they mention a TV show from their childhood."

Even though Aya talked about classroom discussion, the absence of shared knowledge about pop culture must play out in casual conversations between American students and Japanese students. It may not only knowledge about TV shows. It includes their shared

memory attached to certain TV shows. Similarly, *Tomoko*, a Ph.D. student in music, experienced a wall between her and her American classmates because of the lack of shared knowledge about TV culture:

> We are doing quintet. The other four members are, of course, Americans. All of the sudden they all sing Popeye's theme song together [Laughs]. I am like, "I don't know that song!" [Funny tone]. Among all Japanese people, we talk about TV dramas and jokes that we often see in the TV shows. [She talked about one famous line from the popular TV romantic drama] If I say it, we all get it. I know that they [American classmates] are talking about something like that. When they start doing that during the quintet practice, I am like, "They start it, again!" I am disappointed to face the fact that I am not able to understand it. But if I start feeling that way, I will get irritated. So I try not to feel disappointed that way…[I am disappointed] because I am the only person who does not get the meaning in that circle when everyone gets excited. I am like, "You all are having fun now but [pause]". Something like that. But I can't ask "What did you say?" or "what are you talking about" every time when someone says that kind of thing. I think I should not interrupt them.

The lack of shared knowledge about pop culture results in a sense of isolation because Tomoko is the only person who cannot appreciate or share the excitement. She hesitates to ask about the TV show that they are talking about because she does not want to interrupt their ongoing conversation.

The remarks of Aya and Tomoko tell us that the lack of shared knowledge about pop culture can be problematic for intercultural communication with Americans. American TV shows have a unique history. For international students, it is almost impossible to know and understand American pop cultures to the same level as American students. Thus, there is an inevitable barrier between them when they are talking about pop culture. Moreover, occasionally, it is impossible for international students to appreciate some American TV shows because they are based on American values, norms, or a sense of humor.

Effort to Increase Common Topics

Having experienced communication difficulty due to lacking common conversation topics, *Kouta* and *Tarou* make an effort to increase common topics by gaining knowledge about the topics of American students' favorites. *Kouta* makes an effort to have more common topic with his American friends by watching Japanese anime because his Americans friends are interested in them:

> I've seen Anime is popular among Americans. I try to watch Anime, too. In that way, I can talk more with Americans. I can explain about Japanese anime, compare Japanese TV shows with American ones, and talk about the movie we've both seen. It's small things, but using the internet, I try to get more topics that I can talk about with Americans.

Likewise, *Tarou* makes an effort to have more shared topic with his American friends by watching American football games on television even though he does not care for this sport. He forces himself to watch the games on television only to have common topics with American people:

> I hate American football. I force myself to watch it. I don't understand what is so exciting about it at all. I went to watch the game once. But still, I do not like it at all. Yet, people here seem to be crazy about American football. As long as I know something about American football, I can have an opening topic, I believe. American football and tornado. I know something about it, I can deal with it. I can talk about only those kinds of topics. It is hard to find the shared topics with them.

Both Kouta and Tarou strive to increase common topics with Americans. Kouta tries to watch more anime so that he can talk more with Americans. Tarou forces himself to watch American football games even thought he does not care for it at all so that he can initiate a conversation with Americans. Koura and Tarou show their desperation to talk more with Americans.

Summary: Lack of Common Conversation Topics

Intercultural conversation is difficult because each culture has its own rules and forms of conversation (Carbaugh, 2005). When two people from the different cultural backgrounds come across, both of them carry on a conversation based on a rule of their own. Sometimes one person can easily violate the other's preferences for conversation (Carbaugh, 2005). This study finds that intercultural conversation is difficult because there are cultural differences in common and popular conversation topics. It is difficult for Japanese students to initiate and develop relationships with Americans because they do not share popular and common conversation topics with them. This study observes that some Japanese students desperately strive to increase common topics.

At social occasions, people are engaged in small talk. Small talk is defined in the American Heritage dictionary (1997) as "casual or trivial conversation, chitchat." Small talk helps fill silence, find a common topic of interest, and build and maintain relationships. In the early stage of relationship development, people try to find an integrative topic that both individuals can easily discuss (e.g., the weather, the entertainment, the traffic) (Davis, 1973) and small talk is useful for this purpose. There are universal ideas about socially appropriate topics for small talk or casual conversation. For example, people in most cultures would probably find weather as a safe and appropriate topic, and on the other hand, they may probably find it inappropriate or at least awkward when a stranger discloses private issues such as his or her medical history or past sexual partners at a first encounter.

In addition to such cross-cultural universality, there is cross-cultural variety in appropriate or preferred topics for small talk or casual conversation (e.g., Carbaugh,

2005). As a Japanese national, I have observed that common discourse topics among Japanese college students include Japanese TV dramas, comedy shows, pop music, celebrity gossip, dating situations, part time jobs, fashion, and job search. This is not an all-inclusive list of their common topics; however, from my years of observation including my own experience as a college student in Japan, I am certain that Japanese college students like to talk about these topics.

Japanese college students commonly enjoy talking about pop culture such as movie, music, and television shows. This study finds that it is difficult for them to talk about these topics with Americans because they do not share the same knowledge and preference about movie, music, and TV shows. Talking about pop culture can be problematic in intercultural communication between Japanese people and Americans. Recent movies, popular TV shows and favorite music are great conversation topics for small talk. However, except for those who are excessively interested in American pop culture, it is challenging for many Japanese students to talk about pop culture with Americans because: (1) they are not familiar enough with American pop culture to carry on a conversation with Americans; (2) Americans are not familiar enough with Japanese pop culture to carry on a conversation with them; (3) they do not have enough English ability and cultural knowledge to understand and appreciate the content and essence of American pop culture; and (4) some American movies and TV shows are based on American meaning systems, values, norms, or a sense of humor which non-Americans often find it difficult to understand.

For the first few years, it was difficult for me to talk about American pop culture partly because my knowledge about and familiarity with American pop culture is

superficial compared to Americans' knowledge and familiarity. I knew about American pop culture more than the majority of Japanese people but much less than Americans. Because my knowledge stock about American pop culture was limited, I could talk about American pop culture only briefly and superficially; however, I could not enjoy talking about that subject with Americans.

As an international student from Japan, American people have frequently asked me about a large variety of subjects about Japan including food, history, lifestyle, Japanese statistics (e.g., population, birth rate, unemployment rate), politics, social systems such as education, health insurance, and recycling policy to name a few. Occasionally, I feel as if Americans see me as "a walking Wikipedia of Japan"—an expert who has answers to all of their questions about Japan. I have noticed that I am asked about Japan more often from strangers at a social occasion than friends of mine. I assume that those Americans think it is an appropriate topic for small talk with Japanese international student. Unfortunately, I am not knowledgeable enough about Japan to answer their questions. For me it is shameful to reveal that I have little knowledge about my own country and at the same time I have the feeling of guilt for my failure to return Americans' politeness of showing an interest in Japan.

Additionally, based on my personal experiences, I assume it is difficult for many Japanese international students to talk about some of their past experiences with American students. Although none of the Japanese students in this study mentioned this issue, I positively assume that quite a few Japanese international students experience difficulty talking about their past experiences with American students. Japanese and American students have their own past experiences and memories respectively. The

essences, meanings, and significances of their past experiences are contextual and culturally constructed. Therefore, it is difficult for Japanese students to fully understand the essential meanings and significance of American students' past experiences and vice versa. To illustrate, Japanese students come from a society where people do not have a prom and would have a hard time to understand this school event and the experiences and memory that American students have about it. On the other hand, American students come from a society where senior high school students do not need to go through tough and competitive college entrance examinations and would have a hard time to understand the difficulty, stress and memory that Japanese students have with their experiences of "examination hell." In order for two people to understand, not just explain, their past experience and its memory, it is necessary for them to share the same or similar understanding and interpretation about one's past experience and its memory. Therefore, even though none of the interviewees mentioned in the present study, I assume that past experience is one of the topics that Japanese international students would find it difficult to talk about with American students.

Joking Together

The Japanese students in this study experience difficulty sharing jokes with Americans or making Americans laugh. Inability to share jokes with Americans and make them laugh frustrates Japanese students. There are various reasons why this communication difficulty frustrates them, including failure to develop relationships with American students, failure to appeal their attractiveness, failure to please and amuse their friends, and so forth.

Cultural Differences in a Sense of Humor

In this study, Japanese international students reported that they find it difficult to share laughter with American students. They have found the cultural differences in a sense of humor or jokes. Their communication and relationships with Americans are affected by cultural differences of a sense of humor. *Kouta* thinks there is difference in a sense of humor between Japanese and American culture. He does not watch American TV shows very much because he cannot understand what is funny:

> I am not saying that I never watch American TV shows but I don't quite get their funniness…I am thinking, 'What is a joke spot about this?' Japanese people and Americans laugh at very different things…For example, there are the scenes in which people are murdered in the movies. Americans laugh when people are murdered. Japanese would be shocked.

Kana also has found the differences in a sense of humor and jokes between Japanese people and Americans:

> The Japanese and Americans have totally different triggers for laughter. I had no idea about American triggers for laughter. I don't understand yet. I don't find American movies funny. I don't understand American comedies [Laughs]…A sense of humor. I really don't understand it [a sense of humor] even now. When I am talking about something which I don't find funny, people laughed about it. I am like, "What is going on? Did I say something funny now?"

Sayaka specified several problems communicating with Americans:

> I can't talk with American at the same rhythm. And I can't find a topic. As we talk, they are laughing. But I don't know what they are laughing about. They tend to keep talking about stupid stuff, so it is difficult. The point we laugh during a conversation is different between us [the Japanese] and them [Americans]. When we went to the movie together, I didn't know what was so funny in the movie…I did understand the movie and I did understand the story line, but I wondered, "Why are you laughing now?" I guess it was a unique American joke. It was sad that I could not share.

Junko felt sad when she was separated from a circle of laugher. She said, "When everyone is laughing in class, I sometime don't know what they are talking and laughing about. When it happens, I feel sad."

For *Kenji*, a lack of a common sense of humor or jokes results in dissatisfaction with the relationships with Americans. He said, "It is difficult for each of us to become close friends when we do not have something in common." He has found it difficult to find American friends with whom he can connect himself:

> Even though I have good friends here, there is still a mismatch about a point that we find the most exciting and important in a conversation… I'm not saying that my American friends and I can't be on the same wavelength. Even they are good friends of mine, compared to my Japanese friends, there is still something different. We have a different sense of humor and jokes. I also find differences in everyday small talk, too.

The occurrence of humor is universal. Cross-cultural research indicates that laughter appears in extremely similar forms across diverse cultures and linguistic groups (see Edmonsdon, 1987), suggesting its universality. However, what is considered funny, as well as when, where, with whom, under what conditions a person may joke, differs cross-culturally, and even between individuals of a single culture (Raskin, 1985; Hymes, 1972). Given the cross-cultural distinctiveness in an idea of what is funny, the construction and comprehension of verbal humor in a foreign language require sophisticated linguistic, social and cultural competence (Bell, 2006, 2007).

Joking performance and a sense of humor are culturally unique and specific. Each cultural group has its own unique styles and norms of joking performance. Ethnographic research has documented that distinctiveness of joking performance and a sense of humor across cultural groups. Basso (1979) analyzed Western Apache's joking imitation of Anglo-Americans (*the Whiteman*). This joking performance is a production of intergroup

encounters. For Western Apaches, daily face-to-face interactions with Anglo-Americans became unavoidable. In social interactions, Anglo-Americans violated Western Apache's sociocultural norms. They parodied typical behaviors of Anglo-Americans ("*the Whiteman*"), frequently physicians, Bureau of Indian Affairs officials, and school teachers. This was how this joking style was created. Joking imitation of *the Whiteman* portrays Anglo-Americans as socially incompetent and differentiates appropriate Apache behavior from inappropriate Anglo-American behaviors. By dramatizing "what Western Apaches are not" (i.e., Anglo-Americans) and joking about *the Whiteman*, they define "what Western Apaches are" and maintain Western Apache beliefs and values. The important implication of Basso's (1979) research for this study is twofold. First, this unique form of joking produces the in-group bounding and intergroup boundary maintenance for Western Apache. Secondly, Western Apaches' imitation of *the Whiteman* functions as a joke only among Western Apaches because the essence of their jokes is the contrast between Western Apache sociocultural norms of appropriate behaviors and typical behavioral patterns of Anglo-Americans. Imitation of "*the Whiteman*" is distinctively Western Apache humor.

A Boke-Tsukkomi Joking Dialogue

The uniqueness of Japanese humor was mentioned by the Japanese students in this study. Tetsuya and Sayaka both mentioned the difficulty performing a Japanese joking style in an intercultural conversation. *Tetsuya* mentioned that he frequently does not understand American jokes when he is communicating with Americans.

> I think Americans have different triggers for laughter. They laugh at something that we don't know what is funny about…In my opinion, Japanese jokes are, as a style of *Boke* (ボケ) and *Tsukkomi* (ツッコミ) represents, one person says something silly, and the other jabs and mocks him. I think what the Japanese find

> funny is the gap between *Tsukkomi* and *Boke*. I don't expect it is possible to do it in English. It is difficult…If we do it in English, people would misunderstand that someone is talking total nonsense and stupid. Because in English we [the Japanese] just express a joke in a simple and direct manner, I think this joking style is too unique to Japanese people. So if something is off, a person is nothing but a weirdo talking total nonsense. I am not good at English enough to joke using the Japanese knack of joking.

In playful conversations with her Japanese friends, *Sayaka* often plays a jabber to make people laugh; however, it is difficult for to perform the same role in intercultural settings. She said:

> I always jab [つっこむtsukkomu] at them. Well, at least I believe I do. I don't know how to jab in English. I know there are some slang expressions that people use to teasingly jab at others. There must be English expressions that people use for that. But I don't know well. I can't jab well in English. I am a jabber in conversations with my Japanese friends…Well, I am not familiar with the boundary. I don't know how far I can go. I don't know when it becomes rude…I think it is different between Japanese people and Americans. Well, when they react to my jab, I can't figure out their response. I can't tell whether if they are offended or they take my jab as a joke. So I try to keep my mouth shut.

Boke (ボケ) can be translated to the fool who says something silly, nonsense, unpredictable or extravagant. *Boke* also means the comments that he or she makes. *Tsukkomi* (ツッコミ) can be translated to "to jab" and a person who jabs at others. A *Tsukkomi* jabs at a *Boke* and exaggerates his or her foolishness. As Tetsuya described, what Japanese people find funny is the gap between *Tsukkomi* and *Boke.* A unit of humor is a dynamics dialogue between a *Boke* and a *Tsukkomi*. A *Tsukkomi* teases and insults a *Boke* to accentuate and exaggerate his or her foolishness. Hence, there is likelihood that this style of humor construction could offend an interlocutor. This possibility may increase especially when a receiver of jabbing is not familiar with sociolinguistic competence and context of this speech act (Hymes, 1972, 1974). This style of humor can

be constructed and comprehended only when both parties are aware of and familiar with this style and their roles in a dialogue.

Japanese international students mention that a joking dialogue between a *Boke* (the fool) and a *Tsukkomi* (a jabber) is distinctive Japanese humor. The fact that each cultural group has its own unique form of joking is also demonstrated by a study of razzing among Osage Indians (Wieder & Pratt, 1990). Wieder and Pratt (1990) describe razzing—the distinctive Indian form of sparring. Razzing is "a typically extemporaneous form of communication about the ongoing events of a particular situation—razzing is dependent on the situation, evolves from it, is a feature of that situation that is done within that situation, and is about it" (Wieder & Pratt, 1990, p.54). There is expectation about how to respond to razzing, and that expectation is socially and culturally constructed. Both parties razz each other. One who razzes must be ready to play a role of a recipient of razzing. A recipient of razzing is expected to make light of the situation and respond in the appropriate manner which is defined by cultural custom. Wieder and Pratt (1990) contend that "who may and, indeed, who should razz whom about that and in which situations is…defined by cultural convention" (p.54). Construction of razzing requires both parties to have the familiarity with and competency for this form of communication. Because it is distinctive and almost exclusive Indian form of joking, razzing serves to identify oneself as a real Indian.

The Japanese students in this study commented that, "It is impossible to perform a *Boke* and a *Tsukkomi* in English." This comment can be interpreted in two ways. First, they believe it would be impossible because it requires high level of English proficiency. Second, the comment can be interpreted as the Japanese students' assumption that it

would be impossible because a joking dialogue between a *Boke* and a *Tsukkomi* is too distinctive to Japanese people. A joking dialogue between *Boke* and *Tsukkomi* is a unique Japanese humor. Japanese students find it funny; however they assume that Americans cannot understand what is funny and why it is funny. In this sense, even perfect Japanese-English bilinguals would not be able to perform it intercultural settings. Although I am not sure if this joking dialogue between *Boke* and *Tsukkomi* serves to identity Japanese people as real Japanese in the similar way with razzing for Indian (Wieder & Pratt, 1990), I assume it can serve to indicate native-like competence of Japanese communicative behaviors.

Based on the comments of the Japanese students in this study, we can see that it is difficult for Japanese students to perform a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogue in intercultural settings. For Japanese international students, it is highly challenging to perform this joking dialogue in English and toward an American, either as a participant in a dialogue or an audience of this dialogue. First of all, there is a prerequisite for Japanese students to perform a *Boke-Tsukkomi* dialogue in the settings of intercultural communication with an American. The prerequisite is American's familiarity with this joking style. If an American has no clue about this joking style, Japanese student's attempt at performing a Boke or Tsukkomi fails. Without knowledge about this joking performance of Japanese people, Americans might probably perceive a Boke as a total fool and a Tsukkomi as an offensive and rude person.

An intercultural setting can be the situation in which two or more Japanese students perform a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogue as they have an American audience. In this situation, Japanese students need to have enough English language proficiency to

perform this joking dialogue in English in order for their dialogue to be recognized as joking by an American audience. It is difficult for Americans to understand the dynamics of a dialogue between a *Boke* and a *Tsukkomi*. When an American student observes two or more Japanese students engaging *Boke-Tsukkomi* dialogue, he or she may have difficulty recognizing that they are joking and/or understanding what is funny and why it is funny.

Another intercultural setting can be the situation in which a Japanese student engages in a conversation with an American. In other words, an American is their conversation partner and they perform jabbing at or play a Boke toward an American person. Presumably, it is difficult or challenging for Japanese students to carry a *Boke-Tsukkomi* dialogue with Americans for several reasons. First, it is difficult to perform jabbing at an American. In order for a Japanese student to perform jabbing toward an American student, they need to have enough English proficiency, familiarity with the boundary between being funny and being rude or offensive, and understanding of social appropriateness among Americans. Otherwise, their intents to joke may be misunderstood by Americans. They might not perceive Japanese students' attempt at a playful jabbing to be funny. They may even perceive such playful attempt of Japanese student as offensive. As such, it is likely to offend an American person when Japanese students perform jabbing toward an American. When they believe they are not competent enough to jab in English, Japanese students are unlikely to attempt to jab at their American friends probably because they presume that it will violate their communicate norms which value consideration about others' feelings.

Second, it is challenging to perform a Boke toward an American hoping he or she recognizes their playful intentions. Japanese students need to have enough communicative ability and resource in order to be recognized their intentions to play a *Boke;* otherwise, an American person, either as an audience or a receiver in a dialogue, would perceive him or her as a strange fool talking total nonsense. When a Japanese person plays full with an intention to perform a *Boke* and initiate a joking dialogue, it may be difficult for an American to recognize it as a sign of joking and respond to it with jabbing in an appropriate manner so that the ongoing joking dialogue can develop between them.

Summary: Joking Together

The findings of this study demonstrate that, in intercultural conversations, Japanese international students experienced difficulty in joking together due to the cultural differences in a sense of humor and joking style. Japanese students find it difficult to share jokes with American students because of a language barrier between them as well as the cultural barrier regarding a sense of humor and joking performance. Following past studies which have discussed the cultural differences in joking styles and a sense of humor (e.g., Basso, 1979; Wieder & Pratt, 1990), this study finds that cultural distinctiveness of Japanese joking performance, which is a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogue. Furthermore, this study also finds that difficulty in joking and laughing together has an impact on satisfaction with intercultural communication for Japanese college students. To my knowledge, no studies about joking in intercultural communication, not cultural differences in joking, have been documented in the literature.

From the perspective of Japanese students, difficulty in sharing jokes and laughter is a hindrance to satisfactory intercultural communication. It is important to take into account that the interviewees are young college students. Having fun with friends is one of their primary concerns in their college lives. The difficulty in sharing jokes or laugher may not be a significant or salient issue for international communication of Japanese businessmen. Specifically for Japanese international students, it is of great importance to share jokes and humor and laugh together with American students.

Research on laughter suggests a possible explanation for why sharing jokes and laughter is an important issue for Japanese students when they talk about their relationships with American students. Glenn (2003) shows that laughter is a means to display that interaction participants have like-mindedness and similar background and knowledge and promote bonding and affiliation with others. Jefferson, Sacks, and Schegloff (1987) show how speakers utilize shared laughter in displaying affiliation and remedying possible interactional improprieties. As Hertzler (1970) notes, shared laughter provides, at least temporarily, a group unity or awareness, a psychic connection of all the laughers. It can be induced as a means of displaying this group togetherness. It allows for the expression and maintenance of group values and standards, via the subjects and situations to which it refers. It can boost morale and ease internal hostilities or differences. Laughing at people or things external to the group can strengthen boundaries, solidifying members in their group identity against outsiders (pp.93-98). Sharing jokes, humor and laughter with American students is particularly important for Japanese international students probably because they long for the affiliation with them as friends.

Summary

Research has found that Japanese sojourners and international students tend to have problems of the interpersonal relationships with the local. In reviewing studies on Japanese sojourners, Okazaki-Luff (1991) has concluded that Japanese people tend to experience a great deal of difficulty communicating with hosts and they tend to separate themselves within coethnic networks without developing relationships with host social networks. Yeh and Inose (2002) found that Japanese students in the U.S. were more likely to experience interpersonal problems than were Chinese and Korean students. This study finds several problems that Japanese international students have experienced in communication with American students.

The Attitudes and Behaviors of American Students

This study finds that it is difficult for Japanese students to make friends with American students because they perceive American students' attitudes and/or behaviors as problematic. Specifically, the following primary issues were mentioned by the Japanese students in the present study: (1) unwillingness to communicate; (2) unfriendly reactions; and (3) problematic speaking behaviors. True motives of American students remain unknown; therefore, they may be in fact willing to communicate and trying to be helpful and friendly. Japanese students may misunderstand American students' attitudes and/or behaviors. Regardless of Americans' motives, Japanese students perceive American students' behaviors to be problematic.

I assume that Japanese international students find American students' behaviors as problematic because they rely on Japanese communicative norms when they observe and interpret American students' behaviors. For Japanese people, concern for others is an

important criterion of interpersonal communication skills. Most probably, while interacting with American students, they are concerned about American students' feelings and they expect American students to reciprocally give them the same consideration. Compared to Japanese people, Americans place less value on consideration for others. Their expectations were violated. Based on a Japanese norm which values consideration for others, Japanese students perceive American students to be unwilling to communicate with them, display unfriendly reactions, and have problematic speaking style.

Japan-Connected Americans

This research finds that the Japanese international students in this study have developed friendly relationships with Japan-connected Americans—the Americans who have an interest in Japan. Based on Japanese students' remarks, communication and relationship between them are characterized by communicative ability of Japan-connected Americans as well as reciprocal interests and motives for communication. First, Japanese international students develop and maintain friendships with Japan-connected American students because they perceive that Japan-connected Americans have acquired communication ability which helps Japanese students to speak and understand English, including: (1) patiently listening to influent English speaking, (2) slowly and clearly speaking English; and (3) showing interest in and appreciation of Japanese culture.

Second, their relationships are initiated, developed and maintained on the basis of mutual motives and interests. Japanese students seek an opportunity to speak English with native speakers for practice as well as friendships with American students.

Reciprocally, American students seek for an opportunity to learn and practice Japanese language as well as friendships with Japanese students.

Comparison between Two Relationships

Japanese students' relationships with Japan-connected Americans are contrastive to their communication with the other American students (i.e., non-Japan-connected Americans). Roughly speaking, Japanese students are not satisfied with communication and relationships with the other American students. In Japanese students' observation and interpretation, there is perceived conflict between their interest in communicating with American students and American students' indifference about communicating with them.

To the contrary, Japanese students are satisfied with relationships with Japan-connected Americans. Their relationships represent Japanese students' integration strategy and American students' multiculturalism strategy (e.g. Berry, 1997, 2006, 2008). There is mutuality between Japanese students and American students in terms of interest in intergroup relationships. The relationships between Japanese students and Japan-connected Americans are built upon appreciation of Japanese culture and language.

The difference between Japan-connected American students and the other American students is the existence of reciprocal interests and motives. It is difficult for Japanese students to communicate and develop relationships with the other American students because there is less reciprocal interests between them. Perhaps, Japanese students can develop relationships with Japan-connected Americans more smoothly than the other American students because they share reciprocal interests and motives for communication and relationships.

Comparison between these two groups of American students helps us presume what kind of attitudes and abilities are necessary and desired for native speakers to help non-native speakers to communicate in a foreign language. Japanese students recognize that Japan-connected American students have acquired communication ability to patiently listen to their influent English, slowly and clearly speak English, and show appreciation of Japanese culture. On the other hand, Japanese students perceive problems in the other American students' behaviors, namely unwillingness to communicate, unfriendly reactions, and problematic speaking behaviors (e.g., speaking too fast). Grounded in these findings, this study proposes that, when native speakers communicate with influent non-native speakers, non-native speakers would appreciate if they have the willingness to invest time and energy to speak slowly and listen patiently.

This study finds that making friends with Americans is an important issue for Japanese international students. During the interviews, many Japanese students talked a lot about their experiences of communicating with Americans. It is important to take into account that the interviewees are young college students. Having fun with friends is one of their primary concerns in their college lives. The difficulty making friends may not be a significant or salient issue or concern for non-student sojourners such as businessmen. Specifically for Japanese international students, it is of great importance to make friends and have fun with Americans.

Lack of Common Conversation Topics

This study finds that it is difficult for Japanese students to initiate and develop relationships with Americans because they do not share conversation topics. Common topics facilitate conversations progress as well as relationship development. The common

discourse topics among Japanese college students include Japanese TV dramas, comedy shows, pop music, celebrity gossip, dating situations, part time jobs, fashion, and job search. Recent movies, popular TV shows, and music are great conversation topics for small talk in many situations.

This study finds that it is difficult for Japanese students to talk about pop culture such as movie, music, and television shows with American students. It is challenging for many Japanese students to talk about pop culture with Americans because: (1) they are not familiar with American pop culture enough to carry on a conversation; (2) Americans are not familiar with Japanese pop culture enough to carry on a conversation; (3) they do not have enough English ability and cultural knowledge to understand and appreciate the content and essence of American pop culture; and (4) some American movies and TV shows are based on American meaning systems, values, norms, or a sense of humor which non-Americans often find it difficult to understand.

Joking Together

The findings of this study demonstrate that, in intercultural conversations, the Japanese students in this study have experienced difficulty joking together with American students. Japanese students find it difficult to share jokes with American students because of a language barrier as well as a cultural barrier regarding a sense of humor and joking performance. Following past studies which have discussed the cultural differences in joking styles and a sense of humor (e.g., Basso, 1979; Wieder & Pratt, 1990), this study finds that cultural distinctiveness of Japanese joking performance, which is a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogue. The Japanese students in this study have recognized or experienced difficulty performing a *Boke* or a *Tsukkomi* in intercultural settings. The fact

that they cannot perform a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogue has an impact on their communication satisfaction because that is their favorite way to be playful with friends. This study finds that sharing jokes, humor and laughter with American students is particularly important for Japanese international students. It is probably because they are young college students who long for friendships with Americans and care to have fun and playful time with friends.

CHAPTER FIVE: IDENTITY DISCREPANCY, ALIENATION, AND SELF-EFFICACY

Identity Discrepancy

This study explores and attempts to understand how Japanese international students in the U.S. communicate their personal identities in intercultural interactions with Americans. In order to examine their intercultural communication of personal identity, I focus on three phenomena regarding identity: (1) one's self-perceived personal identity, (2) one's perception of his or her performance; and (3) one's perception of other-perceived identity. To revisit the definitions, self-perceived personal identity is the aggregation of qualities such as competence, character, and attractiveness which people believe define who they are, individuate them as a distinctive existence in the social environment. The second phenomenon refers to how a person observes his or her performance in social interactions. The third focus is how one believes others may perceive his or her personal identity. It is important to emphasize that a person's perception of others' perspectives is a product of his or her imagination.

To restate the research question: How do Japanese international students experience their self-perceived identity, self-observed performance, and their perception of Americans' perspectives of their identity in intercultural interactions? In order to explore intercultural communication of personal identity, I focus on: (1) how an individual Japanese international student in the U.S. perceives his or her personal identity in intercultural situations; (2) how a Japanese student observes his or her presentation of identity in intercultural situations; and (3) how a Japanese student imagines the Americans around him or her think of who he or she is in intercultural situations.

As I was interviewing them, it was apparent that the interviewees had experienced a discrepancy between the three phenomena regarding identity in intercultural situations. As I analyzed interview transcripts, this finding was confirmed in textual data. This study finds that Japanese students experience: (1) a discrepancy between self-perceived identity and self-observed performance (i.e. their self-observed performance presents an identity which is inconsistent with their self-perceived identity); and (2) a discrepancy between self-perceived and other-perceived identities (i.e., how they believe the Americans around them see their personal identities is discrepant with how they perceive their personal identities). I call the former as identity-performance discrepancy and the latter as identity-other discrepancy.

This finding is consistent with existing theories. As previously explained in the second chapter, researchers have paid attention to a discrepancy between self-perceived identity, presented identity, and other-perceived identity. Hecht and colleagues conceptualize this discrepancy as an identity gap (Jung, 2003; Jung & Hecht, 2004). Ting-Toomey (1993; 2005) postulates that intercultural communication is subject to identity inconsistency and people are motivated to negotiate their identities in intercultural interactions. Zaharna (1989) sheds the light on the discrepancy between self, behavior, and Other and calls the psychological discomfort resulting from the discrepancy as "self-shock."

This study finds *how* Japanese students in the U.S. experience identity discrepancy. I provide case-by-case descriptions of the experiences or events of identity discrepancy focusing on the following components of the event: (1) scene and/or setting; (2) interactants; (3) the aspects of self-perceived personal identity; (4) the description of

one's perception of his or her own presented identity; (5) the description of one's perception of other-perceived identity; (6) the reasons for identity discrepancy; and (7) feelings about identity discrepancy.

I will present cases illustrating the discrepancy between self-perceived identity and self-perceived presented identity as well as cases illustrating the discrepancy between self-perceived identity and one's perception of other-perceived identity. The present analysis is based solely on the interviewees' self-observation of their self-presentation performances and their self-perception of others' perspectives of their identities. Since I did not conduct participant observation or interviews with Americans for this study, I do not have data to speak to the natives' perceptions of Japanese students' actual performance.

Identity-Performance Discrepancy

The Japanese students in this study recognized a discrepancy between their self-perceived identity and their self-observed performance in intercultural interactions. Self-observed performance refers to how a person observes his or her performance in intercultural interactions; therefore, it is likely to be inconsistent with others' observation of how he or she behaves or performs in interactions. I present four types of discrepancy between self-perceived identity and self-observed performance: identity discrepancy in terms of: (1) intelligence; (2) extroversion; (3) funniness; and (4) self-assertion.

Intelligence

Both Tarou and Sakura, two graduate students, have experienced a discrepancy between their self-perceived identity and self-observed performance in intercultural

interactions with Americans. First, I will present Tarou's story in which identity discrepancy in terms of intelligence is identified.

Tarou's story. Tarou is a Master's program student majoring in animal ecology in one of the national universities in Japan. He is in the U.S. for a one-year exchange program. His purpose for participating in this study abroad program is to prepare to study abroad for his Ph.D. program. After the completion of this program, he will go back to Japan and finish his Master's program. Tarou described his status as a graduate student in Japan. He described his college life in Japan as follows:

> In Japan, I had a fulfilling life at school. In the Master's program, I have presented once at the conference and I was given a job offer from a company, in fact. If I had not come to the US and stayed in the Master's program, my career could have been pretty promising.

As this excerpt shows, he considered himself to be a competent and promising graduate student who made a conference presentation and was offered a job from a company.

Lost in class activity. The first case of his identity-performance discrepancy took place in his entomology class. Entomology is his expertise along with animal ecology. His class went to the forest to collect insect samples. He could not figure out what was going on and what to do during sample collecting because of language barrier. He said:

> In the first semester, I had a hard time in an experiment. I could not follow them [classmates] at all. I didn't know what they were doing. We went to the forest to do stuff. Collecting insect samples or something. We worked as a group. I had no idea what to do. So I forced myself to ask, "What should I do now?' One of the group members kindly said, "Okay let's go!" and took me with him. We went deeper into the forest to collect the samples.

His performance in this scene was a complete loss during the class activity: he had no idea what to do. According to him, it was because of his English language ability that he performed poorly on the things that he could easily perform in Japan. His performance

did not reflect his self-perceived competence. This identity-performance discrepancy led to strong feelings. He said, "Seriously, I wanted to die [Laughs]. Just kidding. [Laughs] But honestly, I felt really miserable." He felt miserable to the extent that he figuratively described his feeling as "I want to die."

Interaction with American teaching assistant. The second case of Tarou's identity-performance discrepancy occurred during laboratory work. Tarou talked about the interaction he had with an American teaching assistant (TA). He experienced identity-performance discrepancy during this scene:

> I was a teaching assistant in Japan. I was confident with my laboratory work. When an American TA told me something, I couldn't understand it. I can't communicate. I can't deliver what I want to say. It hurts…At that time, we were both looking at a bug's body and started talking about a sting attached to legs, you know. I don't have enough English vocabulary to talk about it. So he started drawing. At some point, we stopped because we both realized that it was not worth making such a big effort anyway. I apologized to him.

He considered himself to be a competent graduate student. He was a TA in Japan and had high self-efficacy about laboratory work. He observed that his laboratory work in the U.S. was poor and incompetent. His performance during this scene did not reflect his self-perceived identity as being a competent graduate student as well as a capable teaching assistant in Japan. His performance presented him as an incompetent student who was not capable of handling laboratory work properly. He experienced identity-performance discrepancy because of his poor English ability. As he said, "it hurts," his feelings were hurt by this identity-performance discrepancy. He apologized to the American teaching assistant for his language problems.

Reading an English article. The third case of Tarou's identity-performance discrepancy happened in his first semester while he was reading an English academic article for his individual study. He described it as follows:

> I started reading some articles, but because I am not a native speaker, I could not understand some parts. Then I despaired [絶望した *zetsubou-shita*]. I spoke to myself in my mind "You are such an idiot!" I felt drained when I found myself looking up the same word over and over in a dictionary.

Tarou experienced a discrepancy between his intelligence and his poor performance of reading an English academic article. Because he could not understand English words in an article, he had to look up the same word over and over again. Such incompetent performance was discrepant from his self-perceived personal identity as a competent graduate student. During this struggle, he said to himself, "You are such an idiot!" Problems with reading an English article for class made him feel "despair" and he called himself an idiot. He remarked 絶望 (*ze-tsu-bo-u*) and I translated to "despair." 絶望 (*zetsubou)* means a person has no hope left. His use of such a strong word indicates that his feeling of despair was quite intense.

Knowledgeableness. The fourth case of Tarou's identity-performance discrepancy is related to his knowledgeableness. It is difficult for international students to express their knowledgeableness in a second language especially when they want to share their professional knowledge with others. Tarou experienced difficulty in expressing his knowledge about animal ecology in English. He answered my question: "Have you ever felt that you can't fully perform your capability or intelligence?" as follows:

> Yeah. In class. I throw in the towel...I can do better when I write. I just cannot say it. If I have a pencil, I write it out as much as I want. I have lot of knowledge. I can write something like, "Someone did so-and-so in the year of 19-something."When it happens, I feel victorious. Inside, I am thinking, "Look. I do have some knowledge, you know."

He has knowledge; however, he cannot express it orally. He can express it using a pen and paper. He needs a proper channel of communication to convey and perform his intelligence. He said that when he managed to express his knowledgeableness using writing tools, he felt victorious over American students and his inner voice said, "Look. I do have some knowledge, you know." Although he did not articulate the feeling that he had when he could not present his knowledgeableness, his remark, "I feel victorious" implies that he might be feeling inferior to American students when he could not express his knowledgeableness.

The fact that he could not fully perform his competence frustrated him to a great extent because his poor performance violated his self-expectation. In the beginning of his study abroad program, he ignored advice from the International Students Service Office and enrolled in upper level classes, including one graduate level. They were too difficult for him. He refused to go to school for a week because he was too frustrated. He studied in the library by himself. Looking back his action, he found it as "a big mistake." Learning from this mistake, he enrolled in "easy classes" for the second semester. Although he had the difficult start, he told me that he had got better. He said "I feel much better after the first semester." He looked back at his first semester and recognized the mistake he made:

> I guess I was overconfident about myself. I enrolled in upper-level classes. That was a big mistake…In fact, I was told by international student service office staff members 'This class may be too difficult for you' but I told them 'I can do this' I should have taken easy classes such as gymnastics and English classes for exchange students. When I just got here, I convinced myself that it would be inappropriate to take such easy classes because I am a graduate student. I was worried that the people in my department in Japanese might have made fun of me if I would take such easy classes.

Tarou had a high self-expectation with his course work. He set his self-expectation high because he thought "it would be inappropriate to take such easy classes because I am a graduate student" and because he was worried that "people in my department in Japanese might have made fun of me if I would take such easy classes." As these statements demonstrate, he used to be overconfident and put too much pressure on himself because he was concerned about his face toward his colleagues in Japan. A part of his stress and frustration is due to comparison with his academic peers and friends in Japan. However, his performance violated his self-expectation and as a result he was stressed to the extent that he refused to go to class for a week.

After he had stayed in the US for four or five months, he changed his attitude. He lowered his self-expectation and standard for his performance. He came to a realization. He said;

> After the first semester, I could relax and feel relieved. I came to think that it is all right not to understand everything and it is not a problem that he cannot communicate in English. I came to think that it is lucky if I succeed.

In his case, his self-expectation was detrimental to his psychological well-being. For him, a discrepancy between his self-perceived identity and performance meant violation of his self-expectation, which leads to self-disappointment or frustration with himself. The expectation that he imposed on himself and his over-confidence caused him a great deal of stress and tension. Once he got rid of self-expectation, he could relax and enjoy himself more.

To summarize, a salient component of his self-perceived personal identity in these four cases is as a competent graduate student. His story indicates that his performance in intercultural settings failed to present his self-perceived identity as a competent and

knowledgeable graduate student. The discrepant performances include: (1) becoming completely lost during the entomology class; (2) poor laboratory work accompanied by difficulty communicating with his American teaching assistant; (3) having trouble reading an English academic journal; and (4) failure to orally present his knowledge. He observes that his performances in these four scenes are discrepant with his self-perceived identity as being a competent and intelligent graduate student.

Sakura's story. Sakura, a one-year exchange student who is a graduate student in Japan, is highly frustrated with her self-observed performance during classroom discussion. For the current semester, she is enrolled in two graduate school classes in her major (i.e., international relations), along with a Chinese language class. She said, "My performance in my graduate school classes is poor. That is my biggest worry and stress now."

At graduate schools in the U.S., instructors frequently use presentation and discussion. Students read assignments in advance and they all discuss and exchange their opinions in class. Classroom discussion is a highly challenging task for Japanese students for two reasons. The first reason is language barrier. During discussion, American students tend to speak fast and use slang, idioms, jargon, and technical terminology. International students tend to sit and "be all ears" in order to understand what the others are talking about. This problem with discussion or presentation is most often mentioned by the participants of this study. Secondly, classroom discussion is not a common teaching style in Japanese high schools or universities especially at the undergraduate level. Japanese international students are not accustomed to participating in discussion. It is difficult for them to jump into ongoing discussion to assert their opinions.

Sakura finds it difficult to participate in discussion: "I am way slower to understand than Americans, I cannot participate in discussions. So there is conflict inside of me. I have inner conflict that "I could understand better in Japanese!" She described her performance during the classroom discussion as follows:

> I very frequently lose confidence in myself. I cannot figure out what is going on because everyone in class uses technical terminology during discussion. This is my second time of studying abroad. So I feel pressured. I cannot understand at all even after I have studied in Canada before I came here. It hurts me. I lived in Canada for nine months and I have been here for four months and so as a total I studied abroad for one year plus. Even so, I can't understand. It is very stressful. It is very stressful when I cannot figure out what the heck is going on around me.
>
> I think I do not have enough vocabulary. I can understand an outline of what people [classmates] say but I can't understand the details. For example, when one student says something, the other students are supposed to state disagreement or point out the weakness. I cannot do that. I just accept what they say and I'm like "I see." I cannot go any further than that. Plus, I don't have vocabulary so I can't understand the discussion once they start talking about something very specialized and profound.
>
> I know that I am expected to say something in class but I can't. I can't meet that expectation. That situation stresses me out. I undergo conflict...I am disappointed in myself. I am stuck. I don't understand. But I do not want to give up. So I try to read the assigned readings very thoroughly. Yet, I am lost in discussion. I cannot catch up with topics. When I am in class, I am thinking "The instructors must be thinking, 'She [Sakura] doesn't say anything AT ALL!' in their minds…I am disappointed in myself. But I can't let it go. I wish I could think, "There is nothing I can do." …I just cannot think, "There is nothing I can do." Maybe I have tendency to hate to lose. I originally hate to lose. So it is mortifying for me that I cannot say anything in the discussion.

She described her performance in the graduate school classes focusing on her discussion participation. She described her performance as frustrating and disappointing. During discussion, she is lost because she cannot figure out what is going on around her due to her insufficient English vocabulary. She cannot catch up with the discussion topic. She cannot express her disagreement or agreement. She just accepts their opinions and has

little exchange of opinions with her classmates. Although she is aware that she has to speak up and participate in discussion, she keeps quiet.

Her performance in the graduate school classes causes "inner conflict"—the conflict between her desire to participate in discussion and her failure to do so. She wants to let it go but she cannot give up because she hates to lose. She compared herself in Japan with herself in the U.S. in classroom situation:

> As far as the graduate school classes are concerned, these two [selves] are totally different. The two different persons…Well, in Japan, I like participating in discussion and doing presentation. I actively speak in class and an instructor gives me good evaluation on my presentation. But since I came here, I don't know what is happening in class. I cannot participate in discussion. I cannot make a good presentation. It takes me very long time to read materials, so all I can do is to understand materials. I cannot afford to build my opinion on them, and as a result, my presentation is poor. Even when an instructor points out the problems in my presentation, all I can say is "I don't understand." My performance in class is poor. That is my biggest worry at present.

Here she describes her self-perceived personal identity about academic work. A salient component of her self-perceived personal identity in this situation is a competent graduate student who is capable of actively participating in discussion and doing presentations well. In graduate school in Japan, she had high self-efficacy beliefs about discussion participation and presentation. However, in graduate school classes in the U.S., she cannot figure out what the others are talking in discussion and she cannot participate in discussion. She cannot express her self-perceived identity in her performance in the graduate school classes in the U.S. Her performance does not represent her self-perceived identity. As she says, because of her limited English ability and the fact that American graduate students frequently use technical and professional terminology during discussion, she experiences the identity-performance discrepancy. This discrepancy causes a loss of confidence, a great deal of stress and frustration.

Importantly, she considers herself in graduate school classes in the U.S. and herself in graduate school classes in Japan as two totally different people. In her case, recognition of identity-performance discrepancy leads to recognition of two selves. She further portrayed such feelings:

> I feel as if I was an empty shell just sitting there and I am floating in the air. I see myself struggling with speaking up and participating in the discussion. I am so frustrated. It is not me. I hate myself being like that.

She observes her own performance as the audience of her own performance. As the excerpts demonstrate, she cannot participate in discussion as much as she wants because of language barriers in the U.S. Her performance is inconsistent with her self-perceived personal identity as a competent graduate student. In Japan, she is capable of participating in discussion and she has high self-efficacy about her academic work in Japanese graduate school. She observes that her performance fails to represent her self-perceived identity, and consequently she feels as if she was a different person and "an empty shell." Her self-perceived identity as a competent graduate student is frozen and suspended in the U.S.

To summarize, in classroom discussions in the graduate school classes, her self-perceived identity as a competent graduate student who is capable of actively participating in discussion becomes salient. She experiences difficulty in participating in discussion because of her limited English proficiency. Sakura perceives a discrepancy between her self-perceived identity and her observed performance in the graduate school classes. In graduate school classes, she feels as if she was a completely different person or "an empty shell." Such cognitive dissonance within her mind results in a great deal of frustration and self-disappointment.

Identity-Performance Discrepancy: Extroversion

Two interviewees (Sakura and Tarou) have experienced discrepancies between the extroversion element of self-perceived identity and their self-observed performance in intercultural settings. Both of them consider themselves as friendly and/or talkative; however, they observe that their performances in intercultural interactions do not reflect these qualities. Their performance presents quiet or less sociable personas.

Sakura's story. First, Sakura talks about her extroverted personality and how she behaves in graduate school classes in U.S. In the retrospective fashion, she said, "I never talked to classmates before. I was scared. I was scared to express myself." I asked why she was scared.

> Why I was scared…Well maybe originally I am the kind of person who can make friends with anyone and I like coming in contact with people very much. When I was in Japan, I did not hesitate to initiate a conversation with a stranger sitting next to me in class. But since I came here, maybe because of language, I can't initiate a conversation with them [American students] because I am scared that I might not be able to understand their response to me. Even if I manage to initiate a conversation with them, I cannot communicate with them. I am scared that they may be thinking, "What is wrong with her?" So I restrain myself.

She further described herself in graduate school classes where her friendliness is frozen.

> I am withdrawn into myself…It is very hard. I cannot follow the others. It is not easy for classmates to talk to me, too. One day, one of the classmates talked to me like "What do you think about this part right here?' but I didn't know exactly how to respond to that so I barely managed to say "It was interesting." That was all I could say. That person gave me a look, "That's all you can say?" It was very scary. Since then, I cannot communicate well in that situation. So in the graduate level classes, I cannot be my usual self…In the graduate class, it is like I am like suffocating myself. In my mind, I am thinking "What should I do if they talk to me?" "What should I do if the instructor asks me something?" I keep my mouth shut. It hurts because I originally love to talk.

In these excerpts, we can see which identity elements were salient in this situation. She says, "Originally I am the kind of person who can make friends with anyone and I

like coming in contact with people very much" and "I originally love to talk." She considers herself as extroverted, friendly, and talkative. These personalities are the salient elements of her self-perceived identity in this situation. It is not a problem for her to talk to classmates and make friends with them in Japan. During the interview, I could easily see her extroverted personality. In spite of the fact that we had never met each other before this interview, she opened up herself and confided in me with her stress about course work. I could easily imagine how frustrating it is for her to be unable to casually talk to people and make friends with them.

Her performance, however, misrepresents who she is. She has observed that her performance in interactions with her American classmates represents a quiet person who cannot carry on a conversation and is scared of talking. She hesitates to initiate a conversation with them and thus keeps silent. She believes it is because of her poor English speaking ability; however, as she explicitly mentions, she hesitates to initiate a conversation with American classmates because she is scared. Her past failures make her too anxious to initiate conversations with American classmates. Her fear and social anxiety have accumulated through her perception of American students' behaviors. Her experience suggests that, when Japanese students perceive American students' communication behaviors as problematic (see Chapter 4), it can result in identity discrepancy. This is an example showing that problems and conflicts with others can eventually lead to inner conflict within a person—a discrepancy between self-perceived identity and self-observed performance. Because of her low self-confidence in English and her social anxiety, her performance in interactions with American classmates is discrepant with her self-perceived identity as being extroverted, friendly, and talkative.

This identity-performance discrepancy makes her feel as if she was suffocated. I think she used the word "suffocating" to figuratively mean that her self-perceived identity or who she really is suffocated under a mask of her performance.

To summarize, in conversations with American classmates, her self-perceived identity as an extroverted, friendly, and talkative person becomes salient. She has observed that her performance, however, misrepresents who she is. Her performance in interactions with American classmates represents a quiet person who cannot carry on a conversation and is scared of talking. This identity-performance discrepancy emerges in her mind because of her limited English ability as well as her anxiety about communication with American students.

Tarou's story. Similarly to Sakura, Tarou has also experienced identity-performance discrepancy in terms of his extroverted and friendly personalities. He talked about his difficulty in making friends with Americans:

> When I try to make friends, sometime it is difficult. I can't make friends with Americans unless they are interested in Japan…Yeah, it is difficult. In Japan, it is easy for me to approach strangers and make friends with them. It is easy for me to make friends with Japanese. But it is difficult to do so here. I should not approach anyone because I can get along well only with the American students who take Japanese classes or who are JSA [Japanese Student Association] members.

As we can see in his remark: "In Japan, it is easy for me to approach strangers and make friends with them," he originally considered himself as a friendly and extroverted person who can make friends with strangers in Japan. During the interview, I saw him as a very friendly and sociable person. He willingly introduced me to some of his Japanese friends for this research.

However, Tarou has come to realize that he cannot make friends with *any* Americans he meets in the U.S. He can make friends only with the Japan-connected

American students because they also want to make friends with him. The other American students, he believes, are indifferent about communicating and making friends with Japanese students. For this reason, he cannot make friends with strangers in the U.S. His social network with local people is limited to the relationships with the Japan-connected American students. No matter how much he wants to make friends with the other American students, his desire is not fulfilled because he perceives that they are indifferent about communicating and developing a relationship with Japanese international students.

His self-observed performance contradicts with his self-perceived personal identity. He considers himself as a friendly person who can approach strangers and make friends with *anyone.* However, it is difficult and almost impossible for him to make friends with any Americans. His performance fails to present his extroverted and friendly character. In this situation, he feels that he is not performing a full version of his personality. He perceived a discrepancy between his self-observed performance and self-perceived personal identity.

To summarize, Tarou considers himself as a person who can make friends with anyone in Japan. In the U.S., no matter how much he wants to make friends with Americans, he can become friends only with a limited group of Americans—the Japan-connected Americans. He experiences a discrepancy between his self-perceived identity (a person who can make friends with *anyone*) and his performance (making friends only with the Japan-connected Americans). He believes that his identity discrepancy is caused by his limited English proficiency and American students' indifference about developing friendship with Japanese students.

Identity-Performance Discrepancy: Funniness

Two interviewees (Sayaka and Tarou) have experienced a discrepancy between their funniness element of self-perceived identity and their self-observed performance in intercultural setting. Both of them consider themselves as funny and good at making people laugh; however, they observe that their performances in intercultural interactions do not reflect their funniness.

Sayaka's story. Sayaka considers herself as a funny person. She finds it difficult to be as funny in English as she really is in Japanese. The following is her talk about her self-perceived personal identity (i.e., funny) and difficulty performing her funniness in intercultural settings:

> Well, Americans like having discussions and arguments. But I want to have silly conversations with them, but we always end up talking about a serious topic. Well, my character is being funny. I am the kind of person who is always making jokes. But in English, I don't know how to fool. I am not happy that I can have only unexciting conversations with them.

We can further see her self-perceived personal identity in her description of joking conversations which she typically has with her Japanese friends.

In the previous chapter, I described a Japanese unique joking performance—a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogues. As you will see below, her funniness is closely bound with a role of *Tsukkomi.* To briefly summarize the description of a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogues, *Tsukkomi* can be translated to the action of "to jab" as well as a person who jabs at others. A *Tsukkomi* jabs at a *Boke* (i.e., the fool who says something silly, nonsense, unpredictable or extravagant). A *Tsukkomi* (or jabber) teases and sometimes insults a *Boke* to accentuate and exaggerate his or her foolishness. Hence, there is great risk that a jabber could offend a recipient because his or her jabbing is likely to be rude,

aggressive, or offensive when the recipient is not familiar with this particular style of joking.

In Japan, Sayaka often plays a jabber in a joking conversation; however, it is difficult for her to perform the same role in intercultural settings. She said:

> I always jab [つっこむtsukkomu] at them [her Japanese friends]. Well, at least I believe I do. I don't know how to jab in English. I know there are some slang expressions that people use to teasingly jab at others. There must be English expressions that people use for that. But I don't know well. I can't jab well in English. I am a jabber in conversations with my Japanese friends.

In joking conversations with her Japanese friends, she always jabs at them to construct humor. A jabber is her role in playful conversations with her Japanese friends. In her opinion, the reason why she cannot jab at her American friends is culture-related.

> Well, I am not familiar with the boundary. I don't know how far I can go. I don't know when it becomes rude…I think it is different between Japanese people and Americans. Well, when they react to my jab, I can't figure out their response. I can't tell whether if they are offended or they take my jab as a joke. So I try to keep my mouth shut.

As this excerpt portrays, for Sayaka, a role of *Tsukkomi* is embedded in her self-perceived personal identity as being a funny person. This can be seen in her comment; instead of saying, "I jab," she said, "I *am* a jabber in conversations with my Japanese friends." She identifies herself as a jabber. She prefers to play a role of a jabber in joking conversations with her friends, both Japanese and American friends.

However, in conversations with Americans, she keeps silent ("So I try to keep my mouth shut"). She observes that her performance in intercultural interactions is discrepant with her self-perceived personal identity as a jabber. Sayaka perceives inconsistency between her performance and self-perceived personal identity.

As she said, her limited English proficiency is the primary reason for her identity-performance discrepancy. Although she does not explicitly specify, it is likely that the cultural difference of humor construction and comprehension prevents her from performing her self-perceived identity of being a *Tsukkomi* in conversations with Americans.

With regard to her feeling about this discrepancy, as we can see in her remark, "I am not happy that I can have only unexciting conversations with them," she is unhappy with the conversation in which she cannot perform her identity as a jabber. She is not satisfied with the conversation that she usually has with Americans because she cannot fully perform her self-perceived identity.

To summarize, Sayaka considers herself as funny person who plays a role of a Tsukkomi in joking conversations with her friends. A role of *Tsukkomi* is embedded in her self-perceived personal identity. However, in conversations with Americans, she keeps silent and her self-perceived identity is suspended. She observes that her performance in intercultural interactions is discrepant with her self-perceived personal identity. The reason for her identity-performance discrepancy is the combination of her limited English proficiency and the cultural differences in joking style between Americans and the Japanese.

Tarou's story. Tarou sees himself as a funny person and wants to be funny when he is interacting with Americans. However, he finds it difficult to perform and express his funniness in interactions with American students. I asked him if he had felt that he could not fully express who he is. He said, "Oh definitely I have," and talked about his experiences in which he could not be his funny self in conversations in English:

> I always try to be funny, you know, funny character. But because I am not good at English, I cannot deliver my funniness and what I want to tell them. So I do whatever it takes to make them [Americans] laugh. You know, I act funny and add some body movement. It hurts when I cannot express what I want to express. It hurts when the word that I want to say does not come out of my mouth.

During casual conversations with his American friends, he cannot perform his funniness because of his limited English ability. He often experiences identity-performance discrepancy in terms of his funny character. As he said, it hurts his feelings when he cannot perform his funniness.

Generally, he cannot perform his funniness; however, he sometimes finds the way to perform his funniness and be recognized as funny by Americans. He compensates for his insufficient English proficiency by using body gestures. This alternative communication channel helps him perform his self-perceived personal identity in intercultural interactions. The following excerpt describes how one person can feel when he or she manages to perform their self-perceived personal identity and his or her American interactants recognize him as funny. Tarou maintained that it is when he makes Americans laugh that he feels a sense of achievement. He said:

> I think "I've got it!" when I make American friends laugh and they say, "You are funny."…At my friend's party, we decided to take a picture of our silly faces. Americans were making silly faces, but I looked for an item and used a rose. They took a picture of me holding a rose in my mouth. At that time, the Americans at the party told me that I was funny and invited me to their future parties. They invited me to their parties. When that happens, I think "I've got it" because I can entertain them with everything I could do.

Tarou sees himself as a funny person and tries to express his funniness to his American friends. Usually it is difficult for him to perform his funniness when he relies only on verbal communication channel. It hurts his feeling when he fails to perform his funny self-perceived personal identity. However, he finds a way to express and perform

his funniness toward Americans and be recognized as a funny person by using nonverbal communication channels (i.e., facial expression, gesture). He started talking about this experience as he answered the question: "Living in the U.S., when do you feel a sense of achievement?" Among all of the events he had experienced in the U.S., he chose his success in making Americans laugh as the event where he feels a sense of achievement.

Tarou has experienced the inconsistency between his self-perceived identity (i.e, funny person) and performance (i.e., failure to express his funniness) in conversations with Americans. As he said, "I do whatever it takes to make them laugh," he is driven and desperate to make Americans laugh. Because he has such strong desire to make them laugh, this identity-performance discrepancy causes great frustration in him. He finds a strategy to perform his funniness using body gestures. Based on his description of how he makes Americans laugh (e.g., making a silly face, holding a rose in his mouth), it seems he acts like a clown to perform his funniness in front of Americans.

To summarize, Tarou considers himself as a funny person; however, he cannot perform his funniness during casual conversations with his American friends. He thinks it is because of his poor English ability. He experiences the identity-performance discrepancy in terms of his funny character. It is of great importance for him to succeed in making them laugh. As he said, it hurts his feelings when he cannot perform his funniness because he has strong desire and desperation to make Americans laugh.

Identity-Performance Discrepancy: Self-Assertion

Kenji, an international student whose major is aviation and has lived in the U.S. for two years and nine months, also experiences a discrepancy between his self-perceived identity and his self-observed performance. Kenji has felt that he cannot fully present his

identity while talking with Americans. When I asked him if he had ever felt that way, he strongly agreed with an affirmative tone. His paralanguage nonverbal cue indicates how strongly he felt that way. He said:

> When I am speaking English, I cannot express my character. When I am speaking English, it is still me but it is me speaking English. How can I describe this better? Well, because there is a limit to the English that I can speak, I can express only the part of me which I can express with my English. If I compare myself speaking English to myself speaking Japanese, the way I speak is surely different and my character is not the same. I am conscious of the difference between who I am when speaking English and who I am when speaking Japanese.

He is aware that there is a difference between his performance in English and Japanese. He sees himself speaking English as "still me but it is me speaking English…only part of me which I can express with my English." He perceives that his performance represents a reduced version of his self-perceived identity. He perceives differences between his Japanese-speaking self and his English speaking-self because of his poor English ability. Unlike the other interviewees such as Tarou and Sayaka, Kenji did not articulate aspects of his identity with which he experiences identity-performance discrepancy. He further portrays how he performs while he is communicating with Americans as follows:

> I tend to easily adjust my opinion to agree with others. I don't assert my opinion very much. I talk with them as trying to adjust myself to the atmosphere among them. I often find myself unable to assert my opinion toward others when I am speaking English.

He observes that, during conversations with Americans, he rarely asserts his opinion and often compromises his opinion to agree with Americans. Based on his remarks, we can see that when he does not assert his opinion and instead compromises with Americans, he sees himself as "him speaking English"—still him but only part of him." His performance of compromising represents a reduced version of him. I asked him for the reason why he compromises his opinion and suppresses what he really thinks. He said:

> Language is a part of it, but not only English. I think it is the atmosphere and vibe of Americans. They are more pushy and speak more aggressively than Japanese and their languages are stronger than Japanese. So I cannot help myself being overwhelmed and intimidated by Americans because they are pushing and speak aggressively.

He thinks that he cannot assert his opinion during conversations with Americans not only because of his language problems but also Americans' verbal aggressiveness. For him, Americans in general are pushy and verbally aggressive when they talk. He is overwhelmed by this American communication style. He accommodates his communication behaviors in a passive and defensive manner. This communication accommodation results in performing a reduced version of his self-perceived identity. Kenji prefers his Japanese character to English character. He said, "My character in Japanese is close to my genuine self. It would be best if I could present my Japanese character in English."

To summarize, Kenji perceives a discrepancy between his self-perceived identity and his performance when he is speaking English in conversations with Americans. Because he is too overwhelmed by Americans' aggressive speech style, he cannot assert his opinion. He sees his English-speaking self as a reduced version of his Japanese-speaking self. This discrepancy emerges because of not only his lack of English ability but also his voluntary communication accommodation for the purpose of coping cope with Americans' verbal aggressiveness.

Identity-Others Discrepancy

The identity-other discrepancy is a discrepancy between (a) a person's self-perceived identity and (b) his or her perception of how others see his or her performance and identity. This is not a discrepancy between a person's self-perceived identity and how

others *actually* see his or her performance and identity. Rather, the identity-other discrepancy is a cognitive discrepancy between one's self-perceived identity and his or her imagination or belief of how others perceive him or her. Using the others' explicit or implicit verbal messages and nonverbal behaviors as an information source, we take the perspective of our interactant(s) on our performance and identity and conjecture how they see our performance and identity.

In this study, I have found two types of identity-other discrepancy. The difference between the two is the presence or absence of one's self-observed discrepant performance. The first type is the discrepancy which is experienced when people perceive their performance is consistent with their self-perceived identity; however, they believe others see it differently. The second type is the discrepancy which is experienced when people recognize the inconsistency between their self-perceived identity and their performance, and also perceives that others see them in a different way than how they see themselves. To differentiate, I will call the first type as "identity-others discrepancy" and the second type as "identity-performance-others discrepancy."

Identity-Other Discrepancy: Intelligence

In this study, one interviewee (Satoshi) talked about his experience in which he perceived the distorted reflection of his self-perceived identity on American students' nonverbal behaviors even though he believes his performance accurately presented his self-perceived identity (i.e., intelligence) during a conversation with American students for group work in class.

Satoshi's story. Satoshi is a male 22-year old senior student in linguistics and has lived in the US for four years and seven months. Based on his English pronunciation and

expressions that he uttered during the interview, he seems to be very fluent. Additionally, the episodes of him negotiating with a car dealer and postal service workers also indicate that he has acquired advanced English communicative competence.

Usually he is not motivated to speak during classroom discussion. This is not because he is not confident with his English: He knows what is going on, has something to say, and knows how to say it. However, he usually gives up participating in discussion because of American students' attitude toward him. He anticipates that, even if he speaks up, American students would think, "Whatever. That international student over there is saying something. Who cares?" He chooses not to speak up in class because he believes none of the American students would take a comment of an international student seriously.

But one day, he did speak up and tried to convince his American classmates. This unforgettable event took place in the class of Chinese modern literature. Students were assigned to discuss a metaphor of a short story in a small group. He was the only non-native English speaker in the group. The other group members, American students, were discussing a metaphor for each single word, such as moon, lake, and fire. Satoshi noticed that a unit of analysis should be an entire story as a whole, not a single word. As stated above, he usually gives up in this situation; however, he did not give up this time. His description of this situation had so much presence that it provides a picture of the behaviors of American students. Below is his description of the situation:

> That time, I could not put up with their misunderstanding. I told them "Well, I think an entire story is a metaphor and I think the writer wanted to say something like this. For example, this sentence implies this." Well, it is obvious that I am an international student because of my Japanese accent in my English. That moment, they were listening to me with very indifferent attitude like this [imitating blank and bored faces]. They just said "Okay. Okay." I guess they were thinking in their

> mind that "Oh this guy must not understand the sentences as much as we do because he is not native" or "He does not understand the sentences well." I am pretty positive that was what they were thinking! All they said was something like "Ah… okay, okay" "Ah, okay…I see." [imitating spiritless voices]. I wanted to make sure if they really listened to me. When they were talking to each other, they are more committed to each other saying "Oh moon should be a metaphor of this!" "Yeah! I think so too!" and "Oh! That's what I thought!" [imitating energetic voices]. When I spoke, they were like "Okay… ah… okay" [imitating spiritless voices].

As this excerpt above shows, he suggested to his group members that an entire story should be a metaphor of the writer's message and so they should have a holistic perspective to read this story and pay more attention to story line than each word. The American students ignored Satoshi's suggestion. Satoshi could not ignore their indifferent attitude toward him.

One of the group members then went to the website of Wikipedia using his smart phone to look for the answer. He read the explanation of the story to the group members. As they were listening, they finally realized that Satoshi was right. He described this situation as follow:

> They said, "Oh, so you were right." In my mind, I was like, "You bastard! Of course I am right. Our literature is closer to Chinese literature than yours. Of course I am right." I talked about this to my Chinese friends and they agreed with me. They said "You are right. I think you had better understanding of the story than Americans. Even if it is written in English, the Japanese have better understanding of the story than Americans." It really was like that. Those Americans students told me only "Ah okay." It was not until they checked the Wikipedia that they admitted that I was right. They said, "So you were right."

American students did not explicitly tell him that they looked down on him or doubt his intelligence level. However, their nonverbal behaviors loudly told him that they did not trust his idea. During this group work in class, he realized how he is seen by Americans students. Satoshi said, "When this happens, I realized that 'Oh, they see me like this

[silence]'" He was shocked to find out that they see him as a less intelligent student who did not understand the material quite well because he is an international student.

When he perceived that his American classmates saw him as an incompetent student, he felt intense shock and anger. He also said, "This was pretty shocking for me. I was surprised to face the reality of how bad those American students look down on me." I could easily see his anger in his nonverbal behaviors while he was describing the situation for me. He was hitting the table with his index finger and the tone of his voice was intense. I assume the intensity was fueled by his confidence in his intelligence and competence. As he stated, he is usually not motivated to speak up in classroom discussion. The fact that he decided to speak up indicates how much he was certain and confident with his suggestion. This identity-other discrepancy led to great shock and anger because his American classmates treated him with disdain over the topic in which he had great confidence.

To summarize, Satoshi unpleasantly perceived a discrepancy between his self-perceived identity as a competent student and the American classmates' perspectives of him. Satoshi believes they see him as an incompetent international student who does not understand English. It is important to note that he fully presented his intelligence by sharing his understanding of the metaphors in Chinese literature. This is a significant difference between him and the other students who experience the similar identity-other discrepancy. Unlike Satoshi, the rest cannot perform their intelligence or competence. In Satoshi's understanding, it is American students' stereotype about international students that causes a cognitive discrepancy between his self-perceived identity and his perception of his American classmates' perspectives of him. He was confronted with American

students' disdainful attitude toward international students. This identity-other discrepancy caused him great shock and anger because the American classmates showed their distain for him over the topic in which he had great confidence, based on their preconception about international students.

Identity-Performance-Other Discrepancy: Intelligence

In this study, three interviewees (Makoto, Satoshi, and Kana) talked about their experiences in which they perceive identity-performance-other discrepancy in terms of their intelligence. They perceive a discrepancy between self-perceived identity and self-observed performance, which leads to a discrepancy between self-perceived identity and their perception of how others may see them. Again, it is not a discrepancy between their self-perceived identity and how others actually see them.

Makoto's story. Makoto talked about his difficulty in delivering his opinion in both classroom discussion and casual conversation with Americans. I analyze Makoto's interview in two ways. First I analyze the content (i.e., what he says), and secondly attend to his communicative performance (i.e., how he speaks) throughout the interview. We can see his self-observed performance and his perception of Americans' perspectives toward him in the following excerpt:

Interviewer: Have you ever felt that you aren't fully exercising your strength and ability?

Makoto: Oh yes *everyday*. Because of language barriers. It is like "I wanted to say more about it." While I am thinking how I should say my opinion about the subject, that subject is over. Yeah. When I go home, I keep the ideas in my mind to use then later when I talk about this subject with someone. Yeah, I felt that way everyday. I can say something but it is not enough. I am thinking "I could say something better in Japanese."

Interviewer: How do you feel when it happens?

Makoto: "Ugh! This American dude must be thinking of me as an idiot!"

Interviewer: I have similar feelings.

Makoto: Right? I am like "Hey you, if we both spoke Japanese, I would definitely defeat you! You are younger than me! Damn you! English is your mother tongue!" They are treating me as if I was an idiot, an idiot who has no opinion. I bite my lip. I think vocabulary is really important.

Interviewer: I hear you.

Makoto: It makes me feel like fighting with papers. I know I could defeat them if I have more time. [Pointing to his head] I have it in here, I have it in here. I like writing a paper for class.

Interviewer: It will get better once you go to graduate school.

Makoto: I think so, too. So I will fight over papers, not conversation.

Interviewer: You will have discussions many times in graduate school. So it might be excellent when you can discuss topics better in English.

Makoto: "Dudes, you have never got out of this rural area, have you huh?"

Interviewer: You can do it!

Makoto: I want to take revenge on those country bumpkins [田舎者 *Inaka-mono*]!

Interviewer: It must be tough on you.

Makoto: Sometimes I wonder "Why should I get a lecture from this younger country bumpkin?" I am like "He is talking to me as if he knows everything!"

Interviewer: Do you think they really think you are an idiot?

Makoto: I think so.

Interviewer: What makes you think that way?

Makoto: Well, I think they are looking down on me. I guess they think "Oh so you haven't learned anything, have you?" They do not say it loud but still I can sense it. I might have been a bit paranoid.

Interviewer: Something about them tells you so.

Makoto: *I* feel they see me as an idiot [バカ*baka*]. When it happens, I am like "Damn you! How dare you! I will not lose when we both write papers! I am way more experienced than you. I have a different background than you! You have seen only a horizontal world!"

The following set of remarks: "It is like 'I wanted to say more about it'. While I am thinking how I should say my opinion about the subject, that subject is over"; "I can say something but it is not enough. I am thinking 'I could say something better in Japanese'" indicates his self-observed performance: he fails to deliver his opinion in ongoing conversation. His remark: "I can say something but it is not enough" indicates that Makoto does not keep silent. He delivers a part of his opinion using his limited English vocabulary. However, what he manages to deliver is a reduced version of his opinion.

Consequently, Makoto's perception of others' perspectives of him is as an idiot with no knowledge or opinion. During a conversation with "American dudes," he thinks that they should conceive him to be "an idiot who has no opinion." He firmly believes that they think of him as an ignorant and naïve person who has no opinion about a conversation topic. His inner voice said; "This dude is thinking of me as an idiot!" We cannot know for sure if "American dudes" really think of him as an idiot. It may be his misinterpretation. However, the important thing is the fact that he *believes* that the Americans see him as an idiot and he is frustrated about this.

To describe his self-perceived identity, I first present what he said and next present how he talked during the interview. First, we can explicitly see his self-perceived identity in his remarks. (1) "If we both spoke Japanese, I would definitely defeat you!"; (2) "They are treating me as if I was an idiot, an idiot who has no opinion." ; (3) "I know

I could defeat them if I have more time. [Pointing to his head] I have it in here, I have it in here."; and (4) "I am way more experienced than you". As such, he considers himself as eloquent, opinionated, knowledgeable, and experienced.

Secondly, another aspect of his self-perceived identity is implicitly present in what he told me and how he talked during the interview. He has high self-efficacy about educating and enlightening people with his talk. The interview with him lasted for one hour and 40 minutes, in which he talked a lot about life, international relations, and culture. I will provide the descriptive information which demonstrates his confidence.

Prior to moving to the US, he traveled around 15 countries mainly in Asia by himself. In addition to his traveling around 15 countries, Makoto stayed in China to study Chinese for five months three years ago. So he can communicate in Chinese. He is confident with his insightfulness and knowledge which he gained through his experience from traveling around 15 countries and studying in China. His talk serves as an example which portrays his confidence about his knowledge about Chinese culture and his argumentative capability. His narrative description of his past experience tells us that he believes he is capable of educating and enlightening people with his insightfulness, knowledge, and argument skills:

> Makoto: One time, I was asked by one Chinese person, oh well actually many Chinese persons have asked me the same question many times. They said "Japanese are polite and well-mannered. How come?" To answer this question, trying to show my sincerity for their culture, I tell them 'Well, Japanese politeness and courtesy originally came from your country a long time ago. We learned it through Confucianism. We learned Confucianism in a class for moral education at elementary and high schools. You used to have very valuable and great virtue in your country. Although it was destroyed during the time of the Great Cultural Revolution, it is worth restoring them.

Interviewer: How do they react?

Makoto: *Speechless* [emphasis]. They look very embarrassed. They don't know what to say. Chinese persons keep their mouths shut. You know, *Chinese* [emphasis] persons become silent.

Interviewer: So they do not have that kind of virtue anymore?

Makoto: Yeah, it is gone. I guess that idea remains inside their hearts but we rarely see it in their behaviors. China was once called the country with no thieves. Now, China is a country of crimes. They have no manner or whatsoever. So when I told them this story, they look very sad. They become speechless and silent. 100% silence.

This conversation between us demonstrates what Makoto is capable of doing. While he was talking about this experience, he appeared to be proud of himself especially when he said that he made his Chinese friends speechless.

The following description of our conversation flow shows that he likes talking about international, cultural, and philosophical matters. Given his past experiences living in China, I asked him which he likes better China or the US. Then he said that he liked neither of them from the political and diplomatic viewpoints, and then started talking about the diplomatic relationships among the U.S., China, and Japan. His opinion about this issue is: "I think the U.S. is having affair with China now. China is his mistress. Japan is his wife, the best wife. The U.S. would be in big trouble if he dumps her [Japan]."

Because he is about to apply for a graduate school in the U.S., GRE examination becomes a topic. I shared my experience taking the GRE and we were talking about how their mathematics questions are easier for the Japanese on average. Then he started talking about Americans' stereotype of Japanese as being good at mathematics, and mentioned that Asian countries are the countries of manufacturing and engineering. He

talked about the tendency that Americans generally seek for clear-cut Yes-No answers and I asked if he has adopted such a communication style. Then he mentioned that it is culturally valued in a Japanese society not to have clear-cut Yes-No answers, and talked about how communication in hierarchical relationships works in Japanese organizations. I asked him if there is anything that he would not want to change in a Japanese person, and he started talking about his idea of being Japanese, his encounter with one Japanese traveler in India, and his pride about Japanese society for four minutes, and then from this topic, he shifted to the subject about a Chinese society. Toward the end of the interview, Makoto spent ten minutes talking about his philosophy about life and happiness, including his idea of enjoying life in a foreign country, a meaning of happiness based on his favorite quotation of Nietzsche, and an inspirational success story of his former boss. During the ten minutes, I was just listening and all I said was conversation fillers. I found myself listening to him attentively.

Makoto is highly frustrated about this identity-other discrepancy. The degree of his frustration can be presumed based on my observation of his behavior during the interview. Until one point of interview, Makoto kept composed and talked a lot about a positive side of his life in the U.S. To illustrate, he claimed that he did not have any major problems or complaints about his life in the U.S. except for transportation inconvenience and his monotonous life in this college town. He said “I am like a cockroach which can live no matter where it is. I am fine because I have the vitality to survive” and “I am good at adjusting to a new environment.” This set of remarks shows that he seems to have higher self-efficacy about living abroad. To confirm my

observation, I asked him, “I see. Except for the lack of car, your life is pretty good, isn’t it?” His answer was, “Yes, it is. Well, no matter what, I came here for study, you know.”

He talked about his great satisfaction with his friendships with American and Chinese friends. When I asked him if he had felt that he could not fully express his personality and character in interactions with Americans, he said that he fully, or more than fully, expressed who he is toward his close friends. I asked him, “Do you think you fully express your natural and original character and personality?” Makoto said;

> Oh I do express them [his natural and original character and personality] to the maximum! Maybe even more. It is so much fun, you know. Just like I hang out with my Japanese friends. Every Saturday, I hang out with them. This Saturday ritual started the last semester. We got together to watch football games on Saturdays. So we keep doing that this semester. None of them are Christians.

The last part of his comment: “None of them are Christians” requires a brief explanation. Makoto goes to a weekly gathering of Christian fellowship to learn something new, despite having no real interest in Christianity. He cannot relax with Christian fellowship members because he perceives them as too nice and polite. He said “I cannot get along with nice people because my friends were not.” His Japanese friends in Japan are sarcastic so that they have a sharp tongue but they have a warm heart. So he feels more comfortable hanging out with this kind of people. He described his American friends as non-Christians to imply they are sarcastic people with whom he can relax. He continued talking about the American friends of his;

> They are my good buddies. They are my great best friends. So I have a great time with them. I can joke around and run them down. One day, one of them got so drunk and decided to confess his feeling to his girl all of the sudden. He didn’t come back for two hours. When we started worrying about him, he came home and asked for beer. So I told him, ‘It is your nose hair. That is why you are turned down. You should trim it better!’ He was like ‘Oh I get it!’ I can say such things to them. You know we are that close.

As such, the interview with him proceeded with the positive aspects of his life in the U.S. Prior to the interview with Makoto, I had done thirteen interviews; thus, I was familiar with the common problems of Japanese international students. During the interview with him, I held the impression that he was doing better than those thirteen interviewees.

In contrast, when I asked him if he had ever felt that he could not fully exercise his capability, I clearly observed strong frustration in him. Then he started talking about the episode in which he believed "American dudes" must think of him as an idiot. He is frustrated with the fact that he cannot express his opinion during conversations with Americans. This observed contrast in his behaviors indicates how much he is frustrated about his inability to deliver his opinion and knowledge toward Americans.

To summarize, Makoto's self-perceived identity is being eloquent, knowledgeable, experienced, and capable of arguing, convincing, educating and enlightening people with his knowledge and talks. However, his performance in intercultural interactions fails to convey these elements of his self-perceived identity. His insufficient English vocabulary prevents him from fully performing his capability. When he is involved with conversation or discussion, he has a lot of ideas and insightful opinion in his head. However, he does not know how to put his ideas into words. The words coming out of his mouth fail to present his knowledgeable, insightful, and experienced self. As a result, he believes Americans see him as an idiot who has no experience, knowledge, or opinion. The cognitive discrepancy between his self-perceived identity and his perception of Americans' perspectives of him causes him great frustration.

Satoshi's story. Satoshi talked about what he generally experiences when he says something in class. Satoshi has felt that he appears to be less intelligent than he really is

because of his imperfect writing and speaking skills. He could not show people that he fully and profoundly understands study materials. In interactions with American students, he believes that they perceive only a reduced version of his actual understanding:

> Well, yeah, again it is also related to English. Yeah, it is English. I do understand quite well. But when I open my mouth and say something in English, I can't find the most matched word. So it ends up like, I understand 90% but I can express only 70%, for example. When it happens, a person gives me a look saying, "I see. He can understand only this much." That same person asks me another question like, "How about this?" I know the answer and I try to explain. But again all because of my vocabulary, my explanation is off. They [American students] may be thinking like this; "I think he [Satoshi] understands but it is not quite well." I sometimes feel that people think, "I mostly understand what he [Satoshi] said but it is a little bit unclear"…In their eyes, my comments and answers appear to be simple and superficial, I think. It makes me look as if I did not understand deeply.

As he said, he considers himself as a competent student who can understand materials fully and profoundly. However, because of his limited English vocabulary, what he writes and speaks in English fails to present how much he really understands. He experienced a discrepancy between his self-perceived identity as being a competent student and the level of intelligence which his writing and speaking skills can present.

He is attentive to how American students see him while they are discussing in class. He takes their perspectives and infers that they should think that he does not understand materials quite well. He believes that American classmates see him as an incompetent international student who has only superficial and partial understanding of study materials. American students did not explicitly tell him that they think he understands only partially or superficially. We cannot know for sure that American students really are questioning his level of understanding. This is how he interprets nonverbal behaviors of American students. Satoshi *believes* that American students saw him as an incompetent international student. He experienced a identity-other discrepancy

because he believes that American students see him as incompetent when he considers himself as competent.

With respect to his feeling about this identity-other discrepancy, he says that he feels down but he tries to accept it and move on. Unlike his experience in Chinese literature class, he never blames his American classmates. He said:

> Well, but it is exactly not that I give up but I think there is nothing I can do. After all I live in the US. If I feel down every time when I can't do my best because of English, I would be asked "Then why did you come to the US? You knew this would happen." I knew that this would happen before I came to the US. Nothing would come out if I keep regretting. So I just give it a break and try to think "There is nothing I can do. I didn't work hard enough."

He thinks that, because he lives in the United States, it is destined for him to experience difficulty in writing and speaking his opinion and answers in English. Therefore, he tries to convince himself to stop feeling frustrated.

To summarize, he believes that he is capable of profoundly understanding study materials. However, because of his imperfect writing and speaking skills, he cannot show his American classmates that he fully and profoundly understands the material. Thus, he believes that his American classmate may see him as an incompetent student who understands the material only partially and superficially. In the Chinese literature class, Satoshi observed that his American classmates perceived him as an incompetent student who does not fully understand. That identity-other discrepancy results in intense shock and anger because he was confident with his idea about how to interpret a metaphor in Chinese literature. Here, he believes his American classmates see him in the same way—an incompetent student who does not fully understand. To the contrary, he does not show intense shock or anger about this identity discrepancy. It is probably because he was not confident about his writing and speaking skills. In the Chinese class, he was confident

about his answer. Self-confidence about his performance seems to make a difference in his reaction to the same perception of American classmates' perspectives of him.

Kana's story. Some international students move to the U.S. with great experience in their professions or majors. Some of them have established their career and professional experiences in their home countries (e.g., graduate students, MBA students). Tarou is an example of such case; he was a competent and promising graduate student in Japan. Even if they are inexperienced in English and American culture, these international students are experienced in their professions in their home countries. Kana is a senior student of theater performing art. She had lived in the US for three years and ten months and at the time of interview, she was about to graduate. Prior to moving to the US, she had established her acting career in Japan ever since her childhood. Given her father's suggestion, she decided to study in the US because the US is a great place to learn theater performing arts.

Kana had to go through a rough time with her classes and American classmates. It was highly challenging for her to study theater performing as an international student. Theater performing arts is not a popular major among international students. In S-University, out of approximately 60 Japanese international students, only four students including Kana major in theater performing. When I asked about her school work, she looked back on her past and then described her painful challenges:

> In the first semester, I cried everyday on the way to school and on the way back home from school. I couldn't speak English but I had to play in English. When I was told to do ad-lib play, I was too panicked to do it. But gradually I got better.

I encouraged her to tell me more about this experience:

> Ad-lib play is a tough one. In the beginning, I could not understand what they were saying. Then the other student gave me the puzzled look, "Why don't you

> say something?" There are not many Japanese students in this major. Most of the students had never seen Japanese. They didn't understand that Japanese can't speak English. So they were like "Why aren't you say anything?" "Why aren't you asserting yourself?" They said something harsh to me. Well it was not as bad as bullying, but they kept telling me things like "Just open your mouth!" and "Why are you standing around?" They kept saying that to me. So I didn't feel like going to school.

The following is a description of her major and classmates:

> There were some mean classmates. The world of theater performers is the place where people defeat others to get what they want…They appear to be good friends on the surface, though. Every semester there is an audition and only the students who pass the audition can get roles in a play. Inside, they are fiercely competitive and they would not mind winning a role at expense of their classmates' feelings. This is a black world. I experienced that at first. Although it was not as bad as racial discrimination, it was pretty harmful and harsh. But now, I played on the stage the last semester. Because I went through all the hard time, I was so happy when I was spotlighted on the stage.

I asked her what she thinks made her cry everyday:

> I am wondering why. Well, I think I was disappointed in myself. I was frustrated with myself that I could do better than this. In Japan, I was given the major roles, the ones closer to the main character, and got to play on the stage. I was very experienced at playing in the local musical. I had played for a long time. So the staff members were very nice to me and I had been taken good care of by them. Once I came here, the circumstance was completely different and I was tormented by Americans friends. But I could not say anything back to them. So I was so frustrated and disappointed at myself. Now I can rationalize that way. Back then, I didn't know why I was crying. Looking back, now I can say that is why I was crying.

Kana cried everyday because she could not perform on stage and received harsh feedback from her American classmates. Her performance of ad-lib play was poor: she could not figure out what was going on and could not say a word during a play. Her performance presented her as an incompetent speechless theater performance student. In Japan, however, she was an experienced, successful, and recognized theatrical actress. She could not fully express and perform her acting competence which she had developed through her professional career in Japan. Her performance in class failed to demonstrate what she

really is capable of. Her American classmates criticized her in a harsh way based on her performance. As she said, what frustrates her about these American students was the fact that she could not say anything back to them. But back then, she could not explain her situation to them. Later, she told them that she cannot perform well because of her language barrier. This discrepancy between her performance in class and her self-perceived acting competence results in frustration and psychological stress. She was disappointed and frustrated in herself to the extent that she cried everyday on the way to school and on the way back home and lost weight.

She overcame this initial difficult time with her vitality. She visited her professors during office hours everyday to practice English and monologue play with her professors. She bravely confronted her mean classmates. She explained her situation as a nonnative English speaker to them and told them "I am doing my best to make it better. Will you help me?" Then they first realized why she couldn't speak in a play. They had gradually become good friends.

To summarize, Kana had a very hard time in her classes of performing art major. Because her English listening and speaking abilities were limited, she could not say a word in a ad-lib play. She experienced identity-performance discrepancy. Her self-observed performance had a great impact on her because it is inconsistent with her self-perceived identity as an experienced theater performer. None of her American classmates had a clue about how much she was disappointed in herself because they did not know her career and acting competence that she had developed in Japan. Her American classmates treated her as an incompetent student. In a very painful way, she experienced

identity-performance-other discrepancy in acting classes. She cried everyday. She felt disappointed in herself and frustrated with herself.

Identity-performance-other discrepancy: funniness and extroversion

In this study, four interviewees (Akiko, Hiromi, Sakura, and Tomoko) talked about the episodes in which their self-observed performances failed to present their self-perceived identity, and consequently their perception of others' perspectives on their identities are discrepant with their self-perceived identities.

Akiko's story. Akiko is a 34-year old female doctoral student whose major is American literature. Before she came to the U.S,, Akiko was in a doctoral program of one of the top national universities in Japan. When I interviewed her, she said that she did not have Japanese or American friends in the U.S. According to her, the primary reason for a lack of friends is studying. She is too busy managing course work to socialize with her American classmates or other Japanese students. No matter how much she wants friends, her situation does not allow her to do so.

During the interview, she mentioned that she had feelings which resemble depression. She described her challenge, "Well, First of all, I've begun to feel bothered to talk to people and then I do not want to get out of my place at all." As a part of her explanation why she is reluctant to hang out with her American classmates, she started talking about an unpleasant experience in class. She spent ten minutes talking about this experience. This engagement indicates how important or memorable this experience was for her. One day, she was unpleasantly forced to face the age issue:

> Maybe they [American classmates] are very young. A very shocking thing happened to me one day. In class, an American instructor [Dr. Smith], the one that I just told you is very strict, asked "How old are you guys?" out of the blue. Then one girl who seemed to be oldest sighed loudly and said "Oh man I am way much

> older than all of you. I am 26. I know that I am the oldest here." [sighed] The rest of the students are 21, 22 or 23 years old. Obviously, Dr. Smith wanted to know my age. Usually I talk little in class and I stay as a quiet person. So I kept silent. Then Dr. Smith said, "Hey! Akiko! How old are you?" I was thinking that the girl who just called herself as the oldest would be shocked and surprised if I told them that I am 34 now and soon to be 35. But telling a lie, like "I am 26 years old." [comical] is not my thing. So I had no choice but tell them I am 34 years old. They became silent. Dr. Smith didn't know what to do. He said, "Oh great." I didn't know what part about it was great at all. I had no idea what is great about it.

Regardless of real intentions of Dr. Smith and her American classmates, Akiko observed and interpreted that they were shocked to find out she was 34 years old. She felt uncomfortable with this conversation. In general, Asian women look younger than their ages from the perspective of Caucasians. I assume that the Americans around her thought she was younger than her real age. Akiko further talked about her American classmates' attitudes toward her:

> Everyone is their late 20's and most of them are married. I guess I am the only single person. Everyone got married in their early 20's and had babies in their late 20's. Some of them are the early 30's and they have kids in a elementary school. It is hard for them to understand why a woman at the age of 34 remains single all the way. They asked me if I am divorced or I was married in the past. I told them that I am not divorced or have never been married. Now they became so cautious and gingerly that they stop asking me any further questions. Their over-cautious attitudes make me feel even worse. I wish they would ask me some questions at least. All of them are too reserved toward me. They are too careful around me seeing me as an oriental spinster of 34 years old who cannot speak English.

As her American classmates got to know more about her (i.e., age and marital status), there was noticeable change in their attitudes toward her. She found them overly cautious with her and oddly reserved and polite to her, and felt awkward and uncomfortable to talk with them. Consequently, she has become reluctant to talk and hang out with her American classmates.

During the interview, Akiko compared herself in the U.S. with herself in Japan. She maintained that when interacting with Americans, she behaves in a different manner

than when she is communicating with her Japanese friends. She described how she usually talked with her Japanese friends as follows:

> There is no difference in myself. But, in Japan I can display more of my self-deprecating character. In Japan I can talk with my friends like 'Ugh! I am freaking tired of this. I am old! I am poor! やべー (Ya-bee)'[comical tone]. I don't know how to say *Yabee* in English. So I just keep smiling and quiet. I can have simple conversation in English but I cannot express my self-depreciating character…Basically I am a person with gloomy character in Japan. But I could change my gloominess to bitter jokes with my friends. But here, I am just a gloomy person… In Japan, I can make it sound like jokes to some degrees. People around me are also over 30. In Japanese graduate school, there are many students who are over 30s and single. So we can have fun saying "We suck!" "Seriously what should we do?' or "Maybe we should get help from a match-making agency."

Yabee is a colloquium expression which originates from the adjective やばい (ya-ba-i) and young people use it to mean something close to "I suck" "This is a disaster!" or "I am in trouble!" We can see that her self-deprecating character—treating her miserable situation as a funny joke—is a salient element of her conversations with her Japanese friends. She makes fun of her own financial problems and marital status and changes them to jokes. Even if she experiences some difficulty, she can present her funniness in a self-deprecating manner in social interactions with her Japanese friends. She enjoys talking about her problems comically with her Japanese friends. She likes to grumble in a bitter yet humorous manner. She enjoys deprecating herself as funny jokes with her friends.

To the contrary, in interactions with her American classmates, she cannot present her self-deprecating character. The following is her idea of why it is hard for her to present that character toward Americans:

> It is not the same here. If I share all of my problems with Americans, they would see me as depressed and miserable [Laughs]. They are married and have kids. They say they are poor. But I don't think they are poor at all. When I told them

> [Dr. Smith and American classmates] that I eat Maruchan's ramen everyday, they became silent. I realized that it is such a wrong thing to eat Maruchan's ramen everyday. I like them a lot, though. I guess they have stereotype about Japanese being rich. I was like, "I eat Maruchan's ramen everyday! Hahaha! [paused] Oh wait you are not laughing." I eat Maruchan's ramen everyday and I am not married…For them, I am the most miserable person among the classmates. Dr. Smith was there, too. He also became silent when I told about Maruchan's ramen.

When talking with Dr. Smith and her American classmates, she intended to talk about her lifestyle in a playful manner. She was expecting them to laugh at her misfortune together. She intended to be funny. However, Dr. Smith and American classmates took it seriously and became silent. Akiko believes that they did not find her story to be funny and they saw her as depressed and the most miserable among them. Their actual intention to become silent is unknown and uncertain. They might have not seen her as depressed or the most miserable. Regardless, Akiko interpreted that they became silent because they sympathized her. Her interpretation and imagination of Dr. Smith and her American classmates' perspectives of her is that they see her as a pitiful and miserable international student from Japan who sadly remains single and poor. In her understanding, if she talks about her problems as funny jokes, the Americans around her would take it seriously and she would be a center of their sympathy and pity.

While talking about the following two episodes, Akiko provided further information to demonstrate how Dr. Smith and her American classmates display their pity and sympathy toward her. The first one is at a restaurant with them. The second one is about her American classmates' behaviors. Again, it is important to note that this is what she observes and how she interprets the situations; therefore, their motives are uncertain:

> One day we all went to eat with Dr. Smith. In fact, that was the time when I told them [Dr. Smith and American classmates] that I ate Maruchan's ramen and all of

> them became silent. I could not finish my dish so I was putting my leftovers in a doggy bag. They started giving me their leftovers, saying "Take this with you." I was thinking in my mind, "Am I a dog? Bowwow!"[Comical tone] I was like, "Ah…well I am not that starved." [Comical tone] I really found it pretty miserable. They gave me the food that they left such as meat and noodles. It made me feel like I was a dog [Laughs]. Dr. Smith gave me his meat that he left, saying "Take this with you. This is expensive meat." I hesitated to take the meat. I would rather eat Maruchan's ramen.
>
> The classmates came to me when they fail in a presentation. They are like, "Oh Akiko, how are you?" I think they look for comfort. I think they are trying to boost their self-esteem by talking with me, more miserable person. I don't think it is okay, though.

From these excerpts, we can see that Akiko firmly believes that the Americans around her consider her to be a miserable and pitiful person. I am aware that this is her observation and interpretation and there is the possibility that the Americans around her might have the different intentions. However, this information makes it reasonable to assume that they really consider her as a pitiful and miserable person. As she said, she does not appreciate how they treat her.

Her intention to be funny was misunderstood by Dr. Smith and her American classmates. Akiko believes that they misunderstood her intention because of her limited English proficiency as well as the difference of background and lifestyles between her and them. In the previous excerpt (p.215), she talked about her typical conversations with her Japanese friends in Japan and described the commonality and similarity between her and her Japanese friends. Both Akiko and her Japanese friends are over 30 years old, remain single, and have similarly serious financial issues. To the contrary, her American classmates are in their 20's and married and they have less serious financial issue in her understanding. As her remark: "In Japan, I can make it sound like jokes" demonstrates, she can talk about her problems as jokes with her Japanese friends because she and her

Japanese friends share the same backgrounds. On the other hand, as her remark: "If I share all of my problems with Americans, they would see me as depressed and miserable" indicates, she cannot joke about her problems with her American instructor and classmates. Based on her experiences, she believes that the Americans around her would not understand her playful intention and instead they would see her as a miserable person because Akiko and her American classmates do not share the same problem.

Akiko wants her American classmates to laugh together about her situation and circumstances. Her expectation is not fulfilled. They did not find her attempt to joke about her problems as funny; rather, Akiko believes they felt sympathetic toward her. Akiko makes her interpretation about the reactions of her American instructor and classmates: they did not laugh because their situations are vastly different from hers.

However, it is important to interpret their behaviors taking into account another issue—appropriateness of laughing about others' problems. People can laugh about the shared problems. Whether or not people share the same problems create in-group and out-group membership. People who share the same problems are in-group members, whereas those who do not share the same problems are out-group members. In-group members can laugh about their problems together; however, out-group members cannot laugh about the other group's problems. For Akiko, her American classmates are out-group members and her Japanese friends are in-group members. Even if Akiko expects her American classmates (out-group members) to laugh about her problems together, it is difficult for them to laugh about her problems because they are not her in-group members.

An issue about a signal for play is another aspect of Akiko's experience of identity discrepancy. Her talk about her misfortunate life (e.g., eating instant ramen

everyday) was interpreted by the Americans around her as her pitiful self-disclosure. She was talking about herself with playful motive. However, they misinterpreted her playful motive. Consequently, she experienced identity discrepancy.

Social interaction may differ depending on whether or not interactants frame interactions as *play*. Bateson (1972) and Goffman (1974) characterize *play* as an interactional state created by metacommunicative signals which frame messages as playful or at least nonserious. However, as Glenn (2003) argues that a play frame, either serious or playful, is often ambiguous. He says, "Play frames may be ambiguous and are subject to redefinition. The 'serious' or playful status of utterances may not be clear to interactants" (p.135). For example, when a person frames an interaction as serious but the other frames it as playful, he or she may feel disrespected. Moreover, Bateson (1972) argues a need of ability to exchange play signals in order for both interactants to engage in *play*: "this phenomenon, *play,* could only occur if the participant organisms were capable of some degree of metacomunication, i.e., of exchanging signals which would carry the message, 'this is *play*'" (p.179).

Akiko's experience of identity discrepancy can be interpreted as a result that she and her American classmates frame a conversation differently. Akiko framed her talk as playful but her American classmates framed it as serious. Akiko attempts to joke about herself in a self-deprecating manner; therefore, her play frame is ambiguous and confusing to her interactants. She needs communicative competence with which she could exchange clear signals of "this is play." Because intercultural interactions are subject to miscommunication, participants in intercultural interactions especially need

metacommunicative competence to exchange signals to tell, "This is play," to construct humor or joke.

To summarize, people have self-verifying motives and thus they want their identity to be validated by others (e.g., Swann, 1983). Akiko's self-perceived identity is a person who jokes about her misfortunate life in a self-deprecating manner. Her self-perceived identity is closely bound with her problems and a communication style that she typically uses to share them with her Japanese friends. Akiko wants this self-perceived identity to be validated by her American classmates. In order for them to recognize and validate this particular self-perceived identity of Akiko, her American classmates need to understand her playful intention behind her self-deprecating behavior. In order for Akiko to recognize that her identity is validated by her American classmates, she needs to know that they find her talk to be funny. In order for her American classmates to find her talk to be funny and let her know that they find it funny, they need to have the same or similar problems, backgrounds and circumstances.

In interactions with her American classmates, this particular self-perceived identity of Akiko was not validated by her American classmates. Toward them, she attempted to present herself as a person who jokes about her misfortunate life in a self-deprecating manner. However, her American classmates see her only as a miserable international student who is unmarried and financially challenged, not as a humorous person. As such, Akiko recognizes the identity-other discrepancy—dissonance between her self-perceived identity and her perception of others' perspectives of her identity. Several reasons possibly account for her identity discrepancy. The Americans around her did not find her as funny or shared laugh with her because: (1) her English proficiency

was not enough to talk her problems humorously; (2) they do not share the similar problems with her; (3) they hesitate to laugh about her problems; and (4) they misunderstood her playful intention and did not find her talk as funny.

Hiromi's story. It is common that international students are quiet in conversations with Americans because they cannot talk a lot in English. Hiromi, an international student at S-University who has lived in the U.S. for two years and ten months, said that she is a "quiet girl" in English. I asked her to compare how she is while talking with Japanese and how she is while talking with Americans. She said that Americans once told her that they thought of her as quiet. She gave more of her thought:

> I'm not sure but maybe I lived in Alabama for the first six months, I don't know but, people say that I speak very slowly, I've been told many times that I have strong Alabama accent. I thought that was because I once lived in Alabama but yet I think there is more to it. I speak slowly also because I have to think about grammar and vocabulary as I speak. Americans tend to talk a lot about the things that I couldn't care less. I have nothing to say about it so I wouldn't speak. Then Americans think that I am a quiet person. When they see me talking with Japanese, they were surprised and tell me, "Wow, you talk very fast!"

Hiromi believes that the combination of her Alabama accent, her slow speech style, and the contrast with talkative Americans makes her appear to be a quiet person. Given this story, I asked for her opinion about being seen as a quiet person. She comically said, "I am not like that at all!" She said:

> A person has a certain image about me and introduces me based on her image about me. When it happens, I think in my mind 'No, I am not like that!" [Laughs]. I am introduced as a very quiet person. One day I was introduced 'She is very quiet and studies very hard, and very sweet and cute' I thought "Oh no no no. I am not quiet at all." It is not until people describe me as a quiet person that I realize what kind of impression they have formed about me.

In her case, the others' perspectives are not her imagination of others' perspectives. They actually introduced her to someone else as a quiet person. Thus, her perception of others' perspectives of her is factual.

Her self-perceived identity is as a non-quiet person ("I am not quiet at all!"). How she was talking in Japanese during the interview exemplifies her self-perceived identity. Her interview lasted for one-hour and 20 minutes. She was highly engaged in talking about her personal experiences. She had a lot to talk about. She shared a lot of her information to each of the interview questions. She was not quiet at all during the interview. I see her as a talkative person rather than a quiet person.

In intercultural interactions with Americans, her perception of others' perspective of her (i.e., a quiet girl) is discrepant with her self-perceived identity (i.e., a talkative girl). As for a reason for her identity discrepancy, Hiromi attributes this identity discrepancy to her limited English ability:

> In my case, everything is associated with my English ability. Either when I talk about my worries or when I say what I want to say, my words are not enough for me to tell everything that I try to say. People form the impression about me before I fully express what I want to say. I communicate less than half of what I want to say. So they would not know who I really am. They form the impression of me based on the half of what I really want to say. I happen to realize that "What? Do I strike them as this way?"

Because her English ability is limited, she can share only limited amount of information about her. She cannot fully express what she wants to say. She said that she could communicate only less than half of what she wants to say ("I communicate less than half of what I want to say."). Hiromi believes that Americans don't know who she really is because she does not have enough English proficiency to fully disclose who she really is toward them.

To summarize, Hiromi has experienced identity-performance-other discrepancy. She considers herself as a non-quiet person but her communication performance in English (e.g., slow and less self-disclosure) presents her as a quiet person. As a result, the Americans around her think of her as "a quiet girl." In her interpretation, her limited English ability leads to less self-disclosure, which results in a discrepancy between her self-perceived personal identity and the others' perspectives of her. Hiromi does not mind seeing as a quiet person because she is used to it. It has happened to her for years even when she was in Japan. She said. "I can take it when it is not a big deal, but I feel a little bit uncomfortable and awkward."

Additional Patterns of Identity Discrepancy

This study has found two additional patterns with regard to identity discrepancy. First, some of the Japanese students in this study said that they had never experienced identity discrepancy in the U.S. They have never observed identity discrepancy. Second, unlike the most interviewees, a couple of interviewees enjoy their identity discrepancy and appreciate their identity changes in the U.S.

Never experienced identity discrepancy. First, in the present study, four interviewees (Tetsuya, Yoko, Yasuko, Mai) had never experienced a discrepancy between their self-perceived personal identities and their performance or their perceptions of others' perspectives (i.e., how they believe others see them). To illustrate, *Tetsuya* has never had a problem expressing his natural character to Americans. According to him, because he is in the US for his work as a researcher, he has no interest in learning English and he has little contact with Americans in this life. There are no Americans among his research colleagues. He prefers hanging out with Japanese students. He said,

"Communication with Americans is pretty much limited to the interaction with waiters at restaurant."

Yoko rarely experiences identity discrepancy. She believes that she can perform and express her character, personality, and capability in interactions with Americans. She is aware that Americans consider her to be a quiet girl but she is not frustrated about it at all. Yoko majors in computer science. She works on a computer all the time. According to her, her course work does not involve any class discussion, presentation, reading, or writing papers, and she rarely has interaction with classmates. She describes her personality as follow:

> I don't have best friends here. Basically, I like being alone at home playing a video game or playing with computer programming. I do not have friends that I would hang out with on the weekend. Basically, I rarely share my personal troubles even with my Japanese friends. I prefer to solve them on my own. Or I occasionally talk with my family. That's all. My personality is like that. I am the type of person who prefers to share only fun things. … My friends here are mainly Japanese and international students from other countries. I do not have American friends who I would casually hang out with.

Yasuko has never felt that she cannot perform her self-perceived personal identity in the U.S. She rarely speaks English because she is surrounded by two male American students who speak Japanese (i.e., her boyfriend and his friend). She has low motivation to study English because she did not come to the U.S. to study. She has an American boyfriend who studies Japanese and she spend a lot of time with him and his friend. She came to the U.S. to enjoy the "adventure" of living abroad.

Miho says "I am not close to Americans at all. When I am with them, I only listen to them or occasionally I talk a little bit. My relationship with them is not close enough to worry whether if I can express my character to them."

Findings of these four cases demonstrate the four conditions in which Japanese international students are less likely to experience identity discrepancy: (1) when Japanese students have less contact with Americans; (2) when they are engaged in superficial conversation; (3) when they rarely use English; and (4) when they are introverted.

Enjoyed identity discrepancy. The experiences of identity discrepancy are undesirable for the most Japanese international students in this study. They dislike how they perform or how they believe Americans see them. They typically experienced psychological discomfort such as frustration, shock, or anger. On the other hand, four interviewees (Sakura, Tomoko, Kouta, and Kayo) feel comfortable with their identity discrepancy and enjoy their experiences of identity discrepancy as emergence of "new identity" or "alter persona."

Sakura's story. In the previous chapter, I discussed that Japanese international students find it difficult to share jokes with American students. Sakura has experienced difficulty in making Americans laugh. She said:

> I like having fun making people laugh, but I cannot do it in English. With Japanese people, I can do it… It is difficult [to make American laugh]. I cannot understand American jokes. I can't understand them. It is difficult… So recently I use my body to make them laugh [Laughs]"

Sakura likes making people laugh. She considers herself as a funny person. However, it is difficult for her to make Americans laugh because of her language barrier and because she cannot understand American jokes. To compensate for her limited English ability, she utilizes body movement to make Americans laugh. She describes her performance while trying to make people laugh as follows:

> Yeah. I think I am being a different person. I am oddly happy and manic. I believe I strike my Japanese friends as down-to-earth and composed. But with Americans, I have to stay high because they are high. If I am not high, I cannot keep up with them [Laughs].

She describes herself trying to make Americans laugh as "a different person." The comical performance and wild gesture are different from how she originally and usually communicates with her Japanese friends. With them, she is funny yet down-to-earth. She does not act like a clown with her Japanese friends. In order to make Americans laugh, Sakura alters her character to be an "oddly happy and manic" person. She believes the Americans around her should see her in the following way:

> A strange Japanese student. A Japanese student who always do strange things, maybe? It is stressful for me when I cannot carry on a conversation. It is stressful for me when a conversation pauses or fades. So I desperately try to keep talking and talking. But it is difficult for me to do in English. So I choose to be comical in front of them [Laughs].

As she says, "I choose to be comical in front of them," she plays a role of a clown in front of Americans with a motive of making them laugh. This is her "front-stage self" (Goffman, 1959). She believes that the Americans around her see her as "a strange Japanese student." This is her perception of others' perspectives of her. Nobody has explicitly told her that is how they see her. She recognizes inconsistency between her self-perceived identity and her self-observed performance.

She is comfortable to act like a clown in front of her American friends. After the interview, I asked her a follow-up question via email to confirm this point. She said:

> I am comfortable with that. In fact, whenever I talk with Americans, I can express more of my feelings, talk about something that I would not normally talk, and I gesture wildly. But that way I can feel more comfortable to talk because I can have a lively conversation with Americans.

She is comfortable with her identity-performance discrepancy as well as her identity-other discrepancy. She also regards this discrepancy positively because it helps her to share more of her feelings as well as have better conversations with her American friends. She thinks her performance helps her build more intimate relationship with her American friends.

To summarize, Sakura considers herself as a funny person. In conversations with her American friends, it is difficult for her to make them laugh because of English barrier and cultural differences in a sense of humor. When she relies only on verbal communicative code, her performance is not reflective of how funny she is. As the solution to overcome her language barrier and present her funniness in conversations with her American friends, she chooses to utilize nonverbal communicative codes. She gestures wildly and behaves comically in front of them. This performance is different from how she usually communicates with her Japanese friends. Her desperation to perform her funny self-perceived identity creates "a different person" which she describes as an "oddly happy, manic and strange Japanese student." Even though she sees herself as a different person and believes that her American friends may see her as "a strange Japanese student," she is comfortable to perform this role in interactions with Americans.

Tomoko's story. When interacting with Americans, Tomoko also experiences a discrepancy between her self-perceived personal identity as being extroverted and talkative and her performance and between the same self-perceived personal identity and her perception of others' perspectives of her. Tomoko is a talkative and humorous person.

During the interview, she made me laugh several times. She compared herself in Japan with herself in the US as follows:

> I think I am quieter in the US…Even in the U.S., I am talkative as long as I speak Japanese. But when I speak English, I am certainly quieter compared to when I talk with my Japanese friends in Japan…Maybe I guess I am more withdrawn about many things here. I cannot jump in ongoing conversations…I am confident that I can make people laugh in Japanese. But I do not have such confidence in English, basically…It hurts, you know. If I see myself through others' eyes, I would appear to be a boring person.

While speaking in Japanese, she considers herself as a funny person who is able to make people laugh. Funniness is constitutive of her self-perceived personal identity. In conversations with Americans, however, her performance is not reflective of how funny she is because of her low confidence in English. She perceives that her performance represents a quiet person and consequently she believes that others may consider her as a boring person, both of which are discrepant with her self-perceived identity as being talkative and funny.

The experience that she cannot perform her funniness in conversations with Americans hurts Tomoko's feelings; however, she decided to positively react to her identity-performance and identity-others discrepancy. Tomoko enjoys her discrepant performance and others' perspectives of her as a chance to play an alternative persona. She commented about the gap between her talkative self and how she performs in intercultural interactions:

> I don't take it seriously. I enjoy it. I am like "It is what it is!" It is not bad to present myself as having a character of 天然 ぼけ(*Ten-nen-bo-ke*) here, you know. It is fun because I cannot experience that in Japan [Laughs]…*Tennenboke* attracts boys in Japan. [Laughs] and I would say "Let's enjoy myself being *tennenboke* here!"

In order to understand Tomoko's comment, it is necessary to briefly explain an expression of 天然 ぼけ(*Ten-nen-bo-ke*). The literal translation from Japanese to English is "natural dumb." The Japanese use *tennenboke* to describe a ditzy person who acts slow, innocent, naïve and dumb at the same time. *Tennenboke* is a character of a person who has little experience and knowledge, and sometime even common sense. Thus, because he or she does not know what is going on, a person who has *tennenboke* character often surprises and confuses people with his or her unpredictable behavior and completely irrelevant comments. Nowadays among adolescent and young adult population in Japan, given the influence of mass media culture, girls with this *tennenboke* character are seen as likable and entertaining. In particular, some Japanese males find this kind of females as attractive or adorable.

While interviewing Tomoko, I did not observe any behaviors that are associated with a Tennenboke character. As she said, she cannot be *tennenboke* in Japanese; however, in interactions with Americans, she believes that she performs as and appears to be *tennenboke* because of her limited English proficiency. She is not frustrated by her identity discrepancy. She looks at the bright side of her self-discrepant performance and how the Americans around her see her.

To summarize, Tomoko cannot fully perform her talkative and humorous character during conversations with her American friends and as a result she believes they see her as a boring person. As such, she experiences a discrepancy between her self-perceived personal identity and her perception of her American friends' perspectives of her. This experience hurts Tomoko's feelings; however, she considers the experience of identity discrepancy in intercultural settings as an opportunity to perform a *Tennenboke*

character. She enjoys performing this alternative persona because a *tennenboke* character is popular among many Japanese males.

Kouta's story. *Kouta* mentioned: "Compared to when I was in Japan, I have changed almost 180 degrees." He said that he was gloomy, distant from his friends and college seniors, and not self-assertive when he was in Japan. But since he came to the U.S., he has changed to become a happy and exciting person who can say whatever he wants to say. About his past self, he said, "I was a little bit frustrated by myself about that." To the contrary, with respect to his current self, he said, "Once I get back to Japan, I want to present that quality of mine."

Kana's story. Similarly to Kouta, *Kana* has changed from being a quiet girl to talkative girl since she moved to the U.S., to the extent which her friends and family in Japan noticed her change. She said, "I think I am being who I really am here, more than when I was in Japan." She was a quiet girl who puts on airs as a smart student in high school. Through learning a lot of life lessons, she has changed to be a fun, exciting, and talkative person who has a lot of friends.

Summary: Identity Discrepancy

First, this study finds the Japanese international students in this study experience a discrepancy between self-perceived personal identity and self-observed performance (i.e., identity-performance discrepancy) or a discrepancy between self-perceived personal identity and self-perception of others' perspectives (i.e., identity-other discrepancy).

Second, this study finds *how* they experience identity discrepancy in intercultural interactions, based on Japanese students' descriptions of their experiences of identity discrepancy. Specifically, the present study finds that: (1) nature of identity discrepancy;

(2) salient identity elements in the experiences of identity discrepancy; and (3) the reasons for identity discrepancy.

Nature of identity discrepancy. An individual experiences identity discrepancy when his or her self-observed performance does not accurately represent his or her self-perceived identity or when he or she perceives others' understanding of his or her identity is inaccurate. People perceive inaccuracy in their presentation or others' understanding of their self-perceived identity when they recognize a reduced, dissonant, or glorifying presentation or understanding of their self-perceived identity. Findings of the present study demonstrate that Japanese international students are more likely to recognize that their self-observed performance and their perception of others' perspectives of their identity represent a reduced or dissonant version of their self-perceived identity.

Japanese students believe that both their self-observed performance and their perception of others' perspectives are a reduced or dissonant representation of their self-perceived identity. Kenji and Hiromi perceive that their presentation or others' understanding of their identities is a reduced version of their self-perceived identities. They cannot fully describe and explain themselves, their thoughts, and/or feelings in English. Naturally, their performance in intercultural communication only partially represents their self-perceived identity and thus Americans form the images of them based on limited self-disclosure.

Many Japanese international students in the present study conceive their presentation of identities and Americans' understanding of their identity to be inferior to or dissonant with their self-perceived identity. To illustrate, Sakura, Tarou, Makoto, and Satoshi consider themselves as competent and intelligent; however, their performance in

intercultural interactions presents them as incompetent or unintelligent (e.g., "You are such an idiot!"). They believe that the Americans around them have misunderstanding about them: Americans see them as an incompetent or unintelligent student. Many Japanese students in the study consider themselves as funny and talkative; however, their performance in intercultural interactions presents them as boring and quiet people. They believe that the Americans around them have dissonant understanding about them—"Americans see me as a boring and quiet student."

Notions of reduction, inferiority, and dissonance are key aspects of the identity discrepancy experiences of Japanese international students. The contrastive example is the dual selves of perfect bilinguals (e.g., Chen, Benet-Martínez, & Bond, 2008; Heller, 2007; Luna, Ringberg, & Peracchio, 2008; Pavlenko, 2006; Rajwade, 2006; Ramírez-Esparza, Gosling, Benet-Martínez, Potter, & Pennebaker, 2006). For instance, Koven's study (1998) finds that perfect bilinguals perceive differences between their French-speaking self and Portuguese-speaking and the others also see the difference between their dual selves. For bilinguals, these two selves are different and both selves coexist within an individual. Unlike international students or second language learners, the duals selves of bilinguals are equal in their minds. They can easily switch between the two selves. However, for many international students at the initial stage, the primary is their Japanese-speaking self and their English-speaking self is immature and defective. Harder (1980) coined this experience of second language learners as "reduced personality." As this study finds, Japanese international students believe that they communicate (i.e., present their identity and receiving the feedback of their self-presentation) their reduced or dissonant representation of their self-perceived identity in intercultural interactions.

Salient identity elements. Some identity elements are central and essential to one's self-concept and self-esteem and the certain identity elements become salient in a given situation. This study finds that, for the Japanese international students, the identity elements of being intelligent and socially attractive are salient elements in intercultural interactions and these identity elements are important for satisfaction with intercultural communication with the Americans around them.

Intelligence. During intercultural interactions, an identity element of *intelligence* seems to become salient for the Japanese international students in this study. Both Tarou and Sakura, two graduate students, experience frustration because they fail at academic activities. Mainly because of limited English proficiency, Tarou got lost in research work and Sakura could not participate in classroom discussion. They observe their academic performance in the U.S. to be discrepant with their self-perceived identities as competent graduate students. In Japan, Tarou was confident about research work and Sakura had high self-efficacy about participation in discussion and presentation in class. Their academic performances in the U.S. inaccurately present their self-perceived identity as competent graduate students. Their experiences of identity-performance discrepancy led to stress, frustration, and self-disappointment. Sakura's experience was severe to the extent that she was undergoing inner dissonance which manifests in a feeling of "being someone else."

Both Makoto and Satoshi have difficulty in presenting their intelligent self in English and as a result they think that American students see them as less intelligent than they really are. Makoto is confident about his knowledgeableness, rich experience, and his eloquent skills. A set of these qualities is constitutive of his identity: it defines him,

individuates him in a social world, and differentiates him from others. When talking with Americans, however, he cannot fully deliver his insightful opinion and knowledge because of his insufficient vocabulary. As a result, he believes that Americans do not accurately understand his intelligence. Regardless of what Americans really think of him, he firmly believes that Americans underestimate his intelligence and think of him as less intelligent than he thinks he really is. Likewise, Satoshi has also experienced identity discrepancy in terms of his intelligence level. Although he profoundly understands study materials, his imperfect writing and speaking performance presents him as an incompetent student who understands only partially and superficially. Consequently, he believes that his Americans classmates see him less intelligent than he really is.

A student of theater performance, Kana, was unable to externalize her acting competence in front of her American classmates. Due to her limited English proficiency, her performance represents her image which is dissonant with her acting competence. American classmates negatively judge her acting performance and competence. Her back-stage self was wrongly judged by her front-stage self (Goffman, 1959). Her performance and perception of her American classmates' perspectives of her endanger her self-efficacy and freeze her self-perceived identity as an experienced and competent theater performer.

In this study, the most experiences of identity discrepancy occurred primarily because Japanese students failed to accurately present or assert their self-perceived identities in interactions with Americans. Satoshi's experience is exceptional among the Japanese students of the current study. He perceived a discrepant and distorted reflection of his intelligence on his American classmates' attitudes. Although he accurately asserted

his self-perceived identity toward them, American classmates saw him through their prejudice against international students and mindlessly doubt his intelligence, only because he is an international student. This identity-other discrepancy caused him great shock and anger.

Social attractiveness. Among the Japanese students in the present study, it is common to experience identity discrepancy in terms of *social attractiveness* in intercultural interactions. Specifically, they experience a discrepancy from their self-perceived identity as being funny, talkative, friendly, sociable and capable of making people laugh. They observe that their performance during conversations with Americans presents them as a boring, quiet, or withdrawn individual. It is frustrating for them to stay quiet because they are originally funny and capable of making people laugh. Their funny and sociable identities are disguised with their quiet and boring personas emerging in interactions with Americans. Consequently, some of them imagine and assume that Americans may think of them as boring, quiet, or withdrawn students.

Reasons for Identity Discrepancy. This study identifies several reasons why Japanese students experience identity discrepancy in intercultural interactions, including communicative competence and interactional partner.

Communicative competence. The primary reason for identity discrepancy is Japanese students' limited English *communicative competence*. Limited communicative competence plays an essential role in identity discrepancy of the Japanese international students. Hymes (1972, 1974) formulates the concept of communicative competence as the *knowledge* about and the *ability to implement* it with respect to the four dimensions: (a) whether and to what extent something is not yet realized, not yet known, but it is

formally *possible*; (b) whether and to what extent something is *feasible* in virtue of the means of implementation available; (c) whether and to what extent something is *appropriate* (adequate, suitable, effective, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated; and (d) whether and to what extent something is in fact done, actually *performed*.

Based on Hymes's formulation, Canale and Swain (see Canale 1983, 1984; Canale and Swain 1980a, 1980b) suggest that communicative competence comprises four areas of knowledge and skills. The first aspect is *grammatical competence*. This competence is concerned with "knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology" (Canale and Swain 1980a, p.29). The second is *sociolinguistic competence*. This competence, broadly speaking, deals with what Hymes (1972, 1974) would call "social rules of use—dimension of language use "without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (Hymes, 1972, p278). It concerns appropriateness of utterances—"the extent to which particular communicative functions (e.g. commanding, complaining and inviting), attitudes (including politeness and formality) and ideas are judged to be proper in a given situation (Canale 1983, p7). The third aspect is *discourse competence*. This competence is concerned with the knowledge and skill required to combine grammatical forms and meanings to produce different types of unified spoken or written texts (Canale, 1983). The fourth aspect is *strategic competence*. This type of competence refers to mastery of verbal and nonverbal communication strategies (Canale 1983).

Grammatical communicative competence. The interviewees mention that, because they do not have sufficient vocabulary and knowledge about expression and

idioms, they cannot present their self-perceived identity or they are more likely to perceive a distorted representation of their self-perceived identity in the eyes of Americans. Knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology is coined as "grammatical competence" (Canale, 1983: Canale and Swain 1980a). Japanese students interpret that they experience identity discrepancy because of the lack of grammatical competence. In particular, identity discrepancy in terms of intelligence is often caused by limited *academic* grammatical competence. In order to present intelligence, Japanese students need knowledge about technical and professional terminology and the ability to implement it. As we have seen in the experiences of Tarou, Sakura, Makoto, and Satoshi, they need to acquire academic, mature and sophisticated grammatical competence to present and perform their maturity and intelligence in interactions with Americans.

Sociolinguistic and strategic communicative competence. In addition to grammatical competence, a need for sociolinguistic and strategic communicative competences was mentioned by the Japanese students in this study. Identity discrepancy in terms of intelligence is caused by a limitation of sociolinguistic competence which is expected and required in a classroom of an American university. Sakura and Tarou experienced identity discrepancy regarding their intelligence in class, because of not only their limited grammatical competence but also their insufficient knowledge about rules and appropriateness in a classroom of an American graduate school. In order to accurately present their intelligence, they need to improve the communicative competence to appropriately and effectively propose, present, question, jump in ongoing

discussions and respond to questions and comments from an instructor and/or American classmates.

Identity discrepancy about social attractiveness is caused by not only the limited grammatical competence but also insufficient discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic communicative competence. Among various aspects of social attractiveness, the Japanese international students in this study experience identity discrepancy regarding their funniness in interactions with Americans. They experience this identity discrepancy because it is difficult for them to share jokes with Americans and make them laugh. Sharing laughs or making Americans laugh requires mastery of all aspects of communicative competence of American society. For the Japanese students in this study, an American sense of humor is too different to understand. Japanese students don't know how to make a joke in English with an American audience. As a result, they are more likely to fail to present their funny character toward their American friends, and consequently experience identity-performance discrepancy.

Communicative competence to perform habitual styles. Japanese students have their own unique ways to present identity as being a funny individual. Japanese international students have formed and maintained their unique and favorite conversation styles through years of socialization and social interactions in Japan. In interactions with Japanese friends, they have always presented their funniness using a habitual communication style. Sayaka has always presented her funniness as a jabber. Akiko has habitually presented her personal identity as a misfortunate doctoral student in a self-deprecating manner.

Certain identity elements are inseparably bound with and deeply embedded in their habitual conversational styles. Because of inseparable connection between identity and conversational style, it is imperative for them to perform their habitual styles in order to present their identities. To illustrate, jabbing is a necessary communicative style for Sayaka to present her identity as being a funny person. Humorously self-deprecating her misfortune is an Akiko's habitual and favorite style through which she can present her funniness and who she is.

In intercultural settings, however, they do not know how to translate their habitual conversation styles into English verbal or nonverbal codes. They do not have enough or necessary communicative competence which allows them to perform such habitual conversational styles and present their funniness in interactions with American friends and classmates. Because they cannot perform their habitual styles using English toward Americans, they fail to present their self-perceived identity as being funny, which leads to the experience of identity discrepancy. What they need is the communicative competence which allows them to perform their habitual conversational style in English, in an American cultural context, and in interactions with Americans.

Alternative strategy. Many may assume that linguistic and verbal communicative competences are prerequisite for realization of one's identities. However, people are creative enough to use the other communication channels than verbal codes and present their identity toward interactants. In this study, two interviewees (Tarou and Sakura) demonstrated that it is possible to find a way to present and realize their identities in the limited linguistic and grammatical competence. They make the best use of body movement to compensate for their limited English language proficiency. They act like a

clown—gesture wildly and comically—in front of their American friends to make them laugh. This performance is different from how they communicate playful with their Japanese friends. Sakura sees herself as a different individual and believes that her American friends may see her as "a strange Japanese student." Yet, both of them are content and comfortable to act like a clown because it enables them to present who they really are and have satisfactory communication with their American friends.

Interactional partners. Limited communicative competence is a primary reason for Japanese students' experiences of identity discrepancy. Interactants are a key element of communicative event (Hymes, 1974). This study finds interactional partners play an important role in Japanese students' communication of personal identity. Based on the descriptions of Japanese students' experiences of identity discrepancy, we can see that their perception of American's attitudes and behaviors is also associated with their experiences of identity discrepancy.

This study finds that, for Japanese international students, Americans' problematic attitudes and behaviors have an impact on their communication of personal identities. The Japanese students in this study observe and perceive Americans' attitudes and behaviors to be unwilling to communicate or unfriendly. In general, when people notice that an interactant is unwilling to communicate or unfriendly, it is difficult for them to remain sociable, outgoing, or extroverted toward him or her. As we have seen in Sakura's case, her identity discrepancy is associated with her social anxiety which had grown her observation of American students' unfriendly reactions to her influent English. She is afraid of American students' reactions and thus she greatly hesitates to initiate a conversation with American students. Consequently, she cannot communicate her

sociable self in interactions with Americans. Tarou had difficulty being his sociable and friendly self because he perceives American students' indifferences about making friends with Japanese international students. Their perception or observation of American students' unwillingness to communicate and unfriendly reactions prevents Japanese students from presenting their self-perceived identity in interactions with many American students. When Japanese students perceive American students' attitudes and behaviors to be problematic, it is difficult for them to be sociable and outgoing toward them. As a result, they cannot present their self-perceived identity as being sociable, outgoing, or extroverted in interactions with such Americans.

As we have seen in Akiko's account, a lack of background commonality between American students and Japanese international students is associated with Japanese students' experiences of identity discrepancy. In interactions with her Japanese friends, because they have the similar problems, she can communicate her personal identity as being a person who jokes about her misfortune. In interactions with her American classmates, because they do not share similar problems, she believes that her personal identity is not recognized or validated by them. As such, she perceives that she cannot communicate her personal identity in interactions with her American classmates.

Japanese distinctiveness. Japanese international students may be more subject to the experience of identity discrepancy because they are more concerned about how others see them. Minami (1983) argues that Japanese sense of self tend to be ruled by one's image in others' eyes (i.e., who they think I am), rather than their own self-image (i.e., who I think I am). According to Markus and Kitayama's (1991) dimension of independent and interdependent construal, Japanese's self construal is predominantly

interdependent. They point out that "experiencing interdependence entails seeing oneself as a part of an encompassing social relationship and recognizing that one's behavior is determined, contingent on, and to a large extent, organized by what the actor perceives to be the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others in the relationship" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p.227). Based on Minami (1983) and Markus and Kitayama (1991), I believe Japanese international students may have a higher level of public self-consciousness. In other words, they may be more concerned about how others see them than others international students from different countries, especially the countries whose culture value independent self construal. Therefore, they are more likely to experience identity discrepancy in both intracultural and intercultural contexts.

Alienation

As a result of social construction of identity, people have multiple identities to multiple audiences. Social interaction is a complicated process consisting of multiple perspectives of one's identity (i.e., self-perceived identity, presented identity, others' perspectives on identity). In some social interactions, multiple perspectives of one's identity can be intertwined in a disharmonic way. We all possibly experience a dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's identity. There is always likelihood that our perception of that how we present identity toward others is not the same with how we see ourselves and we perceive that how others see us is incongruent with how we see ourselves. Such dissonance between multiple perspectives of one's identity can be either intentional or unintentional (e.g., Goffman, 1959; Berger & Luckman, 1967) and reconcilable or irreconcilable.

As discussed in the second chapter, when people experience irreconcilable dissonance between multiple perspectives of their identity in social interaction, they are likely to feel being alienated from self. As such, identity discrepancy can possibly lead to alienation from self depending on conditions and surrounding situations. Following is the summary of these four conditions. First, people feel alienated from self when they perceive their multiple identities to be contradicting with each other and they run out of resource and reasons to rationalize and justify the cognitive dissonance within self (Festinger, 1954). Second, when a certain identity element (e.g., funniness) is central and essential to his or her understanding of self, a dissonance between multiple perspectives of that particular identity element identity discrepancy may be more likely to cause alienation from self. Third, people experience alienation from self when their multiple identities cannot coexist within self because of externally imposed conformity pressure (Fromm, 1955). Fourth, under certain situations such as severe discrimination, people overly internalize how others see them to their identities and let such other-perceived identity override their self-perceived identity. Gradually, they see themselves only through others' perspectives of them (i.e., Du Bois's double consciousness). As a result, people feel being alienated from self.

The interviewees, except for Sakura, did not explicitly mention that they had felt alienated from self or felt irreconcilable dissonance within a self. Although I could see that they have experienced identity discrepancy, findings from the interview transcripts did not provide solid data which indicate whether or not they have experienced alienation from self. To further explore the experience of alienation from self, I asked the two open-ended questions via email: "Have you ever felt that your "self" is separated from you in

the United States?" and "Have you ever felt that you are being someone else in the United States?" Being consistent with findings from the interviews, only Sakura responded saying that she has felt as if she was someone else in the graduate school classes. The others responded that they have not had these kinds of feelings in the United States. Satoshi commented, "My behaviors and performances are different but I remain the same."

Based on the findings and my understanding of the phenomenon of alienation of self, I argue that the Japanese international students in the present study, except for Sakura, have not felt alienated from self in the United States. Their experiences of identity discrepancy have not resulted in alienation from self. Japanese international students have observed that their performance does not accurately or fully present their self-perceived identity and they believe that the Americans around them see them as a person who is different from the person who they think they are. However, they have not recognized irreconcilable dissonance within self or felt alienated from self.

As Satoshi's remark "My behaviors and performances are different but I remain the same" suggests, it is possible to assume that Japanese students may cognitively separate their performances in intercultural settings and Americans' perspectives of them from their identities. Although they observe that their behaviors in interactions with Americans fail to represent their identity, they are aware that their identities remain the same. They are not someone else.

Alienation from Self and International Students: Why don't they experience it?

There are perhaps several reasons why the Japanese students in this study rarely feel alienated from self in intercultural settings. First, it is because they have full control

over the reason for their identity discrepancy. They are aware that the primary reason for identity discrepancy is their limited English communicative competence. Alienation from self is a result of the overall larger social contexts over which an individual has little control. As Fromm (1955) argues, people feel alienated from self when social and situational conditions force them to mutate their identity to meet social expectation. They are aware that, once they acquire English communicative competence to present their identity in intercultural interactions, a discrepancy between their identity and performance and/or a discrepancy between identity and others' perspectives can be resolved.

Secondly, temporality of intercultural experience and lower commitment to a host society can account for Japanese international students' reactions to identity discrepancy. International students are short-term sojourners who will eventually return to their home countries. Immigrants or refuges, on the other hand, intend to live in a foreign country permanently and thus have to re-establish their lives in a new society. They need to economically and socially commit themselves to a host society. Unlike them, international students are given more freedom to choose their commitment level to a host society unless they intend to permanently stay in the U.S. after completion of academic programs.

In the present study, the exchange students stay in the U.S. for 9 to 10 months and most of the international students plan to stay in the U.S. for less than five years. All of the participants plan to return to Japan. Therefore, when they observe a discrepancy between their identity and performance or between their identity and how others think of them, they are able to consider it as a temporary situation which will end within four

years for most of them. It is possible for them to interpret the emergence of a different persona as if they are acting a role in a play and their acting will end when they leave the U.S. I assume this is a possible reason why Japanese international students have not felt alienated from self.

Thirdly, alienation from self is the state in which people lose a core essence of self. The Japanese students in this study compared their self-perceived identity with their performance and others' perspectives of their identity. Since they were able to cognitively compare them and analyze the relations among them, I interpret that their self-perceived identity remains as a core essence of self, which means their self-perceived identity have not yet been overridden by the others' perspectives of them. Therefore, I contend that the Japanese students in this study have not felt alienated from self in the U.S.

Sakura's Story: One Case of Alienation from Self

There is one exception in the present study. One interviewee (Sakura) has felt alienated from herself in intercultural situations. This finding tells us the following notion. Regardless of temporality and low commitment, sojourners may experience alienation from self especially when a certain identity element (e.g., a graduate student who actively participates in classroom discussion) is essential to their understanding of self. She described a feeling she had when she could not participate in discussion in the graduate school classes:

> I feel as if I was an empty shell just sitting there and I am floating in the air. I see myself struggling with speaking up and participating in the discussion. I am so frustrated. It is not me. I hate myself being like that.

When she perceived that her performance presented her as an incompetent student who cannot participate in discussion, she felt as if she was a completely different person and "an empty shell." In this certain situation, she felt alienated from self. When people cannot present their essential identity elements in social interactions, their identity is frozen and suspended, which in turn can lead to a feeling of being alienated from self.

Self-Efficacy

This study finds that self-efficacy belief is a salient issue for Japanese international students. For them, academic and social self-efficacy beliefs become problematic. Self-efficacy refers to "people's belief in their capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives" (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 364). Self-efficacy is different from one's actual capabilities or others' judgment. It is individual subjective beliefs or judgments of one's own ability. Self-efficacy is the *belief* that one is capable of performing or executing courses of action in a certain manner to attain certain goals. People with high self-efficacy beliefs think they have the ability to succeed at a task, to overcome obstacles, and to reach their goals. People with low self-efficacy beliefs doubt their ability to succeed and do not believe they have what it takes to reach their goals.

Unlike efficacy, which is the power to produce an effect—in essence, competence—self-efficacy is the *belief* (whether or not accurate) that one has power to produce that effect by completing a given task or activity related to that competency. For example, a person with high self-efficacy may engage in a more health-related activity when an illness occurs, whereas a person with low self-efficacy would carry feelings of hopelessness.

There is a difference between *self-esteem* and *self-efficacy*. Self-efficacy relates to a person's perception of their ability to reach a goal, whereas self-esteem relates to a person's sense of self-worth. For example, a person who is a terrible singer would probably have poor self-efficacy about singing, but this does not affect her self-esteem since most people, except for professional singers, don't invest much of their self-esteem in singing. On the other hand, one might have enormous skill at singing, yet set such a high standard for herself that self-esteem is low. At the same time, a person who has high self-efficacy in general but is poor at singing might think that he/she is good at singing, or might still believe that he/she could quickly learn.

Academic Self-Efficacy

Academic self-efficacy refers to a student's belief that he or she can successfully engage in and complete course-specific academic tasks, such as accomplishing course outcomes, demonstrating competency skills used in the course, satisfactorily completing assignments, passing the course, and meeting the requirements to continue on in his or her major.

Sakura has a high self-efficacy belief about discussion participation and presentation. Tarou has a high self-efficacy belief about academic work including reading academic journals, laboratory work, and entomology terminology and knowledge. In his Chinese literature class, Satoshi had high self-efficacy beliefs about his understanding of Chinese literature and how metaphors work in Chinese literature. Kana's academic work is theater performing. Kana had high self-efficacy about theater performance which has been built upon her personal past experiences of mastery in Japan.

Social Self-Efficacy

Social self-efficacy is "an individual's confidence in his or her ability to engage in the social interactional tasks necessary to initiate and maintain interpersonal relationships" (Smith & Betz, 2000, p.284) According to the operationalization of social self-efficacy in the Scale of Perceived Social Self-Efficacy (Smith & Betz, 2000), social self-efficacy includes six domains: (1) making friends, (2) pursuing romantic relationships, (3) social assertiveness, (4) performance in public situations, (5) groups or parties, and (6) giving or receiving help.

Both Sakura and Tarou have high self-efficacy in their abilities to initiate conversation with strangers and make friends with anyone. Sayaka, Tomoko, and Tarou all have high self-efficacy in their abilities to amuse people. Akiko has high self-efficacy in her ability to change her problems to humor and laugh about it with her friends. Makoto has high self-efficacy in his social assertiveness. He has confidence in his capability to carry intelligent, sophisticated, and inspiring conversations about cultures, social issues, politics, international relations, and life philosophy. His self-efficacy builds on his past experiences of traveling around 15 countries.

Self-Efficacy in Intercultural Interactions

This study finds that, for Japanese international students, intercultural communication challenges include difficulty in validating one's academic and social self-efficacy beliefs. As we have seen, Japanese international students talked about their experiences in which they cannot perform and present their self-perceived or self-believed capabilities because of their limited communicative competence and situational conditions. They experience difficulty in validating or confirming their academic and

social self-efficacy in intercultural settings. They have failed to prove their beliefs about capabilities to perform academic work and social interactions toward American professors, classmates, or friends. Their problem is not a decrease in academic or social self-efficacy per se. Their problem is a difficulty validating their academic or social self-efficacy beliefs through presenting toward others. Because they have high academic and social self-efficacy, poor performance in class and difficulty in making friends with Americans have a greater impact on them. If they had lower self-efficacy about academic work and social interactions, they would experience less frustration about their behaviors and performance in intercultural settings.

Significance of Self-Efficacy

I have found that it is common that Japanese international students experience difficulty in validating and confirming their academic and social self-efficacy in intercultural situations. In addition, I have found the significance of self-efficacy validation for international students' well-being. Miho is highly frustrated with herself because her English has not improved at all and because she cannot make friends with Americans. During the interview, she criticized herself that she should be more sociable or ambitious to enjoy her overseas experiences. She feels powerless because of her poor English ability. As previously described, her language problems forced her to experience a painful situation in her French class. As she went through such struggle, she had experienced a sense of powerlessness. She takes a piano course in music school and received a compliment from an instructor and the instructor encouraged her to apply for music school. She narrated this story with smile on her face:

> I've played the piano for years and I keep playing here, too. I got a compliment from the instructor. I see myself playing the piano as well as I play in Japan. It

> comforts me a lot by assuring me that I have not changed! The fact that I cannot speak English sometimes makes me feel that I cannot do anything at all. … So when I was so depressed that I didn't feel like talking to anyone, I played the piano alone and just stayed at home. … I seriously think that without piano, I would have become mentally challenged. The piano really saved me. It made me so happy that the instructor encouraged me to transfer and apply to this university. I realized that it makes us really happy to have one thing that we know we can do well.

Many international students in the U.S may be struggling with similar problems as Miho. They may feel powerless because they cannot speak English. They may feel isolated from American students. Living in a foreign country, international students may constantly feel frustrated or depressed because they fail at the activities which they normally can do easily. Miho's experience tells us that one experience in which his or her self-efficacy beliefs are validated and confirmed by others can save international students from the feeling of powerlessness and self-doubt. The experiences in which they can validate their self-efficacy beliefs are very significant for international students' well-being.

Summary

Identity Discrepancy

This study finds that Japanese international students observe that their performance in intercultural interactions fails to present their self-perceived identities as being intelligent and socially attractive individuals. As a result of unsuccessful presentation of one's self-perceived identities, they observe that the Americans around them see them as less intelligent or less socially attractive individuals. The reasons for their identity discrepancy are lack of communicative competences and issues with interactants. This study finds that Japanese international students need not only grammatical competence but also sociolinguistic and strategic competence to present

their self-perceived identities. In particular, when their self-perceived identities are inseparably bound with their unique and habitual communication styles, they need the communicative competence which allows them to perform their habitual conversational style in English and the context of American culture. In addition, this study finds that the Japanese international students observe that their performance presents them as less socially attractive individuals because Americans' problematic attitudes and/or behaviors prevent them from presenting how much they really are funny or friendly. The lack of background commonality with Americans also increases the likelihood that their self-perceived identities are misunderstood by the Americans around them. Moreover, this study finds that they construct and present different identities to different types of interactants. Thus, when acquaintances or friends belonging to the different types come across in a single situation at the same time, they are likely to experience identity discrepancy. I will further discuss identity discrepancy of Japanese international students in the next chapter.

Alienation

With the participants in the present study, I find that Japanese international students in the U.S. experience identity discrepancy; however, they do not experience alienation from self. I made this interpretation because: (1) they have control over a the reasons for identity discrepancy (i.e., lack of communicative competence); (2) their intercultural experience is short-term and temporal; (3) they have commitment to the host society; (4) their core essence of self still remains, which means their self-perceived identity has not yet been overridden by the others' perspectives of them. Among the

eighteen interviewees, only Sakura explicitly mentioned that she had felt alienated from self.

Self-Efficacy

This study has found that academic and social self-efficacy beliefs become salient issues for Japanese international students in intercultural situations. Their problem is not a decrease in academic or social self-efficacy. Their problem is difficulty in validating their academic or social self-efficacy beliefs in and through intercultural interactions. Because of a lack of communicative competence and situational conditions, they cannot perform and present their self-perceived capabilities to perform academic work and social interactions toward American professors, classmates, or friends. In other words, they fail to prove their academic and social self-efficacy beliefs in and through interactions with the Americans around them. Because they have high academic and social self-efficacy, poor performance in class and difficulty in making friends with Americans have a greater impact on them. This study also finds that one experience in which they can validate their self-efficacy beliefs is significant for international students' well-beings. It can save international students from the feeling of powerlessness and self-doubt.

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

Findings

Intercultural Communication with Americans

Many researchers simply assume that the primary reason why international students cannot develop relationships with local people is due to their lack of willingness and/or communicative competence (e.g., Gudykunst, & Hammer, 1988; Kim, 2001). Findings from this study show that international students' intercultural communication cannot be explained solely by their unwillingness or limited communicative competences.

Friendship for Japanese college students. In the present study, friendship with American students emerges as a primary issue in Japanese students' talk about their intercultural experiences. They want to make friends with American students; however, it is difficult for them to communicate and develop friendships with them. Communicating and making friends with American students is one of the major concerns for Japanese international students. It is important to take into account that they are young college students. Having fun with friends is one of their primary concerns in their college lives. Difficulty making friends may not be a significant or salient issue or concern for non-student sojourners such as businessmen and/or international students from the other countries.

Japanese international students may have a strong desire to make friends and have fun with Americans because college students in Japan generally are accustomed to group activities with friends. Many college students belong to two types of groups on campus. They spend a lot of time with the members of each group. The first group is academic. Junior and senior students enroll in a class called ゼミ(*Zemi*) which is

equivalent to “seminar” in English. Each seminar is called by a instructor’s name. For example, a seminar of Dr. Honda is called 本田ゼミ(*Honda-Zemi*). An individual student chooses a seminar class based on his or her research interest and a professors’ academic expertise. Each seminar consists of 15-30 students on average. They have a class once or twice a week. Their classroom activity includes research project, laboratory work, reading and discussing selected materials in class, studying for an individual graduation thesis, and so forth. I met a couple of my close friends in my seminars.

The second group is social. In addition to a seminar, it is common for college students in Japan to belong to one or more common-interest social groups called “circle” (サークル*Saakuru*). Participation in a circle is a completely personal choice. Some students choose to not belong to this type of social group. Each circle engages in a different activity, including sports (e.g., tennis), arts and performance (e.g., dance, chorus), hobby (e.g., photography, traveling), or volunteer work (e.g., helping disabled children). There are numerous circles in each university or college and there are also cross-university circles. When a new academic year starts in April, freshmen are invited by many circles—each circle distributes posters and flyers on campus and arranges a welcome party. Some circles are more committed to its activity so that they practice everyday and participate in a regional tournament. Some circles are less committed to their activity; rather their members are more interested in getting together and have fun drinking or going to Karaoke. Regardless, Japanese college students meet people and make friends through their circles.

For many students in Japan, their college lives evolve around group activities with circle members and/or seminar classmates. They become close friends with them.

They go to class together, have lunch together, and hang out together after school or over the weekend. Coming from such social environment, Japanese students in the U.S. may care to spend time with friends at school as well as during free time. Japanese people are known as collectivistic and group-oriented (e.g., Triandis, 1995; Gudykunst, 2003, 2005). It is reasonable to presume that Japanese international students may seek for a sense of belonging on campus in the U.S.

Diversity within a dominant group. This study finds that Japanese students have developed contrastive relationships with Japan-connected American students and the other American students. They have developed significant and friendly relationships with Japan-connected American students, whereas they struggle to initiate conversations with the other American students and consequently it is difficult for them to develop friendships with them.

When past studies and existing theories address relationships between sojourners/immigrants and local people of a host society (i.e., members of native-born population), they consider local people as one homogeneous group (e.g., Berry, 1997, 2008; Kim, 2001; Ward, 2001). To illustrate, Berry (e.g., 1997, 2008) describes four patterns of acculturation strategy of "a dominant ethnocultural group" (Berry, 2008): melting pot, multiculturalism, segregation, and exclusion based on the assumption that their acculturation strategy is determined by their orientation regarding the degree of maintenance of heritage culture and identity of non-dominant group and the degree of interest in intergroup relationships. Berry's model is useful as a descriptive model; however, it overlooks diversity concerning acculturation strategy within local people, or in his word "a dominant ethnocultural group." Furthermore, in her book "*Becoming*

intercultural," Kim (2001) does not mention individual differences within local people or members of a dominant group. She argues interpersonal relationships between local people and strangers assuming that there is the consensus among members of a dominant group regarding intergroup relationships with strangers and social relationships of strangers are determined by such collective opinion of local people.

My argument is that past studies and theories wrongly consider "local people" as a homogeneous group and ignore substantial heterogeneity within local people. This finding reveals that, even within a so-called "dominant" ethnic group, there is significant difference and diversity in terms of the attitudes and/or behaviors toward sojourners, immigrants and refugees. Japanese students' experiences of interpersonal communication are found to be drastically different between relationships with Japan-connected American students and those of the other American students. Give this finding, we can see that Berry's model overlooks reality that some individuals in a dominant group may have melting pot orientation, whereas the others may have multiculturalism orientation. Likewise, we can see that Kim's (2001) theorems such as: "The greater the preparedness for change, the greater host interpersonal and mass communication" and "The greater the host communication competence, the greater the host interpersonal and mass communication" (p.91) oversimplify what international students actually experience in their lives.

Explanation for interpersonal problems of Japanese sojourners. This study finds that Japanese students perceive the attitudes and behaviors of the majority of American students as problematic. Specifically, they perceive them to be unwilling to communicate with international students, to react unfriendly to influent English, and to

have problematic speaking behaviors. As previously discussed, Japanese students might perhaps observe and interpret American students' behaviors based on a Japanese communicative norm which places a great deal of weight on concern for others and their feelings. American students and/or international students from other countries may possibly find the same behaviors of American students as neutral or even friendly. They may not recognize unwillingness to communicate even if they experience what the Japanese students in this study experienced (e.g., An American student discontinued a conversation with Sayaka and started talking with another American student)

Research has found that Japanese sojourners and international students tend to have problems of the interpersonal relationships with the local. In reviewing studies on Japanese sojourners, Okazaki-Luff (1991) has concluded that Japanese sojourners tend to experience a great deal of difficulty communicating with local people and they tend to stay within coethnic networks without developing relationships with social networks of local people. Yeh and Inose (2002) found that Japanese students in the U.S. were more likely to experience interpersonal problems than were Chinese and Korean students.

The finding of the present study provides a possible explanation for interpersonal problems of Japanese sojourners in an intercultural context. They use Japanese norms regarding interpersonal communication as the standard for interpretation of American students' behaviors. Compared to Japanese people, Americans place less value on consideration for others; therefore, Japanese students observe that Americans' behaviors violate Japanese communicative norms. Because they judge American students' behaviors based on a Japanese communicative norm, they recognized "problems", not cultural diversity or differences, in Americans' behaviors. They do not

think, “That is how Americans communicate;” instead, they think, “Americans’ behaviors have got some problems.” Japanese international students and other sojourners may be more likely to confront with interpersonal problems because they perceive negativity in local people’s behaviors, which leads to social anxiety or communication apprehension.

Details of intercultural communication. The present study sheds the light on the intercultural communication phenomena to which many past studies have paid little attention. Theories of intercultural communication (e.g., Gudykunst, 1995; 2005; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003) do not pay attention to the details and complexity of human phenomena because theorists believe that a good theory has to be simple and parsimonious (e.g., Dubin, 1978). However, human phenomena can only be found in and through their complexity and messiness; therefore, many theories overlook what is really going on in our human lives. The finding of this study reveals the details international students’ perceptions of their experiences in intercultural communication. This study finds that: (1) Japanese international students in the U.S. have difficulty communicating with Americans due to a lack of common topics especially about pop culture; and (2) they are not fully satisfied with communication with Americans because they cannot share jokes and laughter together. These two issues are the real problems that international students actually experience in their lives.

This finding may be peculiar only to Japanese college students because of the following reasons. First, pop culture is one of Japanese college students’ favorite conversation topics. Many Japanese college students, not all of them, like to talk about various kinds of Japanese pop culture including TV shows, celebrities, pop music,

movies, and so on. Closely related to pop culture, many of them like to talk about sports (e.g., baseball, soccer) as well. Therefore, it may be a unique case that Japanese college students find it difficult communicating with Americans because they cannot talk about pop culture. Second, this study finds that sharing jokes, humor and laughter with American students is of great importance for Japanese international students. In particular, the Japanese students in this study experienced difficulty performing a *Boke* or a *Tsukkomi* in intercultural settings. Because it is a favorite way to be playful with friends for some Japanese students, the fact that they cannot perform a *Boke-Tsukkomi* joking dialogue affects their communication satisfaction.

As previously stated, Japanese students recognized this as a salient issue concerning intercultural communication probably because they are young college students. It is typical of Japanese college students to long for friendships and care to have playful time together with friends. However, it is reasonable to assume that international students from other countries have similar experiences with respect to conversation topics and joking in intercultural contexts. It is difficult for almost everyone to talk with someone when there is a little or no common topic between them and also because pop culture is a convenient topic for small talk in many situations. As for joking issues, in spite of the cultural differences in a sense of humor and joking styles, it is universal that people enjoy joking and laughing with others. Joking and laughing together leads to higher communication satisfaction in most cases of friendships. As seen in the findings of this study and other studies about cultural distinctiveness of a sense of humor and joking styles (e.g., Basso, 1979; Wieder & Pratt, 1990), each cultural group has a unique sense of humor and a distinctive joking style. Therefore, I assume that international students

from various cultural backgrounds may commonly experience difficulty joking together with American students or international students from other countries.

Intercultural Communication of Personal Identity

When Japanese international students move to the United States, each Japanese student is a unique individual who has already developed unique attributes—identity. An individual student has already developed personality, character, competence, memory, and experiences. For twenty years or longer, they have constructed, redefined, and maintained their identities to individuate them as a unique being in social world and differentiate them from others. How do Japanese international students communicate their identity in interactions with Americans?

Identity apnea. This study finds that Japanese international students experience identity discrepancy when they communicate their identity in intercultural interactions. They observe that their performance does not accurately represent their self-perceived identity and/or they recognize that others do not accurately understand their identity. In their understanding, their self-observed performance and their perception of others' perspectives of their identity represent a *reduced* or *dissonant* version of their self-perceived identity.

When they experience identity discrepancy, Japanese international students undergo internal dilemma between: (a) desire to present their identity elements of being intelligent and socially attractive in interactions with Americans and (b) ability to present these identity elements toward them. The Japanese international students in the present study have high motivation to maintain and present some essential and enduring elements of their self-perceived identity which they have developed in Japan. However, they have

difficulty in presenting and asserting those identity elements toward their American professors, classmates and/or friends. As a result, they believe Americans may not recognize or understand their essential identity elements.

Grounded in this finding, I propose the concept *identity apnea* to describe these problems with intercultural communication of personal identity among Japanese international students. They experience psychological discomfort because their favorite identity elements of being intelligent and socially attractive are frozen and suspended in interactions with their American professors, classmates and friends. If I characterize the identity construction process as "identity breathing"—presentation as "breathing out" and internalization as "breathing in." The term "identity apnea" was chosen as a way to describe the findings that the Japanese students cannot smoothly present (breathe out) their identity elements of being intelligent and socially attractive and they resist internalizing (breathing in) others' perspective on their identities.

Intercultural identity flexibility. In this study, I have observed that Japanese international students struggle to improve their communicative competence so as to become themselves in intercultural contexts— their enduring and essential identity elements are accurately presented toward others and recognized and understood by them. They struggle to improve their competence so that they can communicate their self-perceived identity in interaction with Americans. None of the Japanese students in the current study maintained that they wanted to become like Americans. For Japanese international students, the success of intercultural communication is not only fitting their communication styles to Americans styles. They do not struggle to improve their communicative competence for the purpose of becoming like Americans. Their goal is to

develop communicative competence to assert who they are toward Americans and have their identity recognized and understood by them.

Some elements of self-perceived identity are enduring—they have constructed, redefined, and maintained for years in interactions with the Japanese people around them (e.g., friends, family). Some enduring elements of self-perceived identity are essential to self-concept, in other words, understanding of who he or she is. Japanese students develop their habitual communicative style in and through long-term social interactions with the Japanese people around them (i.e., jabbing, making people laugh, actively participating in discussion, self-deprecating talk). They have long communicated their self-perceived identity using these habitual styles. Some elements of their self-perceived identity are inseparably bound with their habitual behaviors. For example, for Sayaka, self-perceived identity as being a funny person is closely bound with jabbing joking style. When such behavior-bound identity elements are essential to self-concept, it is imperative for an individual to practice his or her habitual behavioral style in order to maintain identity and not to lose a sense of self.

As present findings show, identity-bound habitual behaviors can be distinctive to communication patterns among Japanese people (e.g., jabbing) or it requires specific Japanese linguistic expression (e.g.,やべー*Yabee*) for some of Japanese students. In this case, imitation-like acquisition of Americans' communicative behaviors does not help them present such behavior-bound identity elements. Behavioral assimilation (i.e., absorbing communicative competences of Americans) is not a sufficient solution to their identity discrepancy. What these Japanese students seek is the ability to effectively play around between the communicative competences of two different cultural groups.

Grounded in this finding, I propose the conceptualization of intercultural identity flexibility. Intercultural identity flexibility is the individual's adaptability and flexibility to *communicate* their self-perceived identity in intercultural interactions. Communicating identity means a person presents his or her identity and it be recognized and accurately understood or validated by interactants. Intercultural identity flexibility transcends mere acquisition of communicative competence of the local cultural group. It is the flexibility to switch around two types of communicative competence (e.g., Japanese and American communicative competence). It is the flexibility to satisfactorily and appropriately practice one's culturally distinctive behaviors in intercultural communication.

My notion of intercultural identity flexibility is closely related to Bakhtin's (1981) notion of *dialogicality* and *multivoicedness*. Wertsch (1991) discusses Bakhtin's view of *dialogicality* as follow:

> In Bakhtin's view, a speaker always invokes a social language in producing an utterance, and this social language shapes what the speaker's individual voice can say. This process of producing unique utterances by speaking in social languages involves a specific kind of dialogicality or multivoicedness that Bakhtin termed 'ventriloquation,' the process whereby one voice speaks through another voice or voice type in social language (p.59).

Following is the quote from Bakhtin's (1981) *The dialogic imagination*:

> The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes 'one's own' only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, after all, out of a dictionary that the speaker gets his own words!), but rather it exists in other people's mouths, in other people's concrete contexts, serving other people's intentions: it is from there that one must take the word and make it one's own.'

Based on Bakhtin's (1981) notion of multivoicedness, successful intercultural communication can be regarded as "the process whereby one voice speaks through

another voice or voice type in social language" (Wertsch, 1991, p.59). For Japanese international students, successful intercultural communication is the communication whereby they can communicate their voices through a foreign language and different behavioral styles and rules. I consider self-perceived identity as one aspects of Bakhtin's notion of voice.

From this standpoint, my notion of identity flexibility disagrees with Kim's (2001) conceptualization of identity flexibility. Kim (2001) defines identity flexibility as "willingness to accept the identity of the host culture" (Kim, 2001, p.111). Kim (2001) conceptualizes "this willingness to accept the identity of the host culture" as a requirement condition for cross-cultural adaptation. Based on the present findings, I understand that identity flexibility is not the willingness or readiness to make change in their behaviors or identity to fit in to a host culture. Identity flexibility is not the willingness to assimilate into a host culture. Long-term cultural adjustment is not the process in which sojourners transform their self-perceived identity to fit in to the expectation or perspectives of the local society and its members. It is the process in and through which sojourners discover and redefine their identities and become themselves.

Integration. A large number of empirical studies have found that immigrants and sojourners report better psychological health when they choose an integration strategy. Largely, when researchers use the concept integration, they mean the integration of sojourners' original culture with the dominant culture of a host society and an individual who accepts host culture and at the same time maintains his or her original culture. Berry (1997, 2006) defines integration as the process and outcome in which sojourners become involved in other cultural groups and at the same time they maintain their heritage culture

and identity. Sowell (1994) argues that integration of diverse skills of multiple ethnic groups leads to the increasing productivity and prosperity of a society. For him, integration takes place when the ethnic groups bring their unique and distinctive skills and values to the larger society and integrate them with the skills and values of the larger society. Kiley (2003) finds that a quarter of the research participants who are Indonesian postgraduate students studying in an Australian university report that they were keen to increase their knowledge and skill, but at the same time they did not want to change who they were and the way they viewed the world.

This study has found that Japanese international students strive for the two patterns of integration: integration of two kinds of communicative competence and integration of identity. First, they strive for balanced integration of the communicative competences of American and Japanese people so as to effectively communicate their enduring and essential identities. By integrating American and Japanese communicative competencies, they can present identity which they have developed in Japan while interacting with Americans. Second, they strive for harmonic integration of their enduring and essential identity which has been constructed in Japan and a new identity which emerges in intercultural interaction with Americans.

Many studies and theories assume that *change* has to occur as a result of intercultural contact and long-term cultural adjustment (see Berry, 2006; Bochner, and Furnham, 2001; Kim, 2001; Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936; Sam, 2006; Ward, 2001). By and large, when they discuss change in sojourners or immigrants, researchers' discussion is concentrated on how sojourners and immigrants learn a host culture.

The cultural adjustment process is conceptualized as cross-cultural adaptation by Kim (2001). Kim's (2001) understanding of adaptation follows Spencer's Social Darwinism and "hyperselectionism" (Gould, 1980). Kim believes that adaptation means the process through which people increase fitness to a host environment and become "well-designed" entities. By change of sojourners, Kim (2001) means acculturation (i.e., learning a host culture) and deculturation (i.e., unlearning an original culture). Kim (2001) theorizes that as sojourners acculturate, they deculturate (i.e., lose) their original culture. Kim (2001) postulates that, in order to become a better fit to a host society, sojourners "unlearn" some elements of their original culture because, she assumes, it is impossible for two mutually exclusive cultures to coexist within an individual.

Based on Gould's (1980) understanding of Darwin's evolution theory, Kim's understanding of adaptation seems inaccurate. Darwin realized that "natural selection was not the only force at work, and that not everyone fits." (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p.46). Darwin was aware of messier universe (Gould, 1980). Gould (1980) emphasizes that Darwin saw "the best proof of evolution is imperfect design" and "messiness and tinkering, not perfect adaptation, are the true marks of historicity." (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p.45). Although Kim (2001) regards adaptation as the process through which people increase fitness to a host environment become "well-designed" entities, adaptation is not the process which leads to a perfect, better, right and well-designed organism which fits to their environment. Adaptation is the messy process in which biological structures including social entities change in an imperfect way.

Individuals find their own way to deal with cross-cultural adjustment. There is more than one way to culturally adjust. Cultural adjustment process varies depending on

individuals. Berry (2006) emphasizes individual diversity of acculturation strategy. He argues:

> The original definitions of acculturation foresaw that domination was not the only relationship, and that cultural and psychological homogenization would not be the only possible outcome of intercultural contact. Why not? An answer to this question lies in the observation that people hold different views about how they want to live following contact: not everyone seeks out such contact, and even among those who do, not everyone seeks to change their culture and behavior to be more like the other (often dominant) group" (Berry, 2006, p.34).

The important point of Berry's argument on acculturation is that an individual finds his or her unique way to deal with cultural adjustment. In this sense, both a person who chooses to deculturate and acculturate to become like a host member and a person who chooses not to acculturate or deculturate are well-adapted as long as they are happy about themselves. Kim (2001) assumes that it is impossible for two cultures to coexist within an individual and unlearning of an original culture has to occur. However, a study with French-Portuguese bilinguals (Koven, 1998) reveals that it is possible for an individual to maintain two selves (e.g., French-speaking self and Portuguese-speaking self) without losing or unlearning either of them.

The present study finds that the cultural adjustment process of Japanese international students is more complex than the mere addition of new cultural elements to the existing ones. Adapting themselves to a dominant culture is not the only way of cultural adjustment. To unlearn or change their identities is not the goal that Japanese students aim for. Their goal for cultural adjustment is to find or create a way to maintain and assert their original identity that they have lived with for years in Japan in intercultural contexts. They choose to struggle to find the way to maintain their original and habitual identity elements in the U.S.

I assume that Japanese students experience identity discrepancy and identity apnea because their motivation to maintain their original identity elements is greater than motivation to "unlearn" them. For them, long-term cultural adjustment is the process through which they strive to develop adaptability, flexibility and resourcefulness to control a new environment so that their originality can survive in there. It is not the process through which they give up and lose their originality to fit in a new environment.

Alienation from self. This study interprets that the Japanese international students in this study do not experience alienation from self. To rationalize this finding, I discuss that they do not feel alienated from self because their intercultural experiences are temporary and they have a weak sense of commitment to a local society. However, I suppose that there is the possibility that international students may experience alienation from self.

This study finds that Japanese international students struggle with the dilemma between the desire for their identity to be recognized by Americans and the ability to present and assert their identity toward them. They may possibly be motivated to cope with this dilemma by reducing the importance of presentation of identity. They may think it would be easier if they quit trying to present and assert their identity. They may think it would be much less stressful if they could internalize how their American professor, classmates, and friends see them no matter how discrepant it is with their self-perceived identity.

As a result of their attempt at coping with this dilemma, they might have possibly felt alienated from self. People feel alienated from self when they overly internalize how

other people see them and their other-perceived identity gradually override self-perceived identities.

According to the present findings, Japanese international students believe that the Americans around them see them as a reduced version of their self-perceived identity (e.g., less intelligent, less funny). If they internalize Americans' perspective of them as being less intelligent or funny and see themselves that way, they might experience alienation from self. Especially when they recognize downward transformation of their identities and perceive irreconcilable gaps between their old and new identities, it is likely that they feel alienated from self.

As a Japanese international student in the U.S, I have experienced such a sense of alienation from self. In the first few years, I had struggled to present and assert my identity elements of being intelligent toward my American professors. Because I frequently failed to present that identity element toward them, I believed that they must think of me as an incompetent student. For the first couple of semesters, I tried to negotiate my identity in interaction with the American professors. I quit trying because it was too stressful and difficult. I chose to stop denying my image that I believed my American professors formed about me and accept such reflective image of me. I took this change positively thinking that I released myself from pressure to become successful in the U.S. I talked to my Russian friend, "I have got used to having low self-esteem and I can relax better now." However, I experienced alienation from self when I went back to Japan over the break and met with my former adviser. He said, "Izumi-san, you have changed. You are not confident as much as you were. I see a negative person in front of me. You were not like this before." When this happened, I first realized that two

dissonant selves exist in me and one self denies the other. I have never forgotten this experience because it was enormously shocking for me. Looking back, now I think what I was going through was alienation from self. I assume this would be the most probable pattern of alienation from self for international students.

Self-Awareness. Intercultural communication scholars have recognized that intercultural experiences lead to an increase in self-awareness. For example, Adler (1975) argues that an intercultural encounter "begins with the encounter of another culture and evolves into the encounter with self" (p.18). Similarly, Hoopes (1979) argues that "even more significant was the dawning recognition that becoming effective overseas involved a heavy measure of self-understanding and awareness" (p.4).

Grounded in the present findings, I argue that the experience of identity discrepancy is beneficial for self-awareness and verification of "who I really am." When international students were in their home countries, their consciousness of "who I really am" was dim or nonexistent because they were less subject to the dissonance between and among their self-perceived identity, performance and others' perspectives of them. Once they are engaged in intercultural communication, they became exposed to the high likelihood of the identity discrepancy. The experience of identity discrepancy may help international students discover and understand who they really are. Through the consciousness of "not-me," one comes to realize and understand who I really am. By observing the image of "not-me" reflected in his or her performance and in the eyes of others, the consciousness of "who I really am" emerges and stands out in relief in one's psyche as they perceive their presented selves to be "not-me" and the reflective image of "not-me" in others' reactions. People come to recognize and understand who they really

are and their distinctiveness as they experience the feelings such as “I cannot be myself” or “I think people misunderstand me.” It is not until they consciousness of “not-me” emerges that the consciousness of “who I really am” emerges.

Practical Implication

Findings of the present study can be applied to help international students overcome their problems with intercultural communication. The findings and discussions can provide domestic students, host families, and university faculty members and administrators with the information about internal struggles of international students and consequently contribute to the improvement of the social environment around international students. Especially for practitioners and psychological counselors, the present findings would be applicable to their services for both outbound and inbound students.

First, the present findings can be applied to pre-departure training for outbound students as well as after-arrival training for inbound students. These findings also suggest an alternative approach to cultural adjustment. Usually training programs place weight on learning the communication norms and styles of a host culture (e.g., Brislin & Yoshida, 1994; Cushner & Brislin, 1996). This study finds that Japanese students strive to develop the communicative competence to present and assert to Americans their original and essential personal identities which have been constructed in Japanese social environment and wish to have these identities accurately recognized and validated by Americans. This finding indicates that it would be more helpful for international students if the scope of a training program is not limited to the acquisition of communicative competence of a host cultural community. International students would appreciate it if a training program could

help them find ways to present their personal identity in intercultural contexts. For example, trainers can introduce studies which describe the distinct communication styles of both home and host culture and arrange a group discussion to think about possible strategies to integrate different communication styles in intercultural contexts.

Another idea about training programs can be suggested based on the finding that Japanese students find it difficult to communicate with Americans because they do not share the same conversation topics with Americans. Pre-departure training could help students prepare topics of small talk with domestic student, host family, and other local people. For example, students list the topics that they want to talk about with the local (e.g., pop culture, academic major), do research if necessary, and practice conversation on each topic. From my personal experience, students would appreciate it if they are informed of the importance of learning culture, history, social systems, statistics and other features of a home country. The more conversation topics they prepare, the more ready they are to talk with local people, and as a result the more they can learn a different culture and improve communication skills.

Second, this study has found that Japanese international students experience identity discrepancy. One possible approach would be to inform them in advance that they might experience such internal struggle in a foreign country. However, in my opinion, sharing such information prior to intercultural experiences could cause unnecessary anxiety in students, frame and distort their perspectives, and as a result they might experience identity discrepancy. Only because they are informed that it is possible for them to experience such an internal struggle, they convince themselves that they experience identity discrepancy. If they are not informed, they would not experience it.

Therefore, it would be problematic to suggest to students that they prepare for the experience of identity discrepancy.

Instead, the knowledge that Japanese international students are likely to experience identity discrepancy will be useful when students actually experience identity discrepancy and ask for help. This study can be used as a framework that international students as well as psychological counselors could use to analyze a problem and rationally handle internal struggle and frustration. For example, when a student feels frustrated because she believes domestic students and/or faculty members see her as less intelligent or socially attractive, it is possible to advise her to care less about how she is seen by Americans, to instead take into consideration that she may be misinterpreting the feedback from Americans because her ability to interpret Americans' behaviors (e.g., English language skills, knowledge about their communication norms) is still limited.

Third, findings about Japan-connected Americans can be used for promoting study abroad programs. This study finds that Japanese international students find Japan-connected Americans and American students with intercultural interest and/or experiences have acquired higher level of patience and tolerance toward non-native speakers' English. As promoting study abroad programs and recruiting students, practitioners could use this finding as evidence that, through the experiences of studying abroad, students can develop intercultural sensitivity which is valued in jobs with multicultural focus (e.g., international organizations and business, social work with immigrants). Based on present findings, practitioners can encourage students to participate in a study abroad program suggesting that it would be an opportunity to learn

not only a foreign language and culture but also the advantageous skills valued when working for an international organization.

Fourth, this research can also contribute to the improvement of support systems for international students on campus. Following are four suggestions that I would make for support systems based on this study. First, this study finds that Japanese international students experience identity apnea in intercultural contexts: They cannot present (breathe out) their identity elements of being intelligent and socially attractive or internalize (breathe in) others' perspectives of them because how they believe others see them is discrepant from how they see themselves. What they need is the opportunity to breathe out or present their identity elements in social interactions with local people. For this purpose, faculty members can provide international students with chances to share their academic achievement and interest with them in private (e.g., during office hours). Given existing studies which find that international students feel more comfortable to communicate with other international students (e.g., Bochner, 1982; Kashima & Loh, 2006; Schmitt, Speaks, & Branscombe, 2003; Zhai, 2002) a research colloquium with other international students as audience may help international students communicate more of their identity elements of being intelligent, compared to classroom presentation with domestic students as an audience. As such, the members of a university community should arrange more events and situations where international students can breathe out their personal identities.

My second suggestion regarding support systems for international students is aimed for university faculty members who have contact with international students as an instructor or thesis/dissertation adviser. They can learn from the present findings that, in

addition to the anticipated issues regarding language acquisition, some international students may be struggling with identity discrepancy and identity apnea while they keep quiet in class. It is a psychological challenge for international students to speak up during a discussion due to fear for identity discrepancy. I am not arguing that international students should be exempted from responsibility to participate in classroom discussion. It is their responsibility as graduate students and they need to make an effort to participate. A point of my argument is the awareness of faculty members. It is important for faculty members to be aware that international students are likely to be experiencing identity discrepancy and identity apnea when they do not participate in discussions. The struggle with identity discrepancy is difficult to be publicly known. American professors, classmates, and casual friends would not know that international students are struggling with such pain inside unless international students explicitly tell them. Hopefully, this study serves as an opportunity for them to understand that, underneath their quiet behaviors, international students are struggling with identity discrepancy and identity apnea. In class, they may appear to be incompetent, compared to talkative American students. However, they are not stupid.

My interview experience provides the third practical implication for the improvement of support system for international students. Some interviewees commented that their participation in the interview was a great opportunity for them to talk about their internal struggles. Especially when they discovered that I had similar experiences, they felt comfortable to talk more about their frustration and inner conflict. Feedback from the interviewees and my observation imply that some international students are in

need of opportunities to share their inner struggles with other international students who have the same or similar experiences.

Because the struggle with identity discrepancy is private and difficult to be expressed or seen publicly, it is important for them to have good friends and/or emotional support on which they can count, to which they can open themselves up, and with which they can share pain. However, depending on regions, schools, majors, and department, international students have fewer chances to meet and make friends with other international students. A university community such as an international student office could organize programs or arrange environment so as to facilitate social networking among international students. This would be an exceptional idea in the context of a mentoring relationship, whereby older international students can help newer international students to identify instances of identity discrepancy and/or identity apnea, as well as to help the newer student to create a strategy to navigate through experienced difficulties.

Finally, the Japanese international students in this study mentioned several issues about their intercultural communication with American students. The present findings can serve as a lesson for American students. It is possible that Americans' behaviors are considered as rude or impolite by Japanese international students regardless of their motives behind their behaviors toward international students. To illustrate, an American student would consider a certain behavior of another American student as neutral and harmless; however, the same behaviors may be interpreted as rude or inconsiderate by a Japanese international student. Japanese international students are vulnerable and sensitive toward the behaviors of American students so that they are more likely to be emotionally affected and experience psychological discomfort. It is important for them to

be tolerant and patient with the imperfect speaking styles of international students. As we have seen in some of the interviews, it would help international students communicate to a great extent if American students speak slowly and patiently listen to them. Moreover, American students need to know that what they see in the performances of international students is only a part of who they are or it can be the opposite image of who they really are. Each international student has more qualities and attractiveness than what their performance shows. Hence, American students need to keep in mind, "Don't judge a book by its cover" while talking with international students.

In sum, application of the findings from this study can contribute to the improvement of training programs for outbound and inbound students. Specifically, this study suggests that training programs should include: (1) learning communicative competence to present their identity in intercultural situations; and (2) preparation of conversation topics. The findings about identity discrepancy can be used as a framework to analyze and cope with international struggles of international students. The findings about Japan-connected Americans can be used for promoting study abroad programs as a proof that students can develop intercultural sensitivity which is appreciated in international and multicultural organizations. This research can also contribute to the improvement of support system on campus. The findings indicate that it is important for university faculty members, administrators, counselors, volunteers, and domestic students to: (1) be aware that international students are likely to experience identity discrepancy and identity apnea; (2) set up the events and situations where international students can breathe out and in their identity; (3) facilitate social networking among international

students; and (4) be careful about the possibility that their behaviors may be interpreted as unfriendly or problematic regardless of their motives.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. The small number of the participants is the first limitation. A total of eighteen Japanese students participated in this study. The eighteen interviews were enough for me to discover the common patterns about communication with Americans and identity discrepancy experiences. However, if I interviewed more Japanese students, I could find more variations within each pattern and add more depth to the description of each finding.

For this study, I interviewed only Japanese students. It is because presumably the experiences involving identity can be too complicated to be described and explained in limited English proficiency. Interviewing in English would have risked the chance to obtain the detailed description of their experiences. It was necessary to conduct the interviews in the native language of the interviewees. I am the only interviewer for this study and I speak only Japanese and English. Therefore, the participants for this study are limited to Japanese international students. Although we will probably be able to see the commonalities between Japanese international students and other international students from different countries, it is important to be aware that some of the findings may be distinctive to Japanese people.

Another limitation can be found in the data collection method. The data for the study were collected through individual interviews. Combination of interview and participating observation would help me yield thicker description of the phenomenon. In

particular, by combining these two methods, this study could have provided more information about their communication with Americans.

There are several limitations in the data analysis. This study does not explore the differences in the identity discrepancy depending on the audience. In the intercultural experiences of the Japanese international students, the primary audience includes American professors, classmates, and friends. First, I could see that they are apt to experience the identity discrepancy with regard to their intelligence during the interactions with professors and/or classmates and the identity discrepancy about their social attractiveness during the interactions with their friends. However, as we have seen in the finding, they do experience intelligence identity discrepancy in casual conversation with friends (e.g., Makoto) and experience social attractiveness identity discrepancy in conversation with classmates (e.g., Sakura). I did not further explore this issue for this study.

Second, identity discrepancy is closely associated with self-disclosure. In other words, we all know that others cannot know who we are unless we talk with them about ourselves. I certainly presume that there must be differences in identity discrepancy experiences between academic peers and friends because the differing amounts of their self-disclosure between academic peers and friends. As we have found in this study, it is not easy for international students to have conversations and make friends with American classmates. Japanese students have fewer chances and less time to talk about themselves and negotiate their identities with their American classmates. On the other hand, they have more chances and time to talk about themselves and negotiate their identities with their American friends, especially with patient Japan-connected American friends. Thus,

the differences are reasonably predictable; however, the present study does not explore this issue.

Another limitation in data analysis comes from the conflict between the research purpose and the nature of the research topic. This study aims to describe the intercultural experiences from the perspectives of Japanese international students. It was necessary for me as a researcher to bracket my interpretation and assumption from the analysis. The purpose for this study is to present how the interviewees experience what they experience. This purpose was conflicting with the research focus, identity. Because identities are socially constructed and it emerges in an interaction in a certain context, the interviewees' identity experiences are frequently contextual. As a researcher, I could see more latent reasons and background conditions for their experiences of identity discrepancy. For example, even when the interviewees claim that the reason for their identity discrepancy is lack of English vocabulary, I could presume their personality also influences their identity discrepancy. However, the interviewee herself did not mention her personality as the reason; therefore, I exclude my presumption from the data analysis. Another example is the influence of their status as exchange students. Exchange students live in the U.S. for about ten months. Many are less committed to academic work because they are not aiming to earn a degree. For them, their short-term intercultural experiences are closer to adventure than life transition. Roughly speaking, they are here for fun. No matter how they are frustrated with their identity discrepancy, it does not last longer than ten months. I could see that it somehow affects their communication with Americans and their attitude about academic works, which is related to their identity discrepancy in

terms of intelligence and social attractiveness. However, because they did not mention it as their reasons for identity discrepancy, I exclude from the findings.

Future Directions

Investigating multicultural groups of international students will help me develop deeper and wider understanding of the present findings about interpersonal communication (i.e., problematic behaviors of local people toward international students, joking together and etc) as well as identity experiences (i.e., identity discrepancy and self-alienation) in intercultural context. By examining both uniqueness and universality across multiple cultural groups, it would be possible to develop richer knowledge about the phenomena. Since it is necessary to conduct interviews in the native language of the interviewees, especially those who have the limited proficiency in the local language, the interviews could be conducted with a team of interviewers who are native speakers of international students' native languages (e.g., Chinese, Korean and Hindu).

In the present study, I find that Japanese students perceive cultural differences of joking style, especially the distinctiveness of Japanese joking dialogues between *Boke* and *Tsukkomi*. First, this finding inspires me to conduct a conversation analysis and ethnographic study to examine how this joking style works and its interpersonal function among Japanese people. Second, this finding finds that it is common for sojourners and immigrants to experience difficulty in sharing jokes with people from different cultural groups. Laughing together is a sign of affiliation (Glenn, 2003). Joking and laughing together is great pleasure and comfort in our interpersonal communication. It can shorten the distance between people. Because of cultural differences in joking style and a sense of humor and language barriers between them, people in intercultural communications

are likely to miss such great pleasures of joking and laughing together. Nevertheless, little attention has been paid to joking and laughing together in the context of intercultural communication. I would like to further investigate the joking and laughing together during conversations between people from the different cultural backgrounds.

This study focuses on the *subjective perception* of Japanese international students. The investigation and discussion are concentrated on how they perceive their performance and how they believe the Americans around them think of them. For future research, it would be interesting to conduct participating observation to find out how they are performing and how Americans are reacting to them in conversations. Also, it would be interesting to interview their American friends or classmates to find out how they really see Japanese students in a conversation. It allows me to compare the Americans' perception of Japanese students with Japanese students' imagination of Americans' perception of them.

Another suggestion for future research is to interview a group of sojourners and foreign-born immigrants who are more committed to the larger society than international students such as those with working visas or permanent residents. I am certain that they experience intercultural communication, identities, identity discrepancy and alienation in a vastly different way than international students. As I discussed earlier, compared to international students, foreign-born immigrants have a stronger commitment to the larger society. The integrative investigation of both temporary sojourners and permanent residents will provide better understanding the continuum of identity experiences in intercultural contexts ranging from identity discrepancy to self-alienation.

Finally, I suggest that researchers and practitioners should respectfully consider international students as individuals with unique qualities and history. The studies and related theories about the intercultural experiences of sojourners are implicitly grounded in the assumption that international students are individual who do not possess the competence and resources necessary to communicate like members of a dominant cultural group (e.g., Kim, 2001) and thus they are likely to experiences more problems (e.g., communicative competence, social networks, status and so on) (e.g., Kuo & Roysircar, 2006; Ying, 2005; Ryan & Twibell, 2000).

When international students move to host countries, many have limited language skills, knowledge about social systems, practical skills and so forth. There may be a little bit of awkwardness in their behaviors because of their limited communicative competence and unfamiliarity with the social environment. However, they are not empty. As the interviewees mention, they have developed maturity, intelligence, social attractiveness and uniqueness in their home countries. I suggest that researchers should stop stigmatizing international students as the individuals who are lacking in the competence and resource that local people naturally possess. Researchers should take into consideration the fact that international students, sojourners and immigrants are individuals who have unique history and qualities when they enter a new society.

Conclusion

This study focuses on what is happening inside international students' minds while they are engaged in intercultural communication. This study releases the inner voices and thoughts that are confined inside many international students during intercultural communication. While they are quiet in class or conversations with

American friends, they feel suffocated inside because of *identity apnea*. They cannot present their intelligence and social attractiveness or make their classmates and friends recognize and understand how intelligent and funny they are.

Their pain from identity apnea would share a lot in common with the embarrassment that people would feel when they are forced to wear idiotic costumes and masks that they dislike for months or even years. Until they find the way to present who they are, many international students feel as if the person whom they identify as who they are is trapped inside their incompetent performances. They struggle to develop *intercultural identity flexibility* to become themselves in a new environment.

People may comment, "They should just stop caring too much about how people see them." I must agree with them because it would resolve a part of their internal struggles. The less they care about how people see them, the less frustrated they would be about a discrepancy between who they are and how they think others see them. However, the core problem lies in their personal disapproval, not only the absence of social approval from others. They disapprove of the persona that their performance creates and presents. They are irritated with the possibility that their undesired persona is to be recognized as who they are. Therefore, if they stop caring about how people see them, it could resolve internal struggles of identity discrepancy only partially. They need to find the way to overcome self-disapproval.

From this study, I have learned that Japanese international students in the U.S. struggle with intercultural experiences and cultural adjustment to maintain their originality no matter how difficult it is to do with their limited communicative competence. They do not struggle to become like Americans. They do not struggle to

imitate Americans. They struggle to maintain their originality and individuality which have constructed and defined who they are for twenty or more years of their lives. They are frustrated when they perceive that their performance presents the reduced versions of themselves and the Americans around them see them as a person who they are not. They struggle to present the full version of their originality and individuality and make people recognize who they really are in intercultural situations.

Of course there are certain things that they need to accommodate to achieve their goal to become themselves in intercultural contexts. For example, Westerners from individualistic cultures (e.g., European Americans) reply on specific and verbalized information to communicate (i.e., low-context communication codes). They are not trained to infer the others' unspoken thoughts or feelings. Once international students enter the country where people expect them to put their thought and feelings into direct words, it is important for them to accommodate their behaviors for mutual understanding. Such communication accommodation is a means to the end—the full realization and verification of their individuality.

From this study, I learned that the experience of studying abroad is the challenge to become who they are in a foreign country. It might be easier to give up and convince themselves that a reduced version is a full version of themselves in the U.S. However, if they mutate themselves to fit in to a reduced version of themselves, their good qualities will be in danger of extinction. They struggle because they do not want it happen. Identity is the aggregation of the quality which individuates us in social world and differentiates us from the others. Identities are differences and originality of individuals. Without the differences, nobody has identity. Without identity, then who are we?

Living overseas is an opportunity to appreciate everything that we have long taken for granted and overlooked its value including ability to communicate, support and love from family and friends, and *ourselves*. To send a message to those who study abroad now or in the future, I would like to conclude this dissertation with a quote from Confucius—"*And remember, no matter where you go, there you are*."

REFERENCES

Abe, J., Talbot, D. M., & Geelhoed, R. J. (1998). Effects of peer program on international student adjustment. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*, 589-547.

Abe, H., & Wiseman, R. L. (1983). A cross-cultural confirmation of the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7*, 53-67.

Abdulrehman, R. Y., & De Luca, R. V. (2001). The implications of childhood sexual abuse on adult social behavior. *Journal of Family Violence, 16*, 193-203.

Adams, J.S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequality. *Journal of Abnormal and Normal Social Psychology, 67,* 422-436.

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequality in Social Exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Adler, P.S. (1975). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15*, 13-23.

Ady, J.C. (1995). Toward a differential demand model of sojourner adjustment. In. R.L.Wiseman (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 92-114) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Allen, F. C. L., & Cole, J. B. (1987). Foreign student syndrome: fact or fable. *Journal of American College Health, 35*, 182–186.

Altman, I., & Taylor, D.A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Amason, P., Watkins, M., & Holmes, S. (1999). Social support and acculturative stress in the multicultural workplace. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 27*, 310-334.

Anaya, G., & Cole, D. (2001), Latina/o student achievement: exploring the influence of student-faculty interaction on college grades. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 3-14.

Andersen, Peter. (2007). *Nonverbal communication: Forms and functions* (2nd ed.) Waveland Press.

Anderson, T., & Kanuka, H. (1997). On-line forums: New platforms for professional development and group collaboration. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 3*.

Antler, L. (1970). Correlates of home and host country acquaintanceship among foreign medical residents in the United States. *Journal of Social Psychology, 80,* 49–57.

Arthur, N. (1997). Counseling issues with international students. *Canadian Journal of Counseling, 31*(4), 259–273.

Arthur, N. (2004). *Counseling international students: Clients from around the world*. New York, NY: Kluwer/Plenum Academic Press.

Atkinson, P. & Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's Immortality: The interview society and the invention of self. *Qualitative Inquiry, 3,* 304-325.

Aubrey, R. (1991). International students on campus: A challenge for counselors, medical providers, and clinicians. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 62*(1), 20–33.

Aveni, V.P. (2005). Study abroad and second language use: Constructing the self. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and Anxiety in Adult Second Language Learning: Looking at and through the Diary Studies. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition.* (pp. 67-103). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Baker, A. J. L. (2005). The Long-Term Effects of Parental Alienation on Adult Children: A Qualitative Research Study. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 33*, 289-302.

Baker, A. J. L. (2006). Patterns of parental alienation syndrome: A qualitative study of adults who were alienated from a parent as a child. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 34*, 63-78.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). The dialogic imagination. In. M. Holquist (Ed.), *Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin,* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1981). Self-referent thought: A developmental analysis of self-efficacy. In J. H. Flavell & J. D. Ross (Eds.), *Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37,* 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self-efficacy. *Developmental Psychology, 25,* 729-735.

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for construction self-efficacy scales. In. F. Pajares, & T. Urdan, (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp.307-337), Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Bargh, J.A. (1989). Conditional sutomaticity: Varieties of automatic influence in social perception and cognition. In. J.S. Uleman & J.A. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp.3-51). New York: Guilford Press.

Bargh, J.A. (1996). Automaticity in social psychology. In E.T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 169-183). New York: Guilford Press.

Barker, M., Child, C., Gallois, C., Jones, E., & Callan, V. J. (1991). Difficulties of overseas students in social and academic situations. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 43*(2), 79–84.

Barnland, D. C. (1978). Communication styles in two cultures: Japan and the United States." In A. Kendon, R. M. Harris, and M. R. Key (Eds.), *Organization of Behavior in Face to Face Interaction*. (pp. 427-456). The Hague: Mouton.

Barnlund, D. (1989). *Communicative styles of Japanese and Americans.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Barratt, M. F., & Huba, M. E. (1994), Factors related to international undergraduate student adjustment in an American community. *College Student Journal, 28*, 422-435.

Basso, K.H. (1979). *Portrait of "the Whiteman:" Linguistic play and cultural symbols among the Western Apache*. Cambridge University Press.

Bateson, G. (1972). A theory of play and fantasy. In *Steps to an ecology of mind*. (pp.177-193). New York: Ballantine.

Baumeister, R.F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin, 91*, 3-26.

Bell, N. (2007). How native and non-native English speakers adapt to humor in intercultural interaction. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 20*(1), 27-48.

Bem, D. J. (1972). *Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Benjamin, R., Tran, T. V., & Benjamin, M. E. (1983). Alienation Among Vietnamese Students in the United States. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology 11*, 33-34.

Berger C.R., & Calabrese, R.J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interactions and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*, 99-112.

Berger, C.R., Gardner, R.R., Clatterbuck, G.W., & Schulman, L..S. (1976). Perceptions of information sequencing in relationship development. *Human Communication Research, 3,* 34-39.

Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treaties in the sociological knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Bern, D. J., & Allen, A. (1974). On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. *Psychological Review, 81*, 506-520.

Berry, J. W. (1974). Psychological aspects of cultural pluralism: Unity and identity reconsidered. *Topics in Culture Learning, 2,* 17–22.

Berry, J.W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation: Understanding individuals moving between cultures. In. R.W. Brislin (Ed.), *Applied cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 232-253). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berry, J.W. (1994). Acculturation and psychological adaptation. In A. Bouvy, F.van de Vijver, P. Boski, & P. Schmitz (Eds.), *Journeys into cross-cultural psychology*, Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 17–37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Berry, J.W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29,* 697-712.

Berry, J. W. (2006a). Contexts of acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology.* (pp. 27-42). New York, NY US: Cambridge University Press.

Berry, J. W. (2006b). Mutual intercultural relations among immigrants and ethnocultural groups in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30,* 719–734.

Berry, J. W. (2008). Globalisation and acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32,* 328–336.

Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa: Supply and Services.

Berry, J.W., & Kim, U., & Boski, P. (1987). Psychological acculturation of immigrants. In Y.Y. Kim & W.B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Cross-cultural adaptation: Current approaches.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 38,* 185–206.

Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. L. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. W.Berry, M. S.Segall & C.Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 3. Social behavior and applications* (2 ed., pp. 291-326). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bhattacharya, G. (1998). Drug use among Asian–Indian adolescents: identifying protective/risk factors. *Adolescence, 33*(129), 169–185.

Biasco, F., Goodwin, E. A., & Vitale, K. L. (2001). College students' attitudes toward racial discrimination. *College Student Journal, 35*, 523–528.

Birman, D., & Tran, N. (2008). Psychological distress and adjustment of Vietnamese refugees in the United States: Association with pre- and postmigration factors. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 78*, 109-120.

Black, J.S. & Mendenhall, M. (1990). The U-curve adjustment hypotheses revisited: A review and theoretical framework. *Journal of International Business Studies, 22,* 113-136.

Blanchard-Fields, F., & Norris, L. (1995). The development of wisdom. In M. A. Kimble, S. H. McFadden, J. W. Ellor, & J. J. Seeber (Eds.), *Aging, spirituality, and religion. A handbook* (pp. 102–118). Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction* (pp. 5–44). Oxford: Pergamon.

Bochner, S., McLeod, B., & Lin, A. (1977). Friendship patterns of overseas students. A functional model.*International Journal of Psychology, 12*, 277–297.

Bodrker, A. (1992). Emotional correlates of language attitudes: The effect of mood on speaker evaluation. Unpublished Master's, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Bond, M. H., & Cheung, M. (1984). Experimenter language choice and ethnic affirmation by Chinese trilinguals in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8*(4), 347–356.

Borgatta, E. F. (Ed.). (1992). Encyclopedia of sociology (Volume 1-2). New York: Macmillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Cambrighe, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourhis, R., Moise, C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 32,* 369–386.

Boyer, S., & Sedlacek, W. (1988), Noncognitive predictors of academic success for international students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*, 218-223.

Brebner, L.-H. (2008, December). *Intercultural interasctions in a New Zealand university: Pakeha and Asian perspectives* Paper presented at the ISANA International Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.

Briggs, C., L. (1986). *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Brilliant, J. J. (2000). Issues in counseling immigrant college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24*, 577–586.

Brislin, R., W (1982). *Cross-cultural encounters: Face-to-face interaction.* . New Yor, NY: Pergamon Press.

Brislin, R. & Yoshida, T. (1994). *Intercultural communication training: An introduction*. CA: Sage Publications.

Brinson, J.A., & Kottler, J. (1995). International students in counseling: Some alternative models. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 9,* 57-70.

Bulhan, H. A. (1978). Reactive identification, alienation, and locus of control among Somali students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 104*, 69-80.

Bulthuis, (1986). The foreign student today: A profile. *New Directions for Student Services, 36*, 19-27.

Burgess, R.L., & Huston, T.L. (Eds.). (1979). *Social exchange in developing relationships*. New York, Academic Press.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G.. (1996). *Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue* (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.

Burke, P. J., & Stets, J. E. (1999). Trust and commitment through self-verification. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 62*, 347-366.

Cadieux, R. A. J., & Wehrly, B. (1986). Advising and counseling the international student. *New Directions for Student Services, 36,* 51–63.

Campbell, M. K., Meier, A., Carr, C., Enga, Z., James, A. S., Reedy, J., et al. (2001). Health behavior changes after colon cancer: A comparison of findings from face-to-face and on-line focus groups. *Family & Community Health, 24*, 88-103.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to language pedagogy. In J. Richards and J. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*. London: Longman.(pp. 2–27).

Canale, M. (1984). A communicative approach to language proficiency assessment in a minority setting. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Communicative competence approaches to language proficiency assessment: research and application.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. (pp. 107–122).

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980a) Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1* (1), 1–47.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980b). *A domain description for core FSL: communication skills.* Ontario: Ministry of Education.

Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cargile, A.C. (1997) Attitudes toward Chinese-accented speech: an investigation in two contexts. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology 16,* 434–44.

Cargile, A.C. & Giles, H. (1998) Language attitudes toward varieties of English: an American-Japanese context. *Journal of Applied Communication Research 26,*

338–56.

Cargile, A.C., Giles, H., Ryan, E.B., & Bradac, J.J. (1994). Language attitudes as a social process: A conceptual model and new directions. *Language and Communication, 14,* 211-236.

Carroll, L., & Anderson, R. (2002). Body piercing, tattooing, self-esteem, and body investment in adolescent girls. *Adolescence, 37*, 627-637.

Cemalcilar, Z., Falbo, T., & Stapleton, L. (2005). Cyber communication: A new opportunity for international students' adaptation? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*(1), 91-110.

Charles, H.,&Stewart,M. (1991). Academic advising of international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 19*, 173-180.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.

Cheek, J. M., & Hogan, R. (1983). Self-concepts, self-presentations, and moral judgments. . In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 249-273). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chen, C.P. (1999). Common stressors among international college students: Research and counseling implications. *Journal of College Counseling, 2*, 49-67.

Chen, S., Benet-Martínez, V., & Bond, M. (2008). Bicultural identity, bilingualism, and psychological adjustment in multicultural societies: Immigration-based and globalization-based acculturation. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 803-838.

Chen, S.F. (1996). Learning multiculturalism form the experience of international students: The experience of international students in a teacher training program. ERIC documents 398177.

Chen, Y.W. (2006). Intercultural Friendship from Perspectives of East Asian Students. *China Media Research, 2*(3), 43-58.

Chi, I., Lubben, J. E., & Kitano, H. H. L. (1989). Differences in drinking behavior among three Asian–American groups. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 50*(1), 15–23.

Church, A.T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment, *Psychological Bulletin, 91*, 540-572.

Clark, J. P. (1959). Measuring alienation within a social system. *American Sociological Review, 24*, 849-852.

Clayton, V. (1982). Wisdom and intelligence: The nature and function of knowledge in the later years. *International Journal of Aging and Development, 15*, 315–323.

Clément, R., Baker, S.C., & MacIntyre, P.D.(2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 22,* 190-209.

Collier, M. J. (1998). Research on cultural identity: Reconciling post-colonial and interpretive approaches. In D. Tanno (Ed.), *Cultural identity and intercultural communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage. (pp.122-147).

Collier, M.J., & Thomas, M. (1988). Cultural identity: An interpretive perspective. In. Y.Y. Kim, & W.B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage. (pp. 99-122).

Constantine, M., Anderson G., Berkel, L., Caldwell, L., & Utsey, S. (2005). Examining the cultural adjustment experiences of African international college students: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 57-66.

Constantine, M. G., Kindaichi, M., Okazaki, S., Gainor, K. A., & Baden, A. L. (2005). A qualitative investigation of the cultural adjustment experiences of Asian international college women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11*, 162–175.

Cooley, C.H. (1902). Human nature and social order. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Cooper, Terry D. (2003). *Sin, Pride & Self-Acceptance: The Problem of Identity in Theology & Psychology.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Costas, J., & Fleming, P. (2009). Beyond dis-identification: A discursive approach to self-alienation in contemporary organizations. *Human Relations, 62*, 353-378.

Cote, James E.; Levine, Charles (2002). *Identity Formation, Agency, and Culture*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cownie, F., & Addison,W. (1996). International students and language support: A new survey. *Studies in Higher Education, 21*(2), 221–231.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Currie, G. (2007). 'Beyond our imagination': The voice of international students on the MBA. *Management Learning, 38*(5), 539-556

Cushner, K., & Brislin, R. (1996). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Dadfar, S., & Friedlander, M.L. (1982). Differential attitudes of international students toward seeking professional psychological help. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29*, 335-338.

D'Augelli, A. R., & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). African American undergraduates on a predominantly white campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *Journal of Negro Education, 62*, 67–81.

Davis, M. (1973). *Intimate relations*. New York: Free Press.

Day, R., & Hajj, F. (1986), Delivering counseling services to international students: the experience of the American University of Beirut. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 27*, 353-357.

Dean, D. G. (1961). Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. *American Sociological Review, 26*, 753-758.

De La Ronde, C., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1998). Partner verification: Restoring shattered images of our intimates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 374-382.

Del Pilar, J. A., & Udasco, J. O. (2004). Deculturation: Its Lack of Validity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10*, 169-176.

Dittmann-Kohli, F., & Baltes, P. B. (1990). Toward a neofunctionalist conception of adult intellectual development: Wisdom as a prototypical case of intellectual growth. In C. N. Alexander & E. J. Langer (Eds.), *Higher stages of human*

development. Perspectives on adult growth. (pp. 54–78). New York: Oxford University Press.

Douglas, J. D. (1976). *Investigative Social Research: Individual and Team Field Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Douglas, J.D. (1985). *Creative interviewing.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Draguns, J. G. (1996). Humanly universal and culturally distinctive: Charting the course of cultural counseling. In P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures* (4th ed, pp. 1–20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dubin, R. (1978). *Theory building*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1903/2009). Of our spiritual strivings. In W.E.B. Du Bois. (Ed.), *The souls of black folk*. (pp.7-18). New York: Oxford University Press.

Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide: A study in sociology*. Glenoe, IL: The Free Press.

Ebbin, A. J., & Blankenship, E. S. (1986). A longitudinal health care study: International versus domestic students. *Journal of American College Health, 34*, 177–182.

Ebbin, A. J., & Blankenship, E. S. (1988). Stress-related diagnosis and barriers to health care among foreign students: Results of a survey. *Journal of American College Health, 36*, 311-312.

Edmondson, M.S. (1987). Notes on laughter. *Anthropological Linguistic, 29*, 23-34.

Eiseman, C. H. (Ed.). (1973). *The McGraw-Hill encyclopedia of world biography* (Vols. 1-12). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eshel, Y., & Rosenthal-Sokolov, M. (2000). Acculturation attitudes and sociocultural adjustment of sojourner youth in Israel. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 140*,

677-691.

Essandoh, P. K. (1995). Counseling issues with African college students. *The Counseling Psychologist, 23*, 348–360.

Eyou, M., Adair, V., & Dixon, R. (2000). Cultural identity and psychological adjustment of adolescent Chinese immigrants in New Zealand. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*(5), 531-543.

Fischer, C. S. (1976). Alienation: Try to bridge the chasm *British Journal of Sociology, 27*, 35-49.

Fisher, S., & Hood, B. (1987). The stress of the transition to university: A longitudinal study of psychological disturbance, absent-mindedness and vulnerability to homesickness. *British Journal of Psychology, 78*, 425–441.

Fontana, A. (2002). Postmodern trends in interviewing. In. J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research: Context and method* (pp.161-175). Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage.

Fontana, A, & Frey, J.H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In. N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. (3rd ed, pp.695-727). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Furnham, A & Alibhai, N. (1985). The friendship networks of foreign students: Application and extension of the functional model. *International Journal of Psychology, 20*, 709-722.

Furnham, A., & Bochner, S. (1986). *Culture shock: Psychological reactions to unfamiliar environments*. London: Methuen.

Furukawa, T., Sarason, I.G., & Sarason, B.R. (1998). Social support and adjustment to a novel social environment. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 44*, 56–70.

Fromm, E. (1955). *The sane society*. New York: Rinehart.

Gallois, C., Giles, H., Jones, E., Cargile, A. C., & Ota, H. (1995). Accommodating intercultural encounters: Elaborations and extensions. In R. L. Wiseman (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory.* (pp. 115-147). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications

Gallois, C., Ogay, T., & Giles, H. (2005). Communication Accommodation Theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication.* (pp. 121-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture". In. C. Geertz, *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. (pp.3-30). New York: Basic Books.

Gilbert, J. (1983). Deliberate metallic paint inhalation and cultural marginality: Paint sniffing among central California youth. . *Addictive Behaviors, 8*, 79-82.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y. & Taylor, D. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations.* (pp. 307-348). London: Academic Press.

Giles, H., Williams, A., Mackie, D.M., & Rosselli, F. (1995). Reactions to Anglo- and Hispanic-American-accented speaker: Affect, identity, persuasion, and the English-only controversy. *Language and Communication, 15,* 107-120.

Gill, M. (1994). Accent and stereotypes: Their effect on perceptions of teachers and lecture comprehension. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22,* 348-361.

Glenn, P. (2003). *Laughter in interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *Presentation of the self in everyday life.* New York: Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Golding, J. M., & Burnam, M. A. (1990). Immigration, stress, and depressive symptoms in a Mexican-American community. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 178*, 161–171.

Goldsmith, D. (2001). A normative approach to the study of uncertainty and communication. *Journal of Communication, 51*(3), 514-533

Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gould, S.J. (1980). *The Panda's Thumb.* New York: W. W. Norton,

Green, J., Dixon, C., & Zaharlick, A. (2002). Ethnography as a logic of inquiry. In. J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook for Methods of Research on English Language Arts Teaching,* New York: Macmillan.

Guclu, N. (1993). A study to identify and analyze international graduate students' adjustment problems at the University of Pittsburgh. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Gudykunst, W. D. (1995). Anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory: Current status. In R. L. Wiseman (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory.* (pp. 8-58). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M. R. (1984). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: Culture specific or culture general? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8*, 1-10.

Gudykunst, W.B., & Hammer, M.R. (1988). Strangers and hosts – an uncertainty reduction based theory of intercultural adaptation. In. Y.Y. Kim & W.B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Adaptation—Current Approaches*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gullahorn, J.,&Gullahorn, J. (1963). An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. *Social Issues, 19*, 33–47.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Oxford England: Anchor.

Hammer, M. R. (1987). Behavioral dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: A replication and extension. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 11,* 65-88.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (2nd ed.), New York: Routledge.

Haplern, D. (1993). Minorities and mental health. *Social Science and Medicine, 36*, 597-607.

Harder, P. (1980). Discourse as self-expression—on the reduced personality of the second-language learner. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(3), 262-270.

Harman, C., Klopf, D., & Ishii, S. (1990). Verbal aggression among Japanese and American students. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 70*, 1130-1130.

Hayes, R.L. & Lin, H.R. (1994). Coming to America: Developing social support systems for international students, *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 22*, 7-16.

Hawkins, M. (1997). *Social Darwinism in European and American thought, 1860-1945: Nature as model and nature as threat.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hecht, M. L. (1978). Toward conceptualization of interpersonal communication satisfaction. *Quarterly journal of Speech,, 64*, 46-72.

Hecht, M. L. (1993). A research odyssey: Towards the development of a Communication Theory of Identity. *Communication Monographs, 60*, 76-82.

Hecht, M. L., Collier, M. J., & Ribeau, S. A. (1993). *African American communication: Ethnic identity and cultural interpretation.* . Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hecht, M. L., Jackson, R. L., & Ribeau, S. A. (2003). *African American communication: Exploring identity and culture.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hecht, M. L., Warren, J. R., Jung, E., & Krieger, J. L. (2005). A Communication Theory of Identity: Development, Theoretical Perspective, and Future Directions. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication.* (pp. 257-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heller, M. (2007). *Bilingualism: A social approach*. New York : Palgrave Macmillan.

Herskovits, M. J. (1955). *Cultural anthropology*. New York, NY, US: Knopf.

Hechanova-Alampay, R., Beehr, T., Christiansen, N., & Van Horn, R. (2002). Adjustment and strain among domestic and international student sojourners: A longitudinal study. *School Psychology International, 23*(4), 458-474.

Hertz, R (1997). *Reflexivity and voice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hertzler, J.O. (1970). *Laughter: A socio-scientific analysis.* New York: Exposition Press.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94*, 319-340.

Hixon, J. G., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1993). When does introspection bear fruit? Self-reflection, self-insight, and interpersonal choices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 35-43.

Hjelm, K., Nyberg, P., Isacsson, A., & Apelqvist, J. (1999). Beliefs about health and illness essential for self-care practice: A comparison of migrant Yugoslavian and Swedish diabetic females. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 30*, 1147-1159.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1989). Continuity and variation in Chinese patterns of socialization. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 149–163.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1995). Internalized culture, culturocentrism, and transcendence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 23*(1), 4–24.

Hodson, G., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Processes in racial discrimination: Differential weighting of conflicting information. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 460–471.

Hofstadter, R. (1955). *Social Darwinism in American Thought.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences, comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hogan, R. (1982). A socioanalytic theory of personality. In. M. Page (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium*

on motivation (Vol. 29, pp. 55-89). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Holstein, J., Gubrium, J. (1995). *The active interview.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Homan, G.C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Hoopes, D.S. (1979). Introduction. In Hoopes, D.S., & P. Ventura (Eds.). *Intercultural sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methodologies.* Chicago: Intercultural Press.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*. 70. 125-132.

Hovey, J.D. (2000). Psychosocial predictors of depression among central American immigrants. *Psychological Reports, 86*, 1237-1240.

Hovey, J. D. (2000b). Psychosocial predictors of acculturative stress in Mexican immigrants. *Journal of Psychology, 134*, 490-502.

Hsiao-Ying, T. (1995). Sojourner adjustment: The case of foreigners in Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26*, 523-536.

Hsieh, M. (2006). Identity negotiation among female Chinese international students in second-language higher education. *College Student Journal, 40*, 870-884.

Hsieh, M. (2007). Challenges for international students in higher education: One student's narrated story of invisibility and struggle. *College Student Journal, 41*, 379-391.

Hsiung, R. C. (2000). The best of both worlds: An online self-help group hosted by a mental health professional. . *Cyber Psychology & Behavior, 3*, 935-950.

Hull, W. F. (1978). *Foreign students in the United States of America: Coping behavior within the educational environment.* . New York: Praeger.

Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*, 539–569.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics.* London: Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach*. The University of Philadelphia Press.

Israel, J. (1971). *Alienation: From Marx to modern society* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Jack, D. C. (1991). *Silencing the self: Women and depression.* . Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press.

Jack, D. C. (1999). Silencing the self: Inner dialogue and outer realities. In T. Joiner & J. C. Coyne (Eds.), *Interactional nature of depression* (pp. 221-246). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Jacob, E. J.,&Greggo, J.W. (2001). Using counselor training and collaborative programming strategies in working with international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 73–88.

James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications

Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button, & J.R.E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization.* Cleveland, OH: Multilingual Matters. (pp.152-205).

Jochems,W., Snippe, J., Smid, H. J., & Verweij, A. (1996). The academic progress of foreign students: Study achievement and study behaviour. *Higher Education, 31*, 325–340.

Johnston, J. R., Walters, M. G., & Olesen, N. W. (2005). Is it alienating parenting, role reversal or child abuse? A study of children's rejection of a parent in child custody disputes. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 5*, 191-218.

Jung, E., & Hecht, M. L. (2004). Elaborating the communication theory of identity: Identity gaps and communication outcomes. *Communication Quarterly, 52* 265-283.

Jung, E., Hecht, M. L., & Wadsworth, B. C. (2007). The role of identity in international students' psychological well-being in the United States: A model of depression level, identity gaps, discrimination, and acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*, 605-624.

Kaczmarek, P. G., Matlock, G., Merta, R., Ames, M. H., & Ross, M. (1994). An assessment of international college student adjustment. *International Journal of the Advancement of Counseling, 17*, 241–247.

Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). *Qualitative inquiry: Approaches to language and literacy research.* . New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kang, T.S. (1972). A foreign student group as ethnic community. *International Review of Modern Sociology, 2*, 72–82.

Kashima, E. S., & Loh, E. (2006). International students' acculturation: Effects of international, conational, and local ties and need for closure. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 471-485.

Katriel, T., & Philipsen, G. (1981). 'What we need is communication': 'Communication' as a cultural category in some American speech. *Communication Monographs, 48*, 301-317.

Katz, J., Beach, S. R. H., & Anderson, P. (1996). Serf-enhancement versus self-verification: Does spousal support always help? *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 20*, 345-360.

Kidder, L. H. (1977). The inadvertent creation of a neocolonial culture: A study of Western sojourners in India. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1*, 48-60.

Kiley, M. (2003). Conserver, Strategist or Transformer: The experiences of postgraduate student sojourners. *Teaching in Higher Education, 8*, 345-356.

Kim, B. S. K., Atkinson, D. R., & Umemoto, D. (2001). Asian cultural values and the counseling process: Current knowledge and directions for future research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*, 570–603.

Kim, M.-S. (1995). Toward a theory of conversational constraints: Focusing on individual dimensions of culture. In R. L. Wiseman (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory.* (pp. 148-169). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage.

Kim, M.-S. (2005). Culture-Based Conversational Constraints Theory: Individual- and Culture-Level Analyses. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication.* (pp. 93-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kim, Y. Y. (1988). *Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Kim, Y. Y. (2001). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kim, Y. Y. (2005). Adapting to a New Culture: An Integrative Communication Theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication.* (pp. 375-400). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Klein, M.H., Miller, M.H., & Alexander, A.A. (1971). When young people go out in the world. In.W.P. Lebra (Ed.). *Youth, socialization, and mental health*: Volume 3. Mental health research in Asia and the Pacific (pp. 217–232). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Klein, M.H., Miller, M.H., & Alexander, A.A. (1980). The American experience of the Chinese student: On being normal in an abnormal world. In A. Kleinman & T.Y. Lin (Eds.). *Normal and abnormal behavior in Chinese culture* (pp. 311–330). Dordrecht, Holland: Kluwer.

Klineberg, O. (1980). Stressful experience of foreign students at various stages of sojourn: Counseling and policy implications. In G. V. Coelho, & P. I. Ahmed(Ed s.), *Uprooting and development*. NY: Plenum.

Klineberg, O., & Hull, W. F. (1979). *At a foreign University: An International study of adaptation and coping.* . New York: Praeger.

Klomegah, R. Y. (2006). Social factors relating to alienation experienced by international students in the United States. *College Student Journal, 40*, 303-315.

Kluckhohn, C. (1954). Culture and behavior. In G. Lindzey (Ed.) Handbook of social psychology. (Vol. 2, pp. 921-976). Cambridge, MA Addison-Wesley.

Koester, J., & Olebe, M. (1988). The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12*, 233-246.

Koester, J., Wiseman, R. L., & Sanders, J. A. (1993). Multiple Perspectives of Intercultural Communication Competence. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication Competence* (pp. 3-15). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Komiya, N., & Eells, G. (2001). Predictors of attitudes toward seeking counseling among international students. *Journal of College Counseling, 4*(2), 153-160

Kuo, B., & Roysircar, G. (2006). An exploratory study of cross-cultural adaptation of adolescent Taiwanese unaccompanied sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 159-183.

Kwan, K. L. K., Sodowsky, G. R., & Ihle, G. M. (1994).Worldviews of Chinese international students: An extension and new findings. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 190–197.

Leary, M. L. (1996). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lee, J., Koeske, G., & Sales, E. (2004). Social support buffering of acculturative stress: a study of mental health symptoms among Korean international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 28*(5), 399-414.

Leong, F. T. L. (1986). Counseling and psychotherapy with Asian-Americans: Review of the literature. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 196–206.

Leong, F. T. L., & Chou, E. L. (1996). Counseling international students. In P. B. Perdersen, J. G. Draguns,W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures* (4th ed., pp. 210–242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Leong, F. T. L., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1989). Academic and career needs of international and United States college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 106-111.

Leong, F. T. L., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1992). International graduate students, stress, and social support. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 71–78.

Leong, C. H., & Ward, C. (2000). Identity conflict in sojourners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*, 763–776.

Liberman, K. (1994). Asian student perspectives on American university instruction. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18*(2), 173–192.

Lin, G., & Yi, J. K. (1997). Asian international students' adjustment: Issues and program suggestions. *College Student Journal, 31*, 473–479.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York, NY: Sage.

Lindemann, S. (2002). Listening with an attitude: a model of native-speaker comprehension of non-native speakers in the United States. *Language in Society 31,* 419–41.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997) *English with an accent: language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States.* New York: Routledge.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1984). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (2 ed.). Belmont,CA: Wadsworth.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1995). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (3 ed.). Belmont,CA: Wadsworth.

Lomak, P. P. (1984). An investigation of foreign students awareness, utilization and satisfaction with selected student personnel services and programs at Ohio University, Athens, 1983/1984. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens.

Loo, C. M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Higher Education, 57*, 58-77.

Luna, D., Ringberg, T., & Peracchio, L. (2008). One individual, two identities: Frame switching among biculturals. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35*(2), 279-293.

Lysgaard, S. (1955). Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. *International Social Science Bulletin, 10*, 45–51.

MacIntyre, P.D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K.A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal, 82* (4), 545-562.

Mallinckrodt, B., & Leong, F. T. (1992). International graduate students, stress, and social support. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 71–78.

Manese, J. E., Sedlacek, W. E., & Leong, F. T. L. (1988). Needs and perception of female and male international undergraduate students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 16*, 24–29.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition,

emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Markus, H., & Sentis, K. (1982). The self in social information processing. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp. 41-70). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McGoldrick, M. (1982). Ethnicity and family therapy: An overview In M. McGoldrick, J. K. Pearce & J. Giordano (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (pp. 3-30). New York, NY: Guilford.

McGuire, M., & McDermott, S. (1987). Communication in assimilation, deviance, and alienation states. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Cross-cltural adaptation: Current approaches.* (pp. 90-105). London, UK: Sage Publications.

McKinlay, N. J., Pattison, H. M., & Gross, H. (1996). An exploratory investigation of the effects of a cultural orientation programme on the psychological well-being of international university students. *Higher Education, 31*, 379–395

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure* Glencoe, IL: The Free Press

Michaels, R. E., Cron, W. L., Dubinsky, A. J., & Joachimsthaler, E. A. (1988). Influence of formalization on the organizational commitment and work alienation of salespeople and industrial buyers. *Journal of Marketing Research, 25,* 376-383.

Miller, A. M., Birman, D., Zenk, S., Wang, E., Sorokin, O., & Connor, J. (2009). Neighborhood immigrant concentration, acculturation, and cultural alienation in former Soviet immigrant women. *Journal of Community Psychology, 37*, 88-105.

Miller, A. M., Sorokin, O., Wang, E., Feetham, S., Choi, M., & Wilbur, J. (2006). Acculturation, social alienation, and depressed mood in midlife women from the former soviet union. *Research in Nursing & Health, 29*, 134-146.

Miller, P.J., Wang, S.H., Sandel, T.L., & Cho, W. (2002). Self-esteem as folk theory: A comparison of European Americans and Taiwanese mothers' beliefs. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 2*, 209-239.

Mishler, E. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Misra, R., Crist, M., & Burant, C. J. (2003). Relationship among life stress, social support, academic stressors, and reactions to stressors of international students in the United States. *International Journal of Stress Management, 10*, 137-157.

Misra, R., & Castillo, L. (2004). Academic Stress Among College Students: Comparison of American and International Students. *International Journal of Stress Management, 11*(2), 132-148.

Morgan, D. L. (1993). *Successful focus groups: Advancing the state of the art*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus group as qualitative research* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morgan, D. L., & Krueger, R. A. (1993). When to use focus groups and why. In D. L. Morgan (Ed.), *Successful Focus Groups: Advancing the State of the Art* (pp. 3-20). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morgan, T., Ness, D., & Robinson, M. (2003). Students' help-seeking behaviors by gender, racial background, and student status. *Canadian Journal of Counseling, 37*, 151–162.

Mori, S. C. (2000). Addressing the mental health concerns of international students. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78*, 137–144.

Morson, G.S. & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creating of a prosaics*. Sanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Mulac, A., Hanley, T.D., & Prigge, D.Y. (1974). Effects of phonological speech foreignness upon three dimensions of attitude of selected American listeners. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60,* 411-420.

Navara, G. S., & James, S. (2005). Acculturative stress of missionaries: Does religious orientation affect religious coping and adjustment? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 39-58.

Nicassio, P. M. (1983). Psychosocial correlates of alienation: Study of a sample of Indochinese refugees. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14*, 337-351.

Nisbet, R. A. (1966). *The sociological tradition*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. . *Practical Anthropology, 7*, 177-182.

O'Donnell-Trujillo, N., & Adams, K. (1983). Heheh in conversation: Some coordinating accomplishments of laughter. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 47,* 175-191.

Oetzel, J. G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2003). Face concerns in interpersonal conflict: A cross-cultural empirical test of the face negotiation theory. *Communication Research, 30*, 599-624.

Okazaki-Luff, K. (1991). On the adjustment of Japanese sojourners: Beliefs, contentions, and empirical findings, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*(1), 85-102.

Olaniran, B. A. (1996). Social skills acquisition: A closer look at foreign students on college campuses and factors influencing their levels of social difficulty in social situations. *Communication Studies, 47*, 72-88.

Olivas, M., & Li, C. (2006). Understanding Stressors of International Students in Higher Education: What College Counselors and Personnel Need to Know. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 33*(3), 217-222.

Oropeza, B. C., Fitzgibbon, M., & Barón, A. (1991). Managing mental health crises of foreign college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 69*, 280-284.

Otto, L. B., & Featherman, D. L. (1975). Social structural and psychological antecedents of self-estrangement and powerlessness *American Sociological Review, 40*, 701-719.

Oudenhoven, J. P. V., & Zee, K. I. V. (2002). Predicting multicultural effectiveness of international students: The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*, 679–694.

Owens, T.J. (2006). Self and identity. In. J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp.205-232). New York: Plenum Publication.

Owie, I. (1982). Social alienation among foreign students. *College Student Journal, 16*, 163-165.

Parr, G., Bradley, L., & Bingi, R. (1992). Concerns and feelings of international students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33,* 20–25.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Pavlenko, A. (2006). Living with Multiple Languages: Multilingualism, Identity, and Belonging. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism, 9*(5), 678-683.

Peeters, M., & Oerlemans, W. (2009). The relationship between acculturation orientations and work-related well-being: Differences between ethnic minority and majority employees. *International Journal of Stress Management, 16*(1), 1-24.

Petronio, S. (2000). The boundaries of privacy: Praxis of everyday life. In S. Petronio (Ed.), *Balancing the secrets of private disclosures* (pp. 37-49). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pedersen, P. (1975). Personal problems solving resources used by University of Minnesota foreign students. In R. Brislin (Ed.), *Topic in cultural learning,* Vol.3., pp. 55-65. Honolulu: East-West Center.

Pedersen, P. B. (1990). Social and psychological factors of brain drain and reentry among international students: A survey of the topic. *McGill Journal of Education, 25*(2), 229–243.

Pedersen, P.B. (1991). Counseling international students, *The Counseling Psychologist, 19*, 240-245. or 10-58

Perrucci, R. & Hu, H. (1995). Satisfaction with social and educational experiences among international graduate students, *Research in Higher Education, 36*, 491-507.

Persky, I., & Birman, D. (2005). Ethnic Identity in Acculturation Research: A Study of Multiple Identities of Jewish Refugees From the Former Soviet Union. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*, 557-572.

Petress, K. C. (1995). Coping with a new educational environment: Chinese students' imagined interactions before commencing studies in the U.S. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 22*(1), 50–63.

Philipsen, G. (1990). Speaking 'like a man' in Teamsterville: Culture patterns of role enactment in an urban neighborhood. In D. Carbaugh (Ed.), *Cultural communication and intercultural contact.* (pp. 11-20). Hillsdale, NJ England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes. In G. Philipsen & T. L. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing communication theories.* (pp. 119-156). Albany, NY US: State University of New York Press.

Philipsen, G., Coutu, L. M., & Covarrubias, P. (2005). Speech Codes Theory: Restatement, Revisions, and Response to Criticisms. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication.* (pp. 55-68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Popadiuk, N., & Arthur, N. (2004). Counseling International Students in Canadian Schools. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 26*(2), 125-145.

Poyrazli, S., & Grahame, K. (2007). Barriers to Adjustment: Needs of International Students within a Semi-Urban Campus Community. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 34*(1), 28-45.

Poyrazli, S., & Lopez, M. (2007). An exploratory study of perceived discrimination and homesickness: A comparison of international students and American students. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 141*(3), 263-280.

Prieto, S. L. (1995). International student populations and needs assessment. In: S. D. Stabb, S. M. Harris, & J. E. Talley (Eds.). *Multicultural needs assessment for college university student populations*, (pp 203- 223). Illinois: Springfield.

Radway, J. (1991). *Reading the romance: Women, patriarchy, and populate literature*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Rai, G. S. (2002). Meeting the educational needs of international students. A perspective from US schools. *International Social Work, 45*,21-33.

Rajwade, S. (2006). An Exploration in Hindi-English Bilingual Identity: Implications for Psychotherapy. *Psychological Studies, 51*(1), 30-44.

Ramírez-Esparza, N., Gosling, S., Benet-Martínez, V., Potter, J., & Pennebaker, J. (2006). Do bilinguals have two personalities? A special case of cultural frame switching. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(2), 99-120.

Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*, 43–61.

Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor.* Dordrecht and Boston: Reidel.

Raunic, A., & Xenos, S. (2008). University counselling service utilisation by local and international students and user characteristics: A review. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 30*(4), 262-267.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American Anthropology, 38*, 149-152.

Redmond, M. V., & Bunyi, J. M. (1993). The relationship of intercultural communication competence with stress and the handling of stress as reported by international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 17*, 235–254.

Reece, D., & Palmgreen, P. (2000). Coming to America: Need for acculturation and media use motives among Indian sojourners in the US. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*, 807-824.

Rice, K., Choi, C., Zhang, Y., Villegas, J., Ye, H., Anderson, D., et al. (2009). International student perspectives on graduate advising relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(3), 376-391.

Ritts, V., & Stein, J. R. (1995). Verification and commitment in marital relationships: An exploration of self-verification theory in community college students. . *Psychological Reports, 76*, 383-386.

Robinson, T.L., & Ginter, E.J. (Eds.) (1999). Racism: Healing its effects [Special issue]. Journal of Counseling & Development, 77(1).

Robinson, D. T., & Smith-Lovin, L. (1992). Selective interaction as a strategy for identity maintenance: An affect control model. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 55*, 12-28.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Rosenberg, M., & Kaplan, H. (1982). *Social psychology of the self-concept*. Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ruef, A. M., Litz, B. T., & Schlenger, W. E. (2000). Hispanic ethnicity and risk for combat-related posttraumatic stress disorder. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6*, 235-251.

Ryan, E.B., Hewstone, M., & Giles, H. (1984). Language and intergroup attitudes. In J. Eiser (Ed.), *Attitudinal Judgment* (pp. 135-160). New York: Springer.

Ryan, M., & Twibell, R. (2000). Concerns, values, stress, coping, health and educational outcomes of college students who studied abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*, 409-435.

Sakamoto, I. (2006). When family enters the picture: The model of cultural negotiation and gendered experiences of Japanese academic sojourners in the United States. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 558-577.

Sam, D. L. (2006). Acculturation: Conceptual background and core components. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology.* (pp. 11-26). New York, NY US: Cambridge University Press.

Sandhu, D. S. (1994). An examination of the psychological needs of international students: Implications for counseling and psychotherapy. I*nternational Journal for the Advancement of Counseling, 17*, 229–239.

Sandhu, D. S., & Asrabadi, B. R. (1998). An acculturative stress scale for international students: A practical approach to stress measurement. In C.P. Zalaquett & R. J.

Wood (Eds.) *Evaluating stress: A book of resources*, V.2. (pp. 1-33). Lanam, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Sato, T., & Hodge, S. R. (2009). Asian international doctoral students' experiences at two American universities: Assimilation, accommodation, and resistance. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*, 136-148.

Schacht, R. (1970). Alienation. New York. Anchor Books.

Schafer, R. B., Wickrama, K. A. S., & Keith, P. M. (1996). Self-concept disconfirmation, psychological distress, and marital happiness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*, 167-177.

Scheurich, J. J. (1995). A postmodernist critique of research interviewing. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8,* 239-252.

Scheurich, J. J. (1997). *Research method in the postmodern*. London: Falmer.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations.* . Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schlenker, B. R. (1985). Identity and self-identification. (pp.). . In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 65-99). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Schlenker, B. R. (1986). Self-identification: Toward an integration of the private and public self. . In R. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self* (pp. 21-62). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Schlenker, B.R., Britt, T.W., & Pennington, J. (1996). Impression regulation and management: Highlights of empathy and friendship strength on beneficial impression management. In. R.M. Sorrentino & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of*

motivation and cognition: Vol.3. The interpersonal context (pp.118-147). New York: Guilford Press.

Schlenker, B.R. & Weigold, M.F. (1992). Interpersonal processes involving impression regulation and management. *Annual review of psychology, 43*, 133-168.

Schmitt, M. T., Spears,R., & Branscombe, N. R.(2003). Constructing a minority group identity out of shared rejection: The case of international students. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*,1-12.

Schram, J.L. & Lauver, P.J. (1988) Alienation in international students, Journal of Student Development, 29, 146-150.

Schutz, A. (1967). *The Phenomenology of the Social World* (G. Walsh & F. Lehnert., Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*, 449–464.

Sedlacek, W.E. & Brooks Jr., G.C. (1976). Racism in American Education: A Model for Change. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. *American Sociological Review, 24,* 783-791.

Seeman, M. (1972). Alienation and engagement. In A. Campbell & P. E. Convers (Eds.), *The human meaning of social change* (pp. 467-528). New York, NY: Russel Sage.

Seeman, M. (1991). Alienation and anomie. In. J.P.Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychology attitude*, Vol.1 (pp.291-372). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Seidman, I. E. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY US: Teachers College Press.

Setiawan, J. L. (2006). Willingness to seek counseling, and factors that facilitate and inhibit the seeking of counselling in Indonesian undergraduate students. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, 34, 403–419.

Sheehan, O. T. O., & Pearson, F. (1995). Asian international and American students' psychosocial development. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(6), 522–530

Shougee, M. (1999). The experiences, meanings and outcomes of studying abroad: A qualitative multiple-case study. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Shupe, E.I. (2007). Clashing Cultures: A Model of International Student Conflict, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*, 750-771.

Singaravelu, H., & Pope, M. (Eds.) (2007). *Handbook for counseling international students in the U.S.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Singh, C., & Singh, U. (1996). Acculturation strategies of migrant Santals. *Psychological Studies, 41*(3), 80-85.

Smart, J. F., & Smart, D. W. (1995). Acculturative stress of Hispanics loss and challenge. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 390-396.

Smith, H. M. & Betz, N. E. (2000). Development and validation of a scale of perceived social self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment, 8*(3), 283-301.

Smith, M., Calam, R., & Bolton, C. (2009). Psychological factors linked to self-reported

depression symptoms in late adolescence. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 37*, 73-85.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.

Sodowsky, G. R., & Carey, J. C. (1987). Asian Indian immigrants in America: Factors related to adjustment. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 15*, 129-141.

Sodowsky, G. R., & Plake, B. S. (1992). A study of acculturation differences among international people and suggestions for sensitivity to within-group differences. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71*, 53–59.

Sowell, T. (1994). *Race and culture: A world view.* New York: Basic Books.

Spencer, H. (1864/2002). *The principle of biology.* Vol.1. Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific.

Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.). (1990).Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.Stengel, E. (1939). On learning a new language. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 20*, 471-479.

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (1990). *Focus groups: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stoynoff, S. (1997). Factors associated with International student's academic achievement. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24*, 56-68.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stroebe, M., van Vliet, T., Hewstone, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Homesickness among students in two cultures: Antecedents and consequences. *British Journal of Psychology, 93*, 147–168.

Suárez-Mendoza, M. J., & Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P. (2007). The impact of work alienation on organizational citizenship behavior in the Canary Islands. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 15*, 56-76.

Surdam, J. & Collins, J. (1984). Adaptation of International Students: A cause for concern. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*, 240-245.

Sussman, N. M. (2002). The dynamic nature of cultural identity throughout cultural transitions: Why home is not so sweet. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 466–473.

Svarney, R. J. (1989). Counseling foreign law students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 68*, 228-231.

Swagler, M. & Ellis, M. (2003). Crossing the distance: Adjustment of Taiwanese students in the United States. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 420-457.

Swagler, M. A., & Jome, L. M. (2005). The Effects of Personality and Acculturation on the Adjustment of North American Sojourners in Taiwan. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 527-536.

Swann, W. B. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In J.Suls. & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 33-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swann, W. B. (1985). The self as architect of social reality. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 100-125). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Swann, W. B., & Hill, C. A. (1982). When our identities are mistaken: Reaffirming self-conceptions through social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 59-66.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Hixon, J. G., Stein-Seroussi, A., & Gilbert, D. T. (1990). The fleeting gleam of praise: Behavioral reactions to selfrelevant feedback. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 17-26.

Swann, W. B., Rentofrow, P. J., & Guinn, J. S. (2003). Self-verification: The search for coherence. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity* (pp. 367-383). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Swann, W. B., Stein-Seroussi, A., & Giesler, R. B. (1992). Why people self-verify. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 392-401.

Swann, W. B., Wenzlaff, R. M., Krull, D. S., & Pelham, B. W. (1992). Allure of negative feedback: Self-verification strivings among depressed persons. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101*, 293-306.

Swatdipong, P. (1980, January). Sojourner alienation: An exploratory study of foreign student alienation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 4242.

Szapocznik, J., & Kurtines, W. (1980). Acculturation, biculturalism and adjustment among Cuban Americans. In A. M.Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 139-159). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tafarodi, R.W. & Smith, A.J. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and depressive sensitivity to life events: The case of Malaysian sojourners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*,73-88.

Taylor, M. W. (2007). *The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer.* London: Continuum.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Reiss, M. (1981). Identities, the phenomenal self, and laboratory research. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Impression management theory and social psychological research* (pp. 3-22). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Teske, R.H.C., & Nelson, B. H. (1974). Acculturation and assimilation. *American Ethnologist, 1*.

Thibaut, J.W., & Kelley, H.H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. New York: John Wiley. Thomas, K., & Althen, G. (1989). Counseling foreign students. In P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns,

W. J. Lonner & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures (3rd ed., pp. 205-241).* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim &W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). Identity Negotiation Theory: Crossing Cultural Boundaries. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication.* (pp. 211-233). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22*, 187-225.

Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G., Trubisky, P., & Yang, Z. (1991). Culture, face maintenance, and styles of handling interpersonal conflicts: A study in five cultures. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 2*, 275-296.

Toyokawa, T., & Toyokawa, N. (2002). Extracurricular activities and the adjustment of Asian intemationai students: A study of Japanese Students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*, 363-379.

Tracy, S. J. (2002). When questioning turn to face threat: An interactional sensitivity in 911 call-taking. *Western Journal of Communication, 66*, 129-157.

Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture.* . New York, NY: Wiley.

Triandis, H. (1991). A need for theoretical examination. *The Counseling Psychologist, 19*, 59-61.

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

Trimble, J. E. (1995). Toward an understanding of ethnicity and ethnic identity, and their relationship with drug use research. In G. J. Botvin, S. Shinke, & M. A. Orlandi (Eds.), *Drug abuse and prevention with multiethnic youth* (pp. 3–27). ThousandOaks: Sage Publications.

Trubisky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S.-l. (1991). The influence of individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 65-84.

Uba, L. (1994). Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health. New York: Guilford Press.

Vaughn, S. Schumm, J.S. & Sinagub J. (1996). Focus Group Interviews in Education and Psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Van Oudenhoven, J. P., & Van der Zee, K. (2002). Predicting multicultural effectiveness of international students: The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26,* 679-694.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Problems of general psychology, including the volume Thinking and speech New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Wacaster, C. T., & Firestone, W. A. (1978). The promise and problems of long-term continuous fieldwork. *Human Organization, 37*, 269-275.

Wadsworth, B. C., Hecht, M. L., & Jung, E. (2008). The role of identity gaps, discrimination, and acculturation in international students' educational satisfaction in American classrooms. *Communication Education, 57*, 64-87.

Wan, T., Chapman, D. W., & Biggs, D. A. (1992). Academic stress of international students attending U.S. universities. *Research in Higher Education, 33*(5), 607–623.

Wang, C., & Mallinckrodt, B. (2006). Acculturation, attachment, and psychosocial adjustment of Chinese/Taiwanese international students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(4), 422-433.

Ward, C. (2001a). The impact of international students on domestic students and host institutions. contract literature review, Ministry of Education, New Zealand.

Ward, C. (2001b). The A, B, Cs of acculturation. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 411–446). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY US: Routledge.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1992). Locus of control, mood disturbance, and social difficulty during cross-cultural transition. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16*, 175–194.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993). Where's the ''culture'' in cross-cultural transition? Comparative studies of sojourner adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24*, 221–249.

Ward, C., Leong, C. H., & Low, M. (2004). Personality and sojourner adjustment: An exploration of the Big Five and the cultural fit proposition. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*, 137–151.

Ward, D., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and adaptation revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*, 372–392.

Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (2000). Home and host culture influences on sojourner adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*, 291-306.

Ward, C., & Searle, W. (1991). The impact of value discrepancies and cultural identity on psychological and sociocultural adjustment of sojourners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 209-225.

Weber, M. (1905/2001). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Chicago, IL: Roxbury.

Wedding, D., McCartney, J., & Currey, D. (2009). Lessons relevant to psychologists who serve as mentors for international students. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*(2), 189-193

Wegner, E. L. (1975). The concept of alienation: A critique and some suggestions for a context specific approach *Pacific Sociological Review, 18*, 171-193.

Weiss, R. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing : Biographic narrative and semi-structured methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Westwood, M. J., & Barker, M. (1990). Academic achievement and social adaptation among international students: A comparison groups study of the peer-pairing program. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*, 251–263.

White, A., Brown, S., & Suddick, D. (1983). Academic factors affecting the scholastic performance of international students. *College Student Journal, 17*, 268-272.

Wicklund, R. A., & Gollwtizer, P. M. (1987). The fallacy of the private-public self-focus distinction. *Journal of Personality, 55*, 491-523.

Wieder, D. L., & Pratt, S. (1990). On being a recognizable Indian among Indians. In. D., Carbaugh (Ed.), *Cultural communication and intercultural contact*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum. (pp.45-64)

Wilton, L. & Constantine, M.G. (2003) Length of residence, cultural adjustment difficulties, and psychological distress symptoms in Asian and Latin-American international college students. *Journal of College Counseling, 6*,177-186.

Wiseman, R. L., Hammer, M. R., & Nishida, H. (1989). Predictors of intercultural communication competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13*, 349-370.

Wiseman, R. L. (2003). Intercultural communicaiton competence. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and ntercultural communication* (pp. 191-208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(3), 361-384.

Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Harvard University Press

Yakushko, O., Davidson, M., & Sanford-Martens, T. (2008). Seeking help in a foreign land: International students' use patterns for a U.S. university counseling center. *Journal of College Counseling, 11*(1), 6-18.

Yang, B., & Clum, G. A. (1994). Measures of life stress and social support specific to an Asian student population. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 17, 51–67.

Yang, B., & Clum, G. A. (1994). Life stress, social support, and problem -solving skills predictive of depressive symptoms, hopelessness, and suicide ideation in an Asian student population: a test of a model. *Suicide and Life Threatening Behavior, 24,* 127–139.

Yang, B., Teraoka, M., Eichenfield, G. A., & Audas, M. C. (1994). Meaningful relationships between Asian international and U.S. college students: A descriptive study. *College Student Journal, 28*(1), 108–115.

Yashima, T. (1995). English proficiency, personality, and intercultural adjustment of Japanese students studying in America. *Intercultural Communications Studies, 1*, 83–109.

Ye, J. (2005). Acculturative Stress and Use of the Internet among East Asian International Students in the United States. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 8*(2), 154-161.

Ye, J. (2006). An examination of acculturative stress, interpersonal social support, and use of online ethnic social groups among Chinese international students. *Howard Journal of Communications, 17*(1), 1-20.

Yeh, C., & Inose, M. (2002). Difficulties and coping strategies of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean immigrant students. Adolescence, 37 (145), 69-82.

Yeh, C. J., & Inose, M. (2003), International students' reported English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 16*(1), 15-28.

Yi, J. K., Lin, J.-C. G., & Kishimoto, Y. (2003). Utilization of counseling services by international students. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 30*, 333–342.

Ying, Y, (2002), Formation of cross-cultural relationships of Taiwanese international students in the United States. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30*,45-55,

Ying, Y. (2005). Variation in acculturative stressors over time: A study of Taiwanese students in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 59-71.

Ying, Y., & Liese, L.H. (1990). Initial adaptation of Taiwan foreign students to t he United States: The impact of pre-arrival variables. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*, 825–845.

Ying, Y. W., & Liese, L. H. (1991). Emotional well-being of Taiwan students in the U.S.: An examination of pre- andpost-arriv al differential. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 345–366.

Ying, Y W,, & Liese, L, H, (1994), Initial adjustment of Taiwanese students to the United States, *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 25,* 466-477,

Ying, Y. W., Lee, P. A., & Tsai, J. L. (2000). Cultural orientation and racial discrimination: Predictors of coherence in Chinese American young adults. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*, 427–442.

Yoo, S. K., & Skovholt, T. M. (2001). Cross-cultural examination of depression expression and help-seeking behavior: A comparative study of American and Korean college students. *Journal of College Counseling, 4*, 10–19.

Yoon, E., & Portman, T. (2004). Critical Issues of Literature on Counseling International Students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*(1), 33-44.

Zaharna, R. S. (1989). Self-shock: The double-binding challenge of identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13*, 501-525.

Zheng, X., & Berry, J. W. (1991). Psychological adaptation of Chinese sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology, 26*, 451–470.

Zhai, L, (2002), Studying international students: Adjustment issues and social support, ERIC Document 474481

Zhang, N., & Dixon, D. (2003). Acculturation and Attitudes of Asian International Students Toward Seeking Psychological Help. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31*(3), 205-222

Zheng, X., Sang, D., & Wang, L. (2004). Acculturation and subjective well-being of Chinese students in Australia. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 5*(1), 57-72.

Zimmermann, S. (1995). Perceptions of intercultural communication competence and international student adaptation to an American campus. *Communication Education, 44*, 321–335.

APPENDICES
Appendix 1

Background Information Questionnaire [English Translation]

1. Age _____ years old

2. Sex Male Female

3. Marital Status Single Divorced Engaged

4. Hometown _____ prefecture

5. When did you come to the U.S.? (year/month) _____/_____

6. Educational Background
   1. High school graduate 2. Junior college graduate 3. Vocational school
   4. University graduate (Bachelor) 5. Master's degree 6. Doctoral degree
   7. Other (Please specify)

7. Current Program
   1. Undergraduate (year) 2. English program
   3. Master's 4. Ph.D.
   5. Other (Please specify)

8. What is your major? _____

9. What is your plan after graduation?
   1. Graduate school in Japan
   2. Graduate school in U.S.
   3. Work in Japan
   4. Work in the U.S.
   5. Undecided yet I return to Japan
   6. Undecided yet I will stay in the U.S.
   7. Other (Please specify)

10. Have you lived or stayed in a foreign country before this? (Included English learning program) Yes No
    Where? _____
    When? _____
    How long? _____

Appendix 2

Interview Protocol [English Translation]

3. Why did you decide to come to the United States to study?
4. How do you like your life in the United States?
5. What do you find troublesome?
6. When do you think you are doing well in the United States?
7. Do you feel at home here?
8. What kind of cultural differences have you found?
9. What is enjoyable for you about living in the U.S.?
10. When do you feel sense of achievement? When do you feel you did a good job?
11. What kind of difficulties and problems have you experienced?
12. Do you have any concerns? Did you?
13. How are the classes in the United States? Any difficulties?
14. When do you feel frustrated about yourself? How do you deal the situation?
15. Please compare you in the US and you in Japan. How do you feel about the differences?
16. Have you ever felt that nobody understands you? How do you deal with the situation?
17. Have you ever felt that you cannot express your natural personality and character? Why is it difficult? How do you feel? How do you deal with the situation?
18. Have you ever felt that you cannot fully exercise your capabilities? Why is it difficult? How do you feel? How do you deal with the situation?
19. What is your relationship with American friends like?
20. What is your relationship with Japanese friends like?
21. What is your relationship with international students from the other countries like?
22. Are there any difficulties in communicating with Americans?
23. When do you think that you are not communicating well with Americans?
24. When do you think that you are communicating well with Americans?
25. Have you ever felt that you cannot express your feelings and thoughts?
26. Do you think you made a good decision to come to the US? How come?
27. Do you think you have grown since you came to the US?
28. Do you think you have changed since you came to the US?
29. Are there anything that you try not to change about yourself?
30. Please tell me the important things for the Japanese who move to and live in the U.S.?
31. How do you stay in touch with people in Japan and Japanese culture and society?

Appendix 3

Background Information Questionnaire [Original Version]

1. 年齢 _____ 歳

2. 性別 男性 女性

3. 婚姻状況 未婚 既婚 婚約

4. 出身地 _____ 都 道 府 県

5. アメリカにいつ来ましたか？ _____ 年 ____ 月

6. 最終学歴
   1. 高卒 2. 短大卒 3. 専門学校
   4. 四年生大学卒 5. 修士号 6. 博士号
   7. その他（具体的に ）

7. 現在のプログラム
   1. Undergraduate （学年 ） 2. English program
   3. Master's 4. Ph.D.
   5. その他（具体的に ）

8. 専攻は何ですか _____

9. 卒業後の計画は何ですか。
   1. 日本の大学院
   2. アメリカの大学院
   3. 日本で就職
   4. アメリカで就職
   5. 決めていないけどとりあえず日本に帰る
   6. 決めていないけどとりあえずアメリカに残る
   7. その他 （具体的に ）

10. この留学以前、外国に住んだことがありますか（短期語学研修も含めて）
    1. はい 2. いいえ
    国名 _____
    いつ _____
    期間 _____ヶ月間 or 年間

Appendix 4

Interview Protocol [Original Version]

1. どうしてアメリカに留学しようと思ったんですか。
2. アメリカでの生活はどうですか。
3. 困ることがありますか。
4. どんなときにアメリカで順調に暮らしてるなと感じますか。
5. アメリカが第二の故郷のような気がしますか。
6. どんなところで文化の違いを感じますか。
7. アメリカでの生活で、どんなことが楽しいですか。
8. どんなときに達成感を感じますか。どんなときに「よくやった！」と感じますか。
9. どんな困難や苦労を経験しましたか。
10. 心配事がありますか。以前はありましたか。
11. アメリカでの授業はどうですか。難しいことがありますか。
12. どんなとき、自分に対してイライラしますか。その状況にどうやって対処しますか。
13. アメリカでのあなたと日本でのあなたを比べてください。違いについてどう思いますか。
14. 誰もあなたのことを理解していないと感じたことがありますか。そのように感じるとき、どうやって対処しますか。
15. 自分の普段の性格やキャラクターを表現できていないと感じることがありますか。それをするのが難しい理由はなんだと思いますか。どんな気分になりますか。そのように感じるとき、どうやって対処しますか。
16. 自分の実力や能力を発揮できていないと感じることがありますか。それをするのが難しい理由はなんだと思いますか。どんな気分になりますか。そのように感じるとき、どうやって対処しますか。
17. アメリカ人の友達との関係はどうですか。
18. 日本人の友達との関係はどうですか。
19. 日本人以外の留学生との関係はどうですか。
20. アメリカ人とのコミュニケーションで難しいことがありますか。
21. どんな時、アメリカ人とコミュニケーションできていないと感じますか。
22. どんな時、アメリカ人とコミュニケーションできていると感じますか。
23. 自分の気持ちや考えを伝えることができないと感じたことがありますか。
24. アメリカに来て良かったと思いますか？どうしてですか？
25. アメリカに来てから成長したと思いますか。
26. アメリカに来てから自分が変わったと思いますか。
27. 自分について変えないようにしていることがありますか。
28. 日本人がアメリカに移住したとき、どんなことが大事だと思いますか。
29. 日本にいる人や日本の文化・社会とどうやって関係を保っていますか。

Appendix 5

Language Glossary

A list of Japanese words in text (in alphabetical order)

Format: Roman alphabet (Japanese): [English translation] Brief explanation

Ba-ka (ばか/バカ/馬鹿): [idiot] (adjective) stupid, (noun) idiot
Bo-ke (ボケ/ ぼけ): [the fool] One of the roles in a Japanese joking dialogue. A person who says something silly, nonsense, unpredictable or extravagant, or his or her remarks
I-na-ka-mo-no (田舎者): [country bumpkin] A person who comes from a rural or primitive area, or an uneducated, inexperienced, uncultured, and naïve person.
Ji-ko-i-ka (自己異化): [self-alienation]自己=self .異化(*i-ka*) =dissimilation.
J*i-ko-so-ga-i* (自己疎外): [self-alienation]自己(*ji-ko*) = self. 疎外(*so-ga-i*) =alienation or separation.
Kei-go (敬語): [respectful language] Japanese grammatical from to show respect
Ken-jyou-go(謙譲語): [humble language] Japanese grammatical form to lower oneself
Ni-hon Tsu-na-g-ari no A-me-ri-ka-jin (日本つながりのアメリカ人): [Japan-connected Americans] American students who have an interest in Japan
Saa-ku-ru (サークル): [circle] A loan word of *circle*. Common-interest social group.
Se-i-shin-bun-re-tsu (精神分裂) [Schizophrenia]
Son-kei-go (尊敬語): [honorific language] Japanese grammatical form to raise someone else's stature
Tei-nei-go (丁寧語): [polite language] Japanese grammatical form to express politeness and formality.
Ten-nen-bo-ke (天然 ぼけ): [natural dumb] a ditzy person who acts slow, innocent, naïve and dumb, behaves unpredictably, and makes completely irrelevant comments.
Tsu-kko-mi (ツッコミ/ つっこみ): [jabbing/jabber] One of the roles in a Japanese joking dialogue. A Tsukkomi playfully teases and insults a Boke.
Ya-ba-I (やばい): [be in trouble] Slang expression used to describe troublesome situation or a person in trouble. In a more casual manner, sometime pronounced as やべー(*Ya-bee*)
Ze-mi (ゼミ): [seminar] a loan word of *seminar*
Ze-tsu-bou (絶望) [Despair, dismay, hopeless]

Appendix 6

IRB Approval Letter

The University of Oklahoma

OFFICE FOR HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANT PROTECTION

IRB Number: 12835
Approval Date: January 11, 2010

January 12, 2010

Saluko Izumi
Department of Communication
1151 Blkvd Dr. Apt D
Norman, OK 73071

RE: Understanding of Self-Alienation of Japanese International Students in the United States

Dear Ms. Izumi:

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed and granted expedited approval of the above-referenced research study. This study meets the criteria for expedited approval category 6, 7. It is my judgment as Chairperson of the IRB that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, that the proposed research, including the process of obtaining informed consent, will be conducted in a manner consistent with the requirements of 45 CFR 46 as amended, and that the research involves no more than minimal risk to participants.

This letter documents approval to conduct the research as described:

Consent form Subject Dated: December 22, 2009 Revised - Japanese
Consent form Subject Dated: December 22, 2009 Revised - English
Other Dated: December 21, 2009 Debriefing Statement Japanese
Other Dated: December 21, 2009 Debriefing Statement English
Survey Instrument Dated: December 21, 2009 Interview Script Japanese
Survey Instrument Dated: December 21, 2009 Interview Script English
Recruitment flyer Dated: December 21, 2009 Japanese
Recruitment flyer Dated: December 21, 2009 English
Protocol Dated: December 21, 2009
IRB Application Dated: December 21, 2009

As principal investigator of this protocol, it is your responsibility to make sure that this study is conducted as approved. Any modifications to the protocol or consent form, initiated by you or by the sponsor, will require prior approval, which you may request by completing a protocol modification form. All study records, including copies of signed consent forms must be retained for three (3) years after termination of the study.

The approval granted expires on January 10, 2011. Should you wish to maintain this protocol in an active status beyond that date, you will need to provide the IRB with an IRB Application for Continuing Review (Progress Report) summarizing study results to date. The IRB will request an IRB Application for Continuing Review from you approximately two months before the anniversary date of your current approval.

If you have questions about these procedures, or need any additional assistance from the IRB, please call the IRB office at (405) 325-8110 or send an email to irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,

Lynn Davenport, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

820 Parrington Oval, Suite 314, Norman, Oklahoma 73019-3073 PHONE (405) 325-8110 FAX (405) 325-2373

Ltr_Prot_Exped_Exp