



**The Influence Of Situation On Languages Of Cooperation:
How Movie Language Coding Influences Audience Cooperation In Japan**

by

THERON MULLER

A dissertation submitted to the School of Humanities
of the University of Birmingham
in part fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (TEFL/TESL)

This dissertation consists of approximately 11,600 words
and 53 pages

Supervisor: John Gosling

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT
United Kingdom
September 2004

ABSTRACT

There have been several different models of human behavior proposed in cross-ethnic and cross-cultural situations. In particular, culture dimensions and linguistic prestige models have been the focus of considerable research. Traditional research has often searched for a means of maximizing the differences between experimental conditions and in developing scales that measure significant differences between ethnic groups and cultures. In contrast this research, an application of the matched guise technique, attempts to minimize the differences between experimental conditions by using written instead of spoken announcements in a theater in Nagano, Japan. No significant differences are found between the two conditions; audiences seeing a Japanese only sign and audiences seeing a Japanese and English sign displayed together. Culture dimension and matched guise literature are reviewed, and it is suggested that both models should, in the future, move from static representations of cultural and ethnic differences to dynamic models which acknowledge that both historical and modern sociocultural variables influence differences between cultures and ethnic stereotyping.

DEDICATION

For my wife Yuki. Thank you for being here for me, through both the good times and the bad, and for teaching me that people from two different languages and two different cultures can share respect and love. And for my parents. Thanks for teaching me to look beyond the immediately obvious, and to see people as primarily, essentially human, and that humanity is a good thing, deserving of respect and admiration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In research there are always those to whom the researcher is indebted for support, assistance, and critical guidance. In my case I would like to thank my advisor in Birmingham, John Gosling, for his patience and feedback on earlier drafts of this volume. I would also like to thank Terry Shortall, whose encouragement started me down this track and kept me from falling off it at several stages. In Japan I am indebted to Greg Birch and Yasuo Nakazawa, who were both instrumental in Japanese translation and in securing the cooperation of the theater used in this research. Thanks are also due to Hiroyuki Ōka and Michie Watanabe,

who both devoted their time and patience to developing audio recordings that ultimately couldn't be used in this study, but will hopefully prove useful in the future. Christopher Long, Teja Ostheider, Lisa Fairbrother and Daniel Long all helped me better understand the field of culture studies at the Asian Studies Conference, Japan. To them I say thanks for your company and conversation. Also, thanks are due to Yamaguchi-san, who gracefully permitted the invasion of his theaters. In America I'm grateful to Beth Alloway for her editing and moral support services. And finally, additional thanks are due to Yuki Muller, my wife, to whom this volume is dedicated. With me wherever I am, without her support and encouragement I probably would have thrown up my hands in frustration long ago.

FOREWORD FOR THE ASIAN EFL JOURNAL IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

In this forward I would like to devote some attention to the practical pedagogical implications of the following discussion and analysis to assist the teaching professional to form links between the theory and discussion which follows in the body of my dissertation and their own practice.

Due to space limitations, the dissertation deliberately avoids pedagogical and methodological concerns, such as models for teacher-student interactions. Particularly, I avoid detailing how a Western teacher in Japan should build and define the teacher-student classroom relationship. Nor does it appear, from current criticisms of Hofstede's (1980) culture dimensions, that there is a simple, easily discernable answer to the question of how teachers and students from different cultural backgrounds should go about defining and building their relationship.

Once the culture studies research to date is accounted for, it appears that simple, easily modeled differences between cultures, at least in natural settings, aren't predictive of behavior, however apparent these traits appear in questionnaire-based research (Matsumoto 1999, Yamagishi 1988a, 1988b). Perhaps, though, the lack of a simple answer to the question of how cultures differ is a heartening revelation rather than a cause for concern. Said (2003) in particular devoted an entire book to explaining how the European and American West's interpretation of the East, of which Hofstede's (1980) culture dimensions are a part, has been interested in quantifying and

delineating exactly what is West and what is East, how they are different, and cataloguing one as superior to the other logically, economically, and practically. On the opposite side of the coin, Buruma and Margalit (2004), scholars of eastern interpretations of the West as an angry imperialistic power, link the philosophical lineage of Japanese uniqueness philosophy to Nazi Germany's Goebbels. While the historical ramifications of such academically justified yet artificially synthesized distinctions are still the focus of front-page news today, the message to individual teachers and students has perhaps been lost in the confusion.

Cultures and civilizations are large, clumsy entities that are difficult to delineate and define. For example, the exercise of defining government, particularly in a democracy, is illustrative of such difficulty. Since public officials are elected via popular vote, the impetus for public decisions can be linked directly to the constituency, making an entire society of qualified voters somehow part of government. Yet, when dealing with such a government, interactions aren't between entire populations; single representatives, or groups of representatives from different governments meet to discuss, debate, and negotiate. These individuals have names and identities that extend beyond their roles as government representatives, and perhaps those identities are as much an influence on their interactions and impressions of one another as their elected or assigned roles.

Perhaps the above explanation can be extended to encompass the classroom; each teacher is an individual, as are the students they teach. The key to reducing cultural misunderstandings may be revealed through this new perspective; it isn't companies that meet one another, nor is it governments that ally and clash; inside each of those complex entities are individuals, and it is the individuals that do the meeting, talking, agreeing, and fighting. Thus for the western teacher in an Asian context the answer to culture bumps and other misunderstandings may lie in individual relationships and not in drawing on generalized formulas intended to help western teachers ingratiate themselves with local colleagues. Clark (1996) refers to this fostering of individual relationships as *common ground*. In business the trend away from macro cultural studies to micro adaptations between different companies is evident in the exchange of Communication Display Portfolios, or CDPs, which are used to communicate how an

individual company does business, and to introduce their way of business to potential clients in order to minimize misunderstandings.

History seems to indicate that generalization leads to stereotyping, and stereotyping in turn leads to self-perpetuation. Even academic literature isn't free from this cycle; Hofstede's (1980) culture dimensions gained such prominence that Kashima *et al.* (1995) felt justified in excluding subjects of Asian descent from their research conducted in America. Even more startling, the six researchers' work was reviewed and accepted by a Journal of the American Psychological Association; a message that apparently indicates the reviewers and editors didn't seem to consider exclusion of Asian-Americans from research samples conducted in America inappropriate or invalidating. An approach to cultural understanding that focused on individual contexts might help to break this cycle.

Particularly in the classroom, it is possible that local, context-specific influences such as students' age, class, major, level of motivation, and impressions of English as an academic subject are more likely to predict behavior and influence the teacher-student relationship than such general dimensions as uncertainty avoidance; Japanese first-graders may be behaviorally more homogenous with American first-graders than with Japanese adult English learners.

Applying this kind of local specialization is no less demanding or rigorous than more traditional culture studies, and in fact requires more effort from individual teachers. Instead of relying on previously completed, justified, and disseminated conclusions regarding the culture one is dealing with, a local adaptation strategy demands individuals build Clark's (1996) common ground and search for localized explanations for why a given strategy succeeds or fails, why a given relationship is good or bad.

That said, enjoy reading; I know I enjoyed the writing process, and am excited to be able to share my dissertation with a larger audience than my advisor and second reader, and am looking forward to seeing how the current dialog of culture studies continues to evolve.

Theron Muller

June 2005

CONTENTS

| | | |
|---------------------|---|----|
| Introduction | | 1 |
| Chapter 1 | The Macro Level: Culture Dimensions | 4 |
| 1.1 | Culture Defined | 4 |
| 1.2 | Introduction to Culture Dimensions | 6 |
| 1.3 | Dimensions of Culture | 6 |
| 1.4 | Uncertainty avoidance | 7 |
| | Table 1: Uncertainty Avoidance and Audience Cooperation | 7 |
| 1.5 | Collective vs. Individual | 8 |
| | Table 2: Interdependence; In-Group vs. Out-Group Audience Reactions | 9 |
| Chapter 2 | Matched Guise Research: Linguistic Prestige and Situation | 10 |
| 2.1 | Ethnicity and Japan | 10 |
| 2.2 | The Matched Guise Technique | 12 |
| 2.3 | Language Prestige | 13 |
| 2.4 | Language Prestige and the Current Study | 14 |
| | Table 3: Language Prestige and Potential Audience Reactions | 14 |
| Chapter 3 | The Null Hypothesis | 15 |
| Chapter 4 | How Situational Factors may Influence Japanese Audiences: Three Hypotheses | 17 |
| | Table 4: Three Hypotheses of Audience Reactions | 17 |
| Chapter 5 | Bourhis and Giles (1976): A Model for this Study | 19 |
| 5.1 | Issues with Bourhis and Giles (1976): Welsh Nationalism vs. Japan | 20 |
| 5.2 | Issues with the Current Research: Movie Preference and Younger Audiences | 21 |
| Chapter 6 | The Method: Questionnaire and Announcement Design | 23 |
| Chapter 7 | Procedure and Results | 25 |
| | Table 5: Comparison of Subtitle and Dubbing in Solicited Sample | 25 |
| | Table 6: Check of Subtitled and Dubbed Solicited Sample for Actual Preference | 26 |
| | Table 7: Experimental Results of Sign Coding and Movie Language Experience | 27 |
| Chapter 8 | Analysis and Discussion | 28 |
| 8.1 | Culture Dimensions and this Research | 29 |
| | Table 8: Culture Dimension Hypothesis vs. Experimental Results | 29 |
| 8.2 | Linguistic Prestige and this Research | 30 |
| | Table 9: Linguistic Prestige Hypothesis vs. Experimental Results | 31 |
| 8.2.1 | Influence of Linguistic Controversy and this Research | 32 |
| 8.2.2 | Motivational Differences between Written and Spoken Requests | 32 |
| 8.3 | Other Possible Factors and this Research | 33 |
| 8.3.1 | Culture Dimensions Fail to Adequately Model Japanese Behavior | 33 |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------|
| 8.3.2 | Linguistic Prestige does not Significantly Influence Behavior | 33 |
| 8.3.3 | Lack of Sanctioning Results in Lack of Cooperation | 34 |
| | Table 10: Yamagishi's (1988a and 1988b) Model of Sanctioning and this Research | 35 |
| 8.3.4 | Possible Non-linguistic, Non-cultural Confounders | 35 |
| Chapter 9 | Suggestions for Future Research—Concession of Limitations | 37 |
| Chapter 10 | Implications | 40 |
| 10.1 | Implications for Culture Dimensions | 40 |
| 10.2 | Implications for Linguistic Prestige | 42 |
| Conclusion | | 45 |
| Appendix 1 | | 48 |
| | The Japanese Questionnaire | |
| References | | 49 |

INTRODUCTION

People's reactions to different cultures, in particular measures of prejudice and attempts to define the variables through which cultures differ, have been the subjects of extensive research in the past. Measures have been designed to determine differences between cultures and to measure preferences for or prejudices against particular accents. Research to date has tended to rely on questionnaires to gauge subject opinion and/or prejudice, and has attempted to emphasize differences, rather than similarities between different groups (Luhman 1990, Hofstede 1980, & Markus and Kitayama 1991).

The literature concerning culture differences and linguistic preference, despite embodying significant volumes of work, is still controversial and undecided in important areas. For example, the measures of cultural variables are based on an international study conducted decades ago (Hofstede 1980), and the continued veracity of the findings, and the theory based upon such findings, has been questioned (Matsumoto 1999). The research tradition which measures prejudice across ethnic groups has focused on language attitudes toward accent, particularly interlocutor's impressions, as recorded in questionnaires designed to contrast how attitudes toward one particular linguistically distinguishable ethnic group differ from another linguistically distinguishable ethnic group. An example would be how North American college students differ in their appraisal of a speaker of Appalachian English vs. Standard American English (Luhman 1990). These studies have formed a picture of prejudice based on speech and socioeconomic variables, and in many instances have demonstrated prejudice for and against different ethnic groups in different cities and countries throughout the world. Unfortunately, many of these studies rely on reported attitudes, while neglecting non-linguistic behavior, such as compliance with requests. One exception is a study by Bourhis and Giles (1976), conducted in Wales, where national identity, particularly when contrasted with RP English, significantly impacted behavior. Yet it is unclear whether, in an environment where language policy is less controversial and less nationalistic, such striking differences in behavior may be observed.

Other variables which have received less attention are non-speech and non-socioeconomic variables. In fact, the tendency of research has been to add variables which may increase the apparent gap between ethnicities, such as income, race, age, etc. (Soukup 2000). The general conclusion has been that, as socioeconomic variables are added, the degrees of prejudice can be manipulated, though accent continues to be the main correlate in many studies. However, most of such research is based on an assumption which remains empirically unverified; whether differences remain between subjects when socioeconomic and sociolinguistic variables are minimalized, such as in written mediums or non-nationalistic settings.

This study attempts to fill the empirical gap mentioned above by conducting research using only signs, and no audio announcements, in a non-nationalistic setting, Japan. It is modeled from a study by Bourhis and Giles (1976), which investigated the affects of language and cooperation in Wales. As in Bourhis and Giles (1976), the degree of cooperation with requests to complete a questionnaire will be compared across two different language experiences and two differently coded signs in a 2 x 2 design. The first factor contains two language situations: Audiences at 1) an English movie (Harry Potter 3) with Japanese dubbing, and 2) an English movie (Harry Potter 3) with Japanese subtitles. The second factor represents manipulation of the linguistic coding of signs asking audience members to complete a questionnaire: 1) Japanese and 2) Japanese and English displayed side-by side. This experiment differs from Bourhis and Giles' (1976) similar experiment, which used differently coded audio announcements (Welsh, Welsh accented English and RP English) across two different experiences (a Welsh play and an English play). While Bourhis and Giles (1976) used audio stimuli, this investigation uses written, visual stimuli only.

When attempting to hypothesize audience cooperation with different language codes in different situations, three theories of cultural interaction can be used to generate three hypotheses. One hypothesis is based on cultural dimensions, which were developed by Hofstede (1980). Cultural dimensions are *a priori* constructs that govern how cultures operate, and their relevance to audience cooperation with differently coded requests will be discussed in Chapter 1. The second hypothesis for audience cooperation is based on the concept of linguistic prestige, pioneered by Lambert *et al.* (1960). Linguistic prestige was developed to model interethnic

encounters in Montreal, and dubbed the matched-guise technique. The matched-guise technique offers both a conceptual model and a research methodology, and has been used to understand how speakers linguistically accommodate, or fail to accommodate, interlocutors from different backgrounds, in different situations (Giles and Coupland 1991:37). This study is itself an application of the matched guise technique, which will be discussed in chapter 2. The final hypothesis also fits the role of the null hypothesis, and can be associated with a paper by Matsumoto (1999) which responded to the flood of cultural research that followed Hofstede's (1980) and later Markus and Kitayama's (1991) assertions that peoples from different cultures have contrasting representations of the self; the independent and interdependent selves. The null hypothesis will be covered in greater detail in chapter 3.

Chapter 4 will compare and contrast the three different hypotheses that can be drawn from the above models. Chapter 5 will present the method used for this experiment, in particular comparing and contrasting it to Bourhis and Giles' (1976) study. Chapter 6 will present the results, and chapter 7 will analyze and discuss these results. Chapter 8 will consider this experiment's relationship to existing research, detailing the limitations of matched-guise research. Chapter 9 will suggest strategies for future research. Finally, chapter 10 will precede the conclusion, and will consider the broader implications of this study in particular, and this type of experiment in general.

CHAPTER 1

THE MACRO LEVEL: CULTURE DIMENSIONS

“The study of culture is not new” (Klein *et al.* 2001:2) and emerges as early as written accounts by explorers such as Marco Polo, which were followed by cultural anthropologists’ relatively more objective and qualitative observations in the 20th Century (Klien *et al.* 2001:2). Cultural anthropologists relied on contrasting their own culture with the cultures they were observing. These subjective reports were followed by a more descriptive approach, pioneered by Hofstede *et al.* (1980), which analyzes *a priori* cultural constructs (Klein *et al.* 2001:2). This chapter concerns the body of research that has arisen from cultural construct studies, primarily focusing on Hofstede’s (1980) culture dimensions. Aspects of the culture dimensions which inform a hypothesis for cross-cultural interaction, in particular uncertainty avoidance and individual-collective will be explained.

1.1 Culture Defined

“Culture is a system of values, beliefs, assumptions, and cognition” (Klein *et al.* 2001:1), which represents “software of the mind” (Hofstede 1991:4). As such, culture is defined by Klein *et al.* (2001:1) as:

- 1) a “functional blueprint” (Klein *et al.* 2001:1), which guides and informs group behavior and social-cognitive functions;
- 2) a response to the environment in which it exists; as an environment changes, so does culture
- 3) a system of integrated components, which may be dependent on one another, and which are learned from birth onward

While Hofstede (1991) concedes that using national boundaries to define cultures is problematic, he also admits that national boundaries are the most convenient means of distinguishing between one group and another. Therefore, his research involved comparing differences across countries, and ignoring possible in-country variations.

Since Hofstede's initial research, culture variation within national borders has been the focus of some research. In cases where in-culture variation has been considered, this variation is labeled *emic*, and the more objective variables, measured across cultures, are labeled *etic* (Triandis *et al.* 1993). Still, the etic and emic distinctions continue to use national borders to mark differences between groups.

In one case, researchers chose to exclude certain within-country groups from their experimental analyses (Kashima *et al.* 1995:925). Kashima *et al.* (1995:925) excluded participants with Asian backgrounds from Australian and mainland USA samples, included them in their Hawaii sample, while in Japan and South Korea there was apparently no attempt to measure subjects' ethnic backgrounds. The logic proposed claimed that Asians in the Hawaii sample were "likely to reflect the culture of Hawaii" (Kashima *et al.* 1995:927), which apparently implies that in the mainland samples Asians weren't likely to reflect the culture of the population. Such an assertion might be seen as controversial, especially by the second and third generation Asian-Australian and Asian-Americans that may have been excluded from the sample. Another potentially controversial assumption by Kashima *et al.* (1995) is a failure to consider possible ethnic variation within their Japanese and Korean samples. In their paper Kashima *et al.* (1995) never address the issue and apparently assume homogeneity of the Japanese and Korean sample populations. Before conducting their research, Kashima *et al.* (1995) seem to have already concluded that the populations of Japan and Korea, and Australia and America were different by considering ethnicity a variable in Australia and America, but not in Japan and Korea. Matsumoto (1999:295) counters, "If we accept stereotypic assumptions about cultures, countries, and self-construals, then we might as well not do the study and assume the findings, too."

1.2 Introduction to Culture Dimensions

Interactants may apply their own culture-dependant expectations to people from different cultures with different culture-dependant expectations, leading to “culture bumps” (Archer 1986). While many culture bumps are situation-specific, such as whether two people should shake hands or bow when they meet, Hofstede (1991:9) proposes culture is composed of visible manifestations of deeper-rooted values, and that the underlying values of cultures are manifest through a finite set of *a priori* constructs. While there is considerable variation between individuals within a culture, Hofstede (1986, 301-320) argues that the *a priori* culture dimensions are representative of a culture’s members as a whole, according to that culture’s scores in different culture dimensions, and relative to other cultures’ scores on the same scales.

1.3 Dimensions of Culture

While Hofstede’s (Hofstede *et al.* 1980, Hofstede 1986 and Hofstede 1991) research involved a series of studies across a multinational company, IBM, he argued these elements were generalizable to any two or more different cultures, where a comparison of their differing scores may help anticipate and avoid culture bumps (Klein *et al.* 2001:1). Often, when a culture bump occurs, it leads to a negative character evaluation, rather than understanding language and culture difficulties, even among teachers in EFL (Thorp 1991).

The four dimensions Hofstede suggests are ‘power distance’ (strong vs. weak), ‘collectivism vs. individualism’, ‘masculine vs. feminine’, and ‘uncertainty avoidance’ (strong vs. weak). These dimensions were independently verified in similar form through an unrelated survey developed by a multinational research team (Hofstede and Bond 1984). The multinational team added a fifth dimension, labeled ‘Confucian dynamism’ (Hofstede and Bond 1984), ‘long-term vs. short-term orientation’ (Hofstede 1991, 159-174), or ‘time orientation’ (Klein *et al.* 2001:2).

In this study, where audience cooperation is solicited in different language codes, two of Hofstede’s dimensions may anticipate audience reactions: uncertainty avoidance and collectivism vs. individualism. Uncertainty avoidance, or the tendency to avoid

the unknown, will be further explained in 1.4, and collectivism vs. individualism, or the tendency of individuals to consider themselves part of a larger group or as individuals will be discussed in 1.5. Because the announcements used in this experiment were written and did not involve interpersonal interaction, in this study the dimensions of power-distance, masculine vs. feminine, and Confucian dynamism are controlled.

1.4 Uncertainty avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance is either strong or weak and defined by Hofstede as “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations”. Japan’s ranking for uncertainty avoidance was the 7th highest of the 53 countries evaluated, and scored 92 out of 100 possible points (Hofstede 1991:113). Thus, Japan fits the definition of a high uncertainty avoidance culture.

Uncertainty avoidance affects this study across situation and announcement categories. This dimension predicts that, when in a familiar situation, such as at a Japanese movie with Japanese dubbing, Japanese audiences will be less anxious, but when faced with an unfamiliar situation, such as an English movie with subtitles, the unfamiliar situation will be stressful and make the audience more anxious. Table 1 summarizes the anticipated impact of uncertainty avoidance across the different variables of this study.

Table 1: Uncertainty Avoidance and Audience Cooperation

| Sign: | A. Japanese Sign | B. English and Japanese Signs |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Situation: | | |
| 1. American movie with Japanese dubbing | Lowest Uncertainty | Uncertain |
| 2. Same American movie with Japanese subtitles | Uncertain | Highest Uncertainty |

Thus, across the different situations, there is an implicit effect of the movie’s coding on audiences. Monolingual Japanese audiences will be most comfortable in situation

1, where their everyday experience is reflected in the language of the movie; speaking Japanese. Situation 2 will be less familiar, as the actors will be speaking a foreign language, and the audience will be reading subtitles, making this an unfamiliar experience when compared to audiences' everyday experiences.

Across announcements, the Japanese sign will be the most familiar to audiences, while the Japanese sign and English sign displayed together will be less familiar. Thus the familiar, Japanese only sign may be less uncertain, making the audience more likely to cooperate. The English and Japanese signs together, less familiar, may induce higher uncertainty, which could make the audience less likely to cooperate.

In taking into account the uncertainty avoidance dimension, it can be anticipated that the largest discrepancy will be between 1.A and 2.B, because in 1.A Japanese will be spoken in the movie and a Japanese sign will be displayed, forming the least uncertain condition. In 2.B, since the audience doesn't encounter English on a daily basis this condition may represent the most uncertainty as English will be spoken in the movie, and an English sign will be displayed parallel to the Japanese sign.

1.5 Collective vs. Individual

Hofstede (1980) defines collective culture as concerned with the well-being of an in-group individuals are born into, while in individual cultures members generally consider themselves independent from the group. However, Hofstede's (1980) dimensions lack a conceptual framework to explain how the dimensions work cognitively (Matsumoto 1999). In addressing this shortcoming, Markus and Kitayama (1991) redefined Hofstede's collective vs. individual as independent vs. interdependent, where Japan represents a typically interdependent culture (Markus and Kitayama 1991:224). As an interdependent culture, the Japanese tend to identify themselves as members of a group, rather than as individuals. "This means that motivations, emotions, and thoughts are part of the whole group" (Klein et al. 2001:12).

The impact of interdependence on audience cooperation can be seen as a result of audience identification with the announcement, regarding whether it is part of the Japanese group or not, as demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Interdependence; In-Group or Out-Group Audience Reactions

| Sign | A. Japanese | B. English and Japanese |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Audience Reaction | In-Group; Sympathetic | Out-Group; Unsympathetic |

Situation A, where the sign is in Japanese, represents an in-group request, while situation B, where the sign is both English and Japanese represents an out-group request. According to the model of interdependence, the Japanese audiences will respond more positively to a request from the in-group, Japanese only sign than from the out-group Japanese and English signs, making audiences in the Japanese only condition more likely to comply with the request than the audiences in the English and Japanese condition.

CHAPTER 2

MATCHED GUISE RESEARCH: LINGUISTIC PRESTIGE AND SITUATION

The matched guise technique-based research differs from Hofstede's culture dimensions in several important ways:

- 1) Hofstede's research is based solely on respondents' answers to questionnaires, while matched guise research incorporates both respondents' questionnaire answers and linguistic behavior
- 2) Hofstede (1991:12) is concerned with the building blocks of cultural differences, *a priori* constructs cultures adapt to in different ways, involving a macro view of culture bounded by national borders. In contrast, matched-guise research has roots in analyzing differences across ethnic groups within national boundaries (Giles and Coupland 1991:33).
- 3) Hofstede claims his findings are universal and independent of local politics and nationalism (Hofstede 1991:5), while matched guise research specifically looks for more local explanations for discrepancies between ethnic groups.

This chapter will define ethnicity, particularly as it relates to Japan in 2.1. The matched guise technique will be explained in 2.2, and then language prestige will be introduced in 2.3. The context of matched guise research, in that it is generally conducted in atmospheres where ethnic and nationalist tensions play a part, will be contrasted with Japan's anglophile reputation in 2.4. Finally, the hypothesis that matched-guise research represents with respect to this study will be discussed in 2.5.

2.1 Ethnicity and Japan

A definition of ethnicity is both elusive and problematic. For the purposes of this paper it is sufficient to contrast ethnicity with the definition of culture given in 1.1. Whereas Hofstede used national boundaries to delineate the groups in his study, and these groups were considered different cultures, matched guise research has concentrated on differences within national borders. Once inside national boundaries, what is or isn't a culture is not a simple question. In many cases, particularly in Japan,

separate cultural groups have tended to attempt to appear as mainstream Japanese, for fear of discrimination, particularly at school and in the workforce (Lie 2001:4).

Thus, in this paper the term ethnicity refers to differences between groups of people within national boundaries, where those differences are products of historical or linguistic differences, and particularly if that group experiences discrimination and/or considers itself somehow unique (Lie 2001:3). Thus, in this definition, mainstream Japanese are the majority ethnicity in Japan, but the Ainu, Okinawans, and Korean Japanese, among others, can be considered separate ethnicities (Lie 2001:3).

In modern discourse on Japan, both within the islands and outside the islands, the Japanese have been considered uniquely monolingual and monoethnic, with a minimum of in-country dialect, accent variation, or minority ethnic groups (Lie 2001:1). While ethnologists, such as Lie, have attempted to refute these claims, monoethnicity and single-class society remain popular myths among the majority of Japanese, a misconception perpetuated through census reporting, which doesn't report ethnicity, instead labeling all Japanese citizens as "Japanese", ignoring people whose family origins are directly linked to China, Korea, or other countries and/or ethnicities (Lie 2001).

Ostheider (2004:3) demonstrates the lack of recognition of non-Japanese Asian ethnic groups in Japan by referencing *Kenkyusha's New Japanese-English Dictionary*, 4th Edition, 1974:

hashi 端 n. <<a pair of>> chopsticks. ¶ Most foreigners are awkward at holding chopsticks.

In the above definition of "foreigners", people from the Asian subcontinent are excluded, and the focus is primarily Western foreigners.

2.2 The Matched Guise Technique

Luhman (1990) summarizes the characteristics of a typical application of the matched guise technique:

The technique is designed to eliminate extraneous variables so that the impact of language or dialect differences on social stereotypes can be measured directly. Participants are exposed to a variety of speech samples of different languages or dialects and are asked to make evaluative guesses about each speaker based only on his or her speech characteristics. The speakers who recorded the speech samples, however, are all bilingual (or bidialectal), so that each speaker records two samples (or guises), one in each language variety, which can later be matched for purposes of comparison. Since the same speaker made both recordings, any impact of voice tone on evaluations that remain should therefore be the result only of stereotypes the judge holds toward different languages or dialects. In such a research design, it is necessary to use a number of different bilingual or bidialectal speakers so that the judges encounter other speakers between each pair of samples from the same speaker and will believe they are evaluating different individuals each time. (Luhman 1990:333)

The traditional matched guise technique, as summarized by Luhman (1990:333), above, is thus divisible into several different steps:

1. Bi-dialectal speakers are asked to read a passage, traditionally subject-neutral (not intended to highlight ethnic tensions) in two or more different dialects.
2. Speakers who are mono-dialectal from both the dialects being researched are also asked to read the passage
3. The recordings of the bi-dialectal speakers and the mono-dialectal speakers are semi-randomly arranged so that subjects hear differently ordered tapes, but the bidialectal speakers' recordings are separated by the monodialectal speakers so subjects don't hear the bidialectal speaker twice in a row, which could possibly give away the nature of the experiment.
4. Subjects are told they will hear different speakers reading a passage, and are asked to rate each speaker on a series of scales. Speakers aren't told some of the people they will hear are the same person.
5. Researchers remove the ratings of the monodialectal speakers, and then compile subjects' impressions of the bidialectal speakers in their different "guises".
6. Any difference in the ratings of the different guises is attested to the difference in dialect, as the speaker was the same person and the only variation was in accent.

There are a variety of variations on the above, typical application, which will be covered in more detail in 4.0, particularly the study upon which this research is based, Bourhis and Giles (1976).

2.3 Language Prestige

In general, the prestige of a language code is the dialect which represents the standard form of pronunciation, “a standard variety is the one that is most often associated with high socioeconomic status, power and media usage in a particular community” (Giles and Coupland 1991:38). In English, RP pronunciation has been rated highly in England, the US, Australia, and New Zealand, and is generally considered the prestige form for the English speaking world (Giles and Coupland 1991:38). Also, America has a prestige broadcast form of English, and the Irish accent has been rated nearly as prestigious as RP accents (Giles and Coupland 1991:38). In Japan, standard Japanese is the language of television news and radio. The general perception among Japanese is that standard Japanese is difficult or impossible for non-Japanese to master (Lie 2001), and there has even been debate regarding whether a foreigner’s, particularly a Western foreigner’s, perceived prestige increases or decreases with increased proficiency in Japanese. Miller (1977:78) refers to the phenomena of decreased prestige when Westerners use fluent Japanese as “the law of inverse returns”.

Regarding prestige in Japan, English and Japanese are both high prestige, while other Asian languages, and non-native speaker Japanese, are considered low prestige (Fairbrother 2004; Long 2004; Ostheider 2004; Ross and Shortreed 1990). There are native minority dialects of Japanese, such as Osaka-bin and the Okinawa dialect, which may also be considered low prestige, though little research available in English has addressed these native dialects.

In addition to linguistic prestige, Japanese also exhibit a hierarchy of visible ethnic prestige which involves regarding Polynesian and other non-European ethnic groups as low-education, low-income and low-prestige, Western ethnicities as high-education, high-income and high-prestige, and Japan and China are ranked between the high and low prestige cultures, with middle prestige (Lie 2001:35). As Lie (2001:32) points out,

the reality in Japan may indeed be the opposite, where Asian and non-European minorities in Japan are drawn from their countries' educational and economic elite, while European-descended foreigners in Japan, such as language teachers, particularly English teachers, may tend to represent their countries' middle and lower classes..

2.4 Language Prestige and the Current Study

Table 3 demonstrates how linguistic prestige may impact this study.

Table 3: Language Prestige and Potential Audience Reactions

| Sign | A. Japanese | B. English and Japanese |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Audience Reaction | High Prestige | Higher Prestige |

Since Japanese is the language of the majority in Japan, it carries high prestige. The English language also carries high prestige in Japan, particularly considering the amount of time devoted to its study during secondary and post-secondary education. Thus the inclusion of English in parallel to Japanese in condition B may represent higher prestige relative to Japanese alone in condition A. According to this representation, the relatively higher prestige of situation B would influence audiences more than the prestige of situation A, resulting in a greater positive response in condition B than condition A.

CHAPTER 3

THE NULL HYPOTHESIS

This chapter details the hypothesis that can be drawn should cultural dimensions and language prestige as described above fail to model cultural behavior in Japan, and is mainly drawn on a criticism of Markus and Kitayama's (1991) refinement of Hofstede's collective vs. individual dimension into interdependent vs. independent by Matsumoto (1999). As Matsumoto writes,

Merely assuming that American samples are individualistic and that Japanese samples are collectivistic, without actually demonstrating these differences empirically, is tantamount to allowing cultural stereotypes to guide theory and research. If we are to empirically demonstrate the validity of core beliefs underlying our theories and research, then assumptions of such crucial aspects of our theories and studies cannot be merely accepted as "truth". If we accept stereotypic assumptions about cultures, countries, and self-construals, then we might as well not do the study and assume the findings, too. If, however, we are to do science well, assumptions about crucial elements of the research and of the theory need to be made explicit and formally tested. (1999:295)

A criticism of the measures of culture differences is that many studies assume the individual-collective orientations of their samples, and don't administer a tool to measure subjects' scores on an individual-collective scale (Matsumoto 1999:294). In cases where researchers have administered a scale to measure levels of collectivism or individualism across countries, the results have been mixed (Bond and Smith 1996:113). As Bond and Smith explain:

On the face of it, then, the research literature does not provide clear evidence of a systematic relationship between cultural conditions and conformity. Authors have variously reported relationships across cultures in the expected direction, in the opposite direction to what has been expected, or have remarked on the consistency of the effect across cultures. Likewise, some have found that the level of conformity varies across time, whereas others have been impressed by its stability. (1996:113)

In the face of such criticisms of Hofstede's culture model and the saliency of finite, measurable *a priori* constructs occurring in differing intensities across cultures, it becomes necessary to consider other possible models for human behavior.

In particular, one study Matsumoto mentions as evidence against culture constructs has expanded the theory of how the dimension of collectivism works (Matsumoto

1999:296). Yamagishi hypothesized that the tendencies toward collectivism in highly collective societies was externally motivated, through a system of social sanctions, and therefore would disappear when social sanctioning systems were removed (Yamagishi 1988a and 1988b). His hypotheses were experimentally verified, to the point where, in the absence of sanctioning, American students appeared to be more collective than Japanese students (Yamagishi 1988b:269). Yamagishi (1988a:534) explained this reversal of Hofstede's conclusions regarding collective vs. individual cultures as follows:

1. People who are forced to cooperate through external sanctions lack intrinsic motivation
2. Such people "...come to think that they are cooperating because of the sanctions" (Yamagishi 1988a:534)
3. They also attribute the cooperative behaviors of others to the external sanctions and not to internal motivations
4. People only cooperate to the extent which they expect others to cooperate
5. Therefore, when sanctioning is not present, they will "...become less trustful of their fellow members and, as a result, become less cooperative themselves." (Yamagishi 1988a:535)
6. Collective or interdependent cultures fit the conditions of 1, above, while independent cultures don't fit the conditions of 1, above.

Therefore, in a situation where no social sanction is in place to induce cooperation in Japan, according to Yamagishi (1988a and 1988b) it is reasonable to predict that Japanese will choose not to cooperate. While in the same situation in America, cooperation among Americans may be more likely. Yamagishi's (1988a and 1988b) experimental findings supported this hypothesis.

CHAPTER 4
HOW SITUATIONAL FACTORS MAY INFLUENCE JAPANESE AUDIENCES:
THREE HYPOTHESES

There are three hypotheses that inform this research:

1. Culture dimensions influence Japanese audiences
2. Linguistic prestige influences Japanese audiences
3. Other factors unrelated to cultural dimensions or linguistic prestige influence Japanese audiences

Table 4 summarizes the above hypotheses.

Table 4: Three Hypotheses of Audience reactions

| Hypothesis: | Movie Type | Sign | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Japanese | Japanese and English |
| 1. Culture Dimensions | Dubbed | Highest Conformity | Middle Conformity |
| | Subtitled | Middle Conformity | Lowest Conformity |
| 2. Prestige | Dubbed | Lower Conformity | Higher Conformity |
| | Subtitled | | |
| 3. Null | Dubbed | No significant differences | |
| | Subtitled | | |

In hypothesis 1, Culture dimensions predict Japanese audiences will react more positively to a Japanese sign than to an English and Japanese sign displayed together, and also that audiences will tend to react more positively to requests in familiar situations, such as when the movie they are watching is dubbed, relative to unfamiliar situations where the movie they are watching is in a foreign language with subtitles, where they may react less positively.

In contrast, hypothesis 2, the matched-guise tradition, considers Japanese to be relatively lower prestige than Japanese and English displayed together. Therefore, audiences may react more positively to the higher prestige condition.

In the final, null hypothesis, there will be no significant difference between the conditions, as factors other than movie language coding and sign type influence the results.

CHAPTER 5

BOURHIS AND GILES (1976): A MODEL FOR THIS STUDY

In 1976 the fact that subjects' impressions of speakers were at least in part influenced by accent had already been established in several different settings using matched-guise research, as outlined in section 2.2. Bourhis and Giles (1976), in their study, intended to address two criticisms that had been raised against matched guise research:

1. Research had involved repetitive, content-controlled speech, where different speakers read similar (seemingly neutral) scripts (Bourhis and Giles 1976:13)
2. Attitudes toward speakers had been extensively measured, but whether attitude influenced behavior had not been empirically tested (Bourhis and Giles 1976:13)

To address these concerns, they conducted a study involving theater audiences, a natural setting which was intended to counter criticism 1, above:

1. different audiences on different nights would be involved, so the experimental subjects would hear only one speech condition
2. subjects would be naïve to the existence of the experiment, and therefore the speech condition would appear to be a natural part of the theater program

To address criticism 2 from above, the measure of the experiment was the percentage of audience members in each condition who cooperated with a request to complete a questionnaire, which was a measure of behavior and not attitude.

They conducted their experiment in the same theater during two different productions, one English play and one Welsh play (Bourhis and Giles 1976:14). They recorded four different announcement types using the same speaker for each announcement, creating 1) RP, 2) mild English Welsh, 3) broad English Welsh, and 4) Welsh language recordings of the same announcement asking patrons to please complete a questionnaire (Bourhis and Giles 1976:14). With the audiences at the English play,

they played announcements 1 to 3 on different nights of the production, and with the audiences at the Welsh play, they played announcements 1 to 4 on different nights of the production (Bourhis and Giles 1976:14).

Bourhis and Giles (1976) concluded that their findings supported their hypotheses, which were:

1. A predominantly English-only speaking audience of Welshmen (the Anglo-Welsh group) would react more favorably to a Welsh-than RP-accented plea
2. A Welsh speaking audience (the bilingual Welsh group) would react more favorably to a plea in Welsh than in English, and in case of the latter, more favorably to a Welsh-than RP-accented request.

(Bourhis and Giles 1976:14)

5.1 Issues with Bourhis and Giles (1976): Welsh nationalism vs. Japan

Research into speech prejudice isn't conducted in a vacuum, and is generally designed to empirically measure a prejudice that is already widely recognized. As Luhman (1990:334) states, "...the purpose of matched guise research is to elicit stereotypes..." Therefore, matched guise research may tend to be conducted in locations and situations where there is a tendency toward prejudice for or against certain modes of speech. Such research plays a role in verifying the existence of stereotypes, and in indicating how those stereotypes may affect people's lives, such as in employment interviews (Soukup 2000).

Yet the downside of matched-guise research is that it is interested in determining which variables, or combination of variables, induces prejudice, and often fails to consider which variables or combination of variables may induce people to exhibit less prejudice.

To return to Luhman, "Although the purpose of matched guise research is to elicit stereotypes of speakers, the results of such research are more useful and interesting if those stereotypes appear when linguistic variation is minimal" (1990:334).

This research set out to minimize the factors that induce prejudice through two strategies:

1. A country in which language issues regarding English are generally considered non-controversial was used; Japan
2. Written stimuli were used instead of spoken announcements

There has historically been language conflict in Japan, between different native ethnic groups, such as the Ainu, and non-native ethnic groups such as the Korean Japanese, on the one hand and majority Japanese on the other (Miller 1977:73, Lie 2000). Yet, while present, the general consensus is that such controversies aren't part of the mainstream dialog in Japan, especially when contrasted with the Welsh nationalism movement in the UK. In fact, of late, Western researchers have experienced difficulty bringing ethnicity into Japan's national dialog (Lie 2000:1).

Therefore, regarding Japanese theater audiences, it is unlikely that there will be a strong nationalistic reaction to English, and it is possible there will be no reaction at all. The use of English signs could be contrasted with using Korean or Chinese signs, which, due to historical factors, may induce stronger nationalist reactions in Japanese audiences.

The second point at which this research differs from Bourhis and Giles is in the use of the written medium instead of the spoken medium. Accent is thought to be immediately recognizable, and as various matched-guise researchers have already indicated, tends to influence both listeners' impressions of a speaker and their tendency to comply with a speaker's requests (Bourhis and Giles 1976, Luhman 1990, Soukup 2000), even in Japan (Long 2004, Ostheider:2004). Therefore rather than concentrate on the effects of spoken requests, this study relied on written requests.

5.2 Issues with the Current Research: Movie Preference and Younger Audiences

One advantage Bourhis and Giles (1976) enjoyed in their study, which the current design lacks, was that Bourhis and Giles (1976) could be relatively certain that the audience members in each of their conditions had chosen to attend either the Welsh play or the English play.

With the current study, while the theater where Harry Potter 3 was showing was cooperative regarding this study's research, and was ideally suited for comparing two different movie-going conditions, the possibility of Harry Potter 3 appealing to younger audiences might influence the results of this study.

Since Japanese children learn to read sequentially, through graded levels of kanji, it is unlikely that primary or middle school students would have the reading proficiency to be able to follow a subtitled film. Therefore, while some adults escorting their children may prefer to see a subtitled movie, they may be forced to visit the dubbed movie in order to satisfy their children.

CHAPTER 6
THE METHOD:
QUESTIONNAIRE AND ANNOUNCEMENT DESIGN

A questionnaire was designed, in Japanese, translated from the following English questions, and printed on A4 paper:

- 1) How many total movies do you watch per month, anywhere?
a. 1 or less b. 2-3 c. 4-6 d. more than 6
- 2) How many movies do you watch in the theater per month?
a. 1 or less b. 2-3 c. 4-6 d. more than 6
- 3) How many do you watch in this theater per month?
a. 1 or less b. 2-3 c. 4-6 d. more than 6
- 4) Do you study English now?
a. Yes b. No
 - 4.1) If yes, how often do you study?
a. less than once a week b. once a week c. more than once a week
 - 4.2) Where do you study?
a. Private language school b. home c. community center d. college/university/school
- 5) Have you ever been abroad?
a. Yes b. No
 - 5.1) If yes, for how long?
a. less than 1 month b. more than 1 month c. more than 1 year
- 6) What type of movie would you prefer to watch in the future?
a. Subtitles b. Dubbing c. Both

The Japanese version of the questionnaire is included in Appendix 1.

Question 6 was added to test for the possibility of the concerns raised in 5.2, regarding possible cross-preferences within audiences.

Standard demographic information, such as age and gender, was deliberately omitted, as the theater manager was concerned about protecting audience privacy, and not making the patrons uncomfortable. Additionally, a primary influence in questionnaire

design was ensuring it could be completed quickly so patrons wouldn't block the exits as they completed it.

Two signs were designed and printed on A4 paper, one in English, and one in Japanese. The text of the signs is reproduced below:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| English Sign | Please tell us about yourself. In order to improve our services, we would like to know more about you, our customers. Please take a few minutes to complete our customer service questionnaire. |
| Japanese Sign | アンケートに記入をお願いします。記入後のアンケート用紙は備えつけの回収箱に入れて下さい。ご協力ありがとうございました。 |

Because the majority of Japanese are monolingual, no effort was taken to make back-translations of the questionnaires or the signs. It was assumed that audience members would notice the English signs, but not translate between the English and Japanese.

It was planned to display the English and Japanese signs together, then take down the English sign and display only the Japanese sign at the Roxy Theater, in Nagano City, during showings of Harry Potter 3. The theater is divided into two different cinemas with separate entrances, at one cinema Harry Potter 3 was shown with Japanese dubbing, and at the other cinema it was shown with Japanese subtitles. Since the entrances are separate, audiences at one movie don't see the lobby of the other movie.

Five hundred questionnaires were prepared, and divided between the different theaters. The questionnaires were placed, with pens, on a table visible to audiences as they entered and exited the cinema, and the signs were taped to the wall above the questionnaires. It was planned to first display the English and Japanese signs together at both cinemas, then to take down the English sign and only display the Japanese sign.

The main measure would be the number of questionnaires completed, as expressed by the total percentage of movie attendees.

CHAPTER 7

PROCEDURE AND RESULTS

At the outset, there was difficulty coordinating administration of the questionnaire between management and the theater staff. One consequence of this difficulty in communication was that, between August 2nd and August 5th, theater staff handed the questionnaire to patrons, collecting 141 solicited questionnaires. These questionnaires were later used to test if there were any significant differences between patrons' answers from the dubbed or subtitled movie groups.

From August 6th to 11th, the Japanese and English signs were used in tandem according to the original experimental design, then from August 12th to 15th only the Japanese signs were used.

The results from the initial, solicited sample, where theater staff asked patrons to complete the questionnaire are included in Table 5. An asterisk (*) indicates statistically significant results, at $p \leq .05$.

Table 5: Comparison of Subtitle and Dubbing in Solicited Sample

| | Experience | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Currently Study English | Dubbed | Subtitled | Total Respondents |
| Yes | 33%* | 52%* | 55 |
| No | 66%* | 43%* | 87 |
| Foreign Experience | Dubbed | Subtitled | Total Respondents |
| Yes | 52% | 41% | 68 |
| No | 45% | 55% | 68 |
| Total Number of Respondents | 97 | 44 | 141 |

The totals in Table 5 are slightly different than the sum of answers because some respondents didn't answer every question on the questionnaire. It was thought that patrons interested in English and/or travel would tend to prefer subtitled movies, and the number of patrons indicating they currently study English was significantly different between the different conditions, indicating that those who attended the

subtitled performance were more likely to be studying English. Although, since demographic information wasn't collected, and the study of English is compulsory in Japan from Junior High School through University, this tendency could be the result of demographic differences between the samples. Regarding foreign experience, item 5 on the questionnaire, no statistically significant difference was found between audience members attending the dubbed Japanese movie and those attending the subtitled movie. This indicates that foreign experience isn't necessarily a predictor of interest in English.

The solicited sample also provided a means of checking audience preference to ensure they were attending the movie type of their preference. The results of the preference analysis are included in Table 6. An asterisk (*) indicates statistically significant results, at $p \leq .05$.

Table 6: Check of Subtitled and Dubbed Conditions for Actual Preference

| Preference | Dubbed | Subtitled | Total |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Dubbed | 57%* | 2%* | 58 |
| Mixed | 11%* | 21%* | 20 |
| Subtitled | 32%* | 77%* | 65 |
| Total Respondents | 100 | 43 | 143 |

The number of patrons who prefer to see the type of movie they attended was statistically significant in both conditions. Also, at the dubbed movie, the number of patrons who preferred to see a subtitled movie, the opposite condition, was statistically significant. Therefore, the possibility that a significant number of patrons attending the dubbed movie may actually prefer subtitles is confirmed.

After a total of 10 days of conducting the experiment using signs, 6 days of English and Japanese signs together and 4 days of only a Japanese sign, there were only 7 respondents. Their data is displayed in Table 7. There were no statistically significant results generated in any of the conditions.

Table 7: Experimental Results of Sign Coding and Movie Language Experience

| Questionnaires | Dubbed | Subtitled | Total Days |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
| English & Japanese Sign | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Japanese Sign | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Total Completed Questionnaires | 6 | 1 | 10 |

Due to the lack of audience response, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the different conditions is not disproved.

CHAPTER 8

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Initially, the lack of respondents was disappointing, especially when contrasted with Bourhis and Giles' response rates of up to 26% of the total number of audience members in attendance (1976:15). In the current study, the total number of audience members is irrelevant, as the data gathered is near 0% of the total number of patrons, regardless of the condition. The fact that the theater manager asked for 500 questionnaires gives an idea of how unprepared both researchers and theater staff were for the lack of audience response.

The contrast between Bourhis and Giles' (1976) success and this study's apparent lack of success is even more pronounced when the simplicity of the method of the current study is contrasted with the complexity of the method of the Bourhis and Giles (1976) study:

When all members of the audience had entered the auditorium, questionnaire forms were placed at convenient points in the foyer and bilingual signs were posted to indicate their location. After the announcement, members of the audience who wished to complete the questionnaire had to leave the auditorium, walk through the foyer, ignore the bar, find the questionnaire forms, and finally complete and return them to the box office. Ushers were strictly forbidden to distribute questionnaires or guide people towards them. At the end of each performance, the completed questionnaires were counted and the total audience number was obtained from the box office ticket records.

In the Bourhis and Giles (1976) study, it was necessary for the audience members to follow several steps in order to comply with the announcement. In contrast, at the theater where this research was conducted, it was only necessary to complete the questionnaire on the way into or out of the movie, and deposit it in a box next to the questionnaires.

This chapter will interpret what the results of this research means with respect to each of the three hypotheses; 1) cultural dimensions, 2) linguistic prestige, and 3) other possible factors.

8.1 Culture Dimensions and this Research

Were the results of this study statistically significant in their current form, they would support the hypothesis that Japanese uncertainty avoidance and interdependence influenced the conditions in this study.

Table 8 revisits the hypothesis regarding culture dimensions, and compares the original hypothesis with the experimental findings for each condition.

Table 8: Culture Dimension Hypotheses vs. Experimental Results

| | Movie Type | Sign | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| | | Japanese | Japanese and English |
| Culture Dimensions Hypothesis | Dubbed | Highest Conformity | Middle Conformity |
| | Subtitled | Middle Conformity | Lowest Conformity |
| Experimental Results | Dubbed | 5 | 1 |
| | Subtitled | 1 | 0 |

As table 8 demonstrates, the highest conformity group, those who are in the least uncertain situation and are seeing an in-group sign, i.e. Japanese-only, have demonstrated the highest degree of conformity, completing five questionnaires, while the group in the most uncertain situation, and seeing an out-group sign, i.e. Japanese and English displayed together, demonstrates the least degree of conformity, with zero questionnaires completed. The middle conditions, where audiences experience a mixed degree of uncertainty, either an out-group sign in the least uncertain situation, or an in-group sign in an uncertain situation, are almost as unresponsive as the condition with the least degree of uncertainty, with only one questionnaire completed in each condition.

With only a total of seven respondents from all the people attending the movie, it can be argued that culture dimensions have only a minimal influence on the degree of audience cooperation. If a researcher were hoping to elicit complicity in questionnaire

completion, according to the current research, relying on audiences attending dubbed Japanese movies and using only Japanese signs would hardly predict success.

Thus, while the hypothesis of culture dimensions is minimally supported, the results of this study don't seem to indicate that, in Japan, the dimensions of high vs. low uncertainty avoidance and independence vs. collectivity have significant influence in natural settings. While questionnaire-based experimental results seem to indicate significant in-country effects for culture dimensions (Hofstede 1980), when measuring behavior these significant effects are lacking.

Unfortunately, there is no comparable data for audiences in other countries, and the lack of significant experimental effects in the current research may predict that no similar studies will be conducted in the future.

8.2 Linguistic Prestige and this Research

The current research, while statistically non-significant, indicates a trend against the hypothesis of additive prestige when using Japanese and English together, as the Japanese only condition elicited more responses, with 6 questionnaires completed, than the English and Japanese condition, which elicited only one questionnaire. While the Japanese condition exhibited the strongest response rate, it can hardly be claimed that six patrons complying from the total number of people seeing Harry Potter 3 represents cooperation, though it may represent a statistically non-significant degree of less uncooperative behavior. This lack of audience response may be caused by three differences between this research and more traditional linguistic prestige literature.

1. Differences between regions where language issues are part of the national or local character, such as Wales or the South of the United States, and Japan
2. Motivational differences between written and spoken requests
3. Motivational differences between live performance audiences and movie audiences

Table 9 compares the hypothesis based on the linguistic prestige model with the experimental results.

Table 9: Linguistic Prestige Hypothesis vs. Experimental Results

| | Movie Type | Sign | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| | | Japanese | Japanese and English |
| Prestige Hypothesis | Dubbed | Lower Conformity | Higher Conformity |
| | Subtitled | | |
| Experimental Results | Dubbed | 6 | 1 |
| | Subtitled | | |

Whereas Bourhis and Giles (1976) were able to use the difference in percentages of the audience who complied with the requests to complete questionnaires in each of their experimental conditions, if percentages of the total audience who complied are used with respect to the current data, then each condition appears equal, exhibiting at or near zero cooperation. This lack of cooperation implies that language prestige didn't play a detectable role in this research and indicates neither written Japanese nor written English requests can elicit significant audience cooperation.

If the data is interpreted in terms of the number of people completing the questionnaires, then the hypothesis that Japanese and English signs together represent higher prestige than Japanese alone is refuted by the experimental results, since there was only one respondent in the condition where Japanese and English were displayed together, and there were six respondents when Japanese was displayed alone. According to the language prestige model, audience compliance should have been in the opposite direction; the English and Japanese condition should have elicited more compliance, and the Japanese only condition less compliance. Thus, according to the data collected, a possible interpretation is that in Japan, Japanese elicits more cooperation than Japanese and English.

8.2.1 Influence of Linguistic Controversy and this Research

A possible discrepancy between this study and Bourhis and Giles (1976) could involve the environment of linguistic tension in Wales influencing Welsh audiences and generating a significant discrepancy in cooperation between linguistic codes, with people from prestige groups reacting positively to prestige language and negatively to non-prestige language. In Japan, where language policy with respect to English is less controversial, the lack of controversy may fail to influence audiences to respond to prestige, making the difference between the experimental conditions negligible.

8.2.2 Motivational Differences between Written and Spoken Requests

Another explanation of the differences between the current results and Bourhis and Giles' (1976) results may be that written requests function differently from spoken requests with regard to audience motivation and were the current study repeated using spoken announcements then the results would reflect the prestige model hypothesis. The trend in this research, however, seems to indicate the opposite; that in the Japanese condition Japanese audiences would demonstrate more cooperation than in a condition with English and Japanese, as patrons responded more positively to the Japanese sign than to English and Japanese signs in tandem.

It is also possible that in Japan, English is high prestige in formal school settings, but outside of school, in social settings such as movie theaters, English is non-standard. Since people tend to react negatively to non-standard languages, to the point where in Quebec Francophones exhibit stereotypes against fellow French speakers (Lambert et. al 1960:46), then audiences may react negatively in situations where even high-prestige languages are non-standard, thereby explaining the discrepancy between audience reactions and the language prestige hypothesis in this study. Were this the case, and the relative standardness of language were shown to influence audience reactions, then the model of language prestige as it has been developed would need to incorporate this new variable into existing theory.

8.3 Other Possible Factors and this Research

Due to the lack of audience response, the null hypothesis is not refuted. Therefore, the most statistically likely explanation is that there is no difference between the different conditions in this experiment. This section considers four possible explanations for the conditions being similar:

1. The culture dimensions fail to adequately model Japanese behavior
2. Linguistic Prestige, in cases where language is non-controversial, does not significantly influence behavior
3. A lack of sanctioning results in a lack of cooperation
4. Other non-linguistic, non-cultural variables confounded the results

8.3.1 Culture Dimensions Fail to Adequately Model Japanese Behavior

While Hofstede (1980) and many other researchers and theorists who followed him, such as Markus and Kitayama (1991), view culture dimensions as static markers of culture, it is possible that cultures, as they are rated in dimensions such as independence and interdependence, are dynamic. If cultures' scores are dynamic, then they are barometric in nature, indicating the influences of recent sociopolitical and socioeconomic changes (Bond and Smith 1996:112).

If it is true that cultures change their relative positioning on the culture dimensions over time, then many of Hofstede's (1991) explanations regarding the dovetailing of historic factors and culture dimensions may prove to be less influential on culture ratings than originally proposed. Instead of relying on historical attributes and considering culture dimensions static, it may prove necessary to rely instead on recent and current sociopolitical processes to explain characteristics of national behavior and dynamically model culture dimensions, if it is possible to continue to use nationality as a predictor of behavior at all.

8.3.2 Linguistic Prestige does not significantly influence behavior

This study, in contrast to past studies of the relationship between linguistic prestige and stereotypes, has sought to minimize the differences between the different language

groups by using written rather than spoken language, and by minimizing the degree of interpersonal interaction. Additionally, English was used in the study, a language which is seldom subject to criticism in Japan.

While this study recorded no statistically significant difference between subjects' response to English and their response to Japanese, it may be possible to generate statistically significant results by using spoken language instead of written language. Also, there are languages which do engender controversy in Japan, such as Korean, Chinese, or any of the local Japanese dialects. It is probable that, were one of these languages utilized experimentally in a spoken form, then the differences between experimental conditions would prove statistically significant.

Also, similarly collected data isn't available for other countries. If the degree of cooperation in another country proved to be significantly higher using written requests such as signs, or if the rate of response in a given condition were significant, then it would be necessary to search for a region-specific reason as to why Japanese audiences are so unresponsive to written requests.

8.3.3 Lack of Sanctioning Results in Lack of Cooperation

This experiment doesn't adequately meet the requirements of determining whether Yamagishi's (1988a and 1988b) model of social sanctioning is salient when eliciting compliance in Japan. If Yamagishi's (1988a and 1988b) model were to be tested, it would be necessary to add a sanctioning system as an experimental condition, which would prove difficult in a natural setting, particularly at a commercial venue.

Table 10 demonstrates how this experiment does not adequately test the saliency of Yamagishi's theory.

Table 10: Yamagishi's (1988a and 1988b) Model of Sanctioning and this Research

| Conditions: | Sanctioning | No Sanctioning |
|--------------------|--|--|
| | Not represented in this research; may exhibit higher cooperation | Represented in this research; exhibits low cooperation |

8.3.4 Possible Non-linguistic, Non-cultural Confounders

Three possible confounders of this experiment are:

1. Harry Potter audiences are not indicative of mainstream Japanese
2. Lack of collaboration between researcher and theater management
3. Live theater audiences are more likely to respond positively to management requests for feedback than movie theater audiences.

Since Harry Potter has an appeal to both adults and children, it could be that busy parents had little or no opportunity to comply with the request to complete the questionnaire, despite a desire to do it. Also, parents accompanying children may have preferred to see a subtitled movie, but were forced to attend the dubbed movie to meet the needs of their children.

Bourhis and Giles (1976:14) indicated they worked with the management of the theater used in their study to make their questionnaire address audience impressions of past performances and to elicit audience opinions regarding possible future performances. Unfortunately, in this study the degree of cooperation between theater and researchers was minimal, and therefore the questionnaire used wasn't modeled to the cinema. Perhaps, were the questionnaire more customized, it would have generated a higher degree of interest. Though, if this proved to be the case, then it would appear that announcements' linguistic characteristics play a lesser role than questionnaire customization.

The third issue concerns the settings of the two experiments. Bourhis and Giles (1976) set their research in a live performance theater, while this research was carried out in a movie theater. It is possible that live performance theater audiences may feel greater affinity toward the venue than movie audiences. A greater affinity may result in theater audiences being more likely to respond to requests for feedback than audiences at movie theaters. This tendency toward greater interest in providing feedback could be particularly relevant at live venues which promote minority ethnic languages, such as the theater used by Bourhis and Giles (1976), which showed both Welsh language and English language performances. Movie theater audiences may not be so interested in leaving feedback, as management at movie theaters may play a lesser role in selecting shows than the management at live theaters.

CHAPTER 9

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH—CONCESSION OF LIMITATIONS

To date, the research emphasis in both culture dimensions and linguistic prestige has been to develop context-independent models of behavior, focusing on how people respond to questionnaires regarding hypothetical situations and character evaluations of speakers heard only on tape. Interestingly, in a case where a context-dependant experiment was carried out, through recording and objectively analyzing interlocutors' conversations in Japan, Japanese attributed positive characteristics to both high linguistic prestige interactants (Westerners) and low linguistic prestige interactants (Southeast Asians), though there were some statistically significant differences in the positive ratings (Long 2004:18).

Perhaps in objective, hypothetical scenarios, subjects will predict behavior that deviates from their actual behavior in subjective, interactive scenarios. This could be similar to the difference between intuitive lexical listings in EFL/ESL textbooks, and listings based on corpus data, where intuitive listings of vocabulary, such as verbs, often fail to match lists of the most frequently occurring verbs in a corpus (Hunston and Laviosa 2000:110). Thus, when subjects are asked to predict their behavior in cross-cultural or linguistically diverse contexts, the experimental results may significantly differ from experiments where subject behavior is recorded and analyzed.

If the behavior subjects predict and the behavior they exhibit are different, then the measures of prejudice generated from the objective questionnaires traditionally used in linguistic prestige research may be statistically skewed toward significance. In experiments using actual conversation the character evaluations of two interlocutors, one with high linguistic prestige and one low linguistic prestige, may exhibit less significant differences.

The weaknesses of linguistic prestige research also apply to the culture dimensions model, as it has also relied on evaluative measures. In objective, hypothetical situations such as those used in questionnaires, significant differences between cultures may appear that are only marginally reflected in natural interactions.

Particularly in international business contexts, there is often a need to adjust one's personal preferences and adapt to local contexts and situations. Japanese and Americans are often cited as being on opposite ends of the independent/interdependent scale, but their differences on objective scale measures can hardly be claimed to make the two nationalities incapable of interacting. Also, little research has been done to determine whether Japanese populations living in America continue to reflect the cultural dimensions of Japan, or change to reflect the cultural dimensions of America and vice-versa. In the one case where such an opportunity existed, researchers chose to exclude the Asian-Americans from their sample, a dubious decision at best, because it either indicates that Asian-Americans aren't a valid part of the American citizenry, or that researchers are more interested in perpetuating stereotypes than they are in discovering objective truths (Kashima *et al.* 1995:927)

As Matsumoto (1996:294) laments, if studies continue to assume the universality of differences between cultures without attempting to objectively measure those differences, then the science of culture studies is doing little more than perpetuating stereotypes. The perpetuation of stereotypes runs counter to the aims of culture research, which should attempt to build bridges between cultures rather than separate and divide them.

While the current research does little to reinforce or undermine the culture dimensions research, future research could consider how subjective interlocutors and objective raters differ. Subjective interlocutors are interactants who see each other face-to-face, while objective interlocutors are subjects who answer questionnaires regarding hypothetical situations, or rate people on scales through audio recordings. Unfortunately, much research to date has concentrated on only the objective conditions, and assumed that objective predictions significantly influence subjective behavior. Yet researchers such as Yamagishi (1988a and 1988b) and Long (2004) have raised doubts regarding those assumptions. It may very well be that a person rated negatively through audio recordings is rated positively after interacting directly with subjects. Such research, while methodologically and logistically challenging, would serve to illustrate just how reliable objective measures are in predicting natural behavior.

Also, in the case of culture dimensions, researchers such as Hofstede (1991:49) have often illustrated the saliency of the dimensions through examples of international cross-cultural mishaps and miscommunications. In one such example, a Saudi corporation run by two brothers was reluctant, when their contact in a Swedish corporation was promoted, to accept the newly appointed supervisor of their account, and instead insisted on continuing to work with the employee they had previous experience with (Hofstede 1991:49). Hofstede's (1991:49) interpretation of this episode involves the cultural difference between Sweden, which is independent, and Saudi Arabia, which is interdependent. While this explanation makes sense if cultural dimensions are an accurate depiction of reality, after the criticisms of Bond and Smith (1996) and Matsumoto (1999), and the experimental findings counter to Hofstede's predictions in Yamagishi (1988a and 1988b), it is perhaps necessary to forward another, non-culture dimension-related explanation.

A culture dimension independent explanation involves contrasting the differences between the business cultures of Sweden and Saudi Arabia. Whereas Sweden, a Western country in Europe, has a history of corporate culture where there is considerable mobility within and between companies, Saudi Arabia could be characterized as composed of family businesses, where there is less mobility within and between companies. Therefore, while Swedish businesses would consider it appropriate to contact the person with the appropriate job position or title, in Saudi Arabia it may be more appropriate to contact the proper person, since business is a family affair and therefore involves decision making based on familiarity rather than according to corporate structure diagrams. In future research it may be appropriate to determine whether or not family business owners in Sweden and multinational employees in Saudi Arabia are comfortable switching between business contacts.

Such models as the above culture dimension independent explanation would rely on specific, local differences between cultures, taking into account socioeconomic, political, and historical differences along with situation and context-specific data regarding interactants, such as economic and educational backgrounds. Less emphasis would be placed on large, macro-attributes such as the different scores of the cultures on objective scales.

CHAPTER 10

IMPLICATIONS

Currently, models of human behavior in cultural contexts tend to emphasize context-free models of behavior, relying on objective variables which inform how different cultures, and interlocutors exhibiting different linguistic characteristics, may tend to interact with and react to each other. However, the two popular cultural models, culture dimensions and linguistic prestige may not be predictors of general behavior, as is assumed in the literature, but may instead be models of the contexts in which they were developed.

10.1 Implications for Culture Dimensions

Hofstede's (1980) culture dimensions were developed in tandem with IBM, in an effort to explain how different local branches of a single multinational company may act and/or react differently to similar situations. While the dimensions take an objective view of the different cultures in general, and attempt to place the burden of differences on cultural factors, it may instead be the case that socioeconomic factors play a greater role than cultural factors alone. For example, in the interaction between a Saudi Arabian company and a Swedish company, cited in 9.0, it may be that the different business cultures make the cultural dimensions salient, but outside the context of business, other variables become salient.

If this is true, then culture dimensions may be able to explain interaction in multinational professional settings where the interactants are both employees of different multinational companies, and their time together, and the nature of their interactions are determined by their respective employers and not necessarily according to personal preference. In such situations it may be likely that the interactants rely more heavily on abstract culture-dependant ideals of interaction to define the relationship; the same ideals quantified through the culture dimensions. The same two people, however, were they to meet in a social setting, might rely less heavily on these same culture-dependant ideals.

Regarding this observation, it is enlightening to refer back to Hofstede's (1991:50) example regarding the Saudi and Swedish companies' misunderstanding "So the corporation twisted its structure to allow Johanneson to handle the Saudi account..." (Hofstede 1991:50). The perspective Hofstede (1991:50) uses is from the viewpoint of the Swedish company, which feels it is making a major concession to its Saudi customer, though from the opposite perspective the Saudi corporation feels it is only natural for their familiar contact to continue to coordinate their accounts. In the Saudi family business, the person who is most familiar with the account is perhaps preferable to the person who is in the appropriate department.

Thus, in a multinational business capacity, it may be effective to rely on the culture dimensions to explain difficulties in communication. When the culture dimensions are applied in non-business interpersonal settings, such as in Yamagishi's experiment (1988a and 1988b), the culture dimensions may prove less salient, and alternative models of behavior become appropriate.

Another criticism of culture dimensions is that they may be one-sided; capable only of explaining interactions originating from Western organizations operating internationally, which is the primary purpose to which they've been applied. It may hold true that in interactions from non-Western cultures with the West, the culture dimension are less salient. This one-way applicability could be a product of the business hierarchy in the West, whereas other cultures without such a hierarchy find the dimensions irrelevant.

The applications of culture dimensions have been considered in aviation contexts where an American company supplied its aircraft, aircraft maintenance, and aircraft safety technology to China and the Middle East (Klein et al. 2001) and international military collaboration projects (Klein and Hahn 2003). Unfortunately, the context of both of these reports was how to adapt the company/organization systems to take into account the discrepancies between the different cultures, rather than in creating a system where the members of the different organizations from different cultures could interact and define their own interpersonal compromises. The perspective seems to be that of experts determining the most effective means of interaction between two incompatible groups, then implementing a system whereby the two incompatible

elements are somehow shaped into being compatible, rather than a system where the interactants are made responsible for developing interpersonal compatibility in a decentralized manner. The context is parallel to a language teaching model where students are considered objects to be acted upon and taught appropriate language, as opposed to a teaching model where students are considered independent actors capable of analyzing and developing their own unique language and learning models, where the teacher is an informant in the learning process but not a dictator of learning methods.

Perhaps from a different cultural view, as in the Saudi example, the brothers would consider it necessary when engaging in business with a new company to befriend someone who understands their needs and can navigate within the company with whom they are considering doing business with. Once a reliable person has been found, then it is only necessary to continue contact with that person to guarantee a satisfactory relationship. From this perspective, engaging from Saudi Arabia to Sweden, the process involves finding someone trustworthy who is a representative of the appropriate organization, then utilizing their expertise and understanding to meet your needs. It is easy to understand how upset the Saudis may become when their well-valued contact is suddenly removed at the whim of the larger company. They would feel as if it would be necessary to start the friendship process over again from the beginning. Hofstede's (1991:49) culture conflict only surfaces when the Swedish company attempts to force its mobile employee policy on its Saudi customer. Likewise, in the case of Boeing exporting its technologies to China, the conflicts arise when Western overseers and trainers attempt to force their own concerns on their Chinese colleagues, rather than attempting to develop working compromises (Klein *et al.* 2001).

10.2 Implications for Linguistic Prestige

The research concerning linguistic prestige has tended to concentrate on areas where linguistic policy is somehow controversial, or where minority groups may be subject to considerable negative prejudice (Bourhis and Giles 1976 and Luhman 1990). While there are thought to be considerable degrees of negative stereotypes toward minorities in Japan (Lie 2000:81), those negative stereotypes generally don't apply to English-speaking residents (Long 2000:35). So this research offers a contrast to traditional research, as it was conducted in a location where language policy regarding the two languages studied isn't controversial, whereas more traditional prestige research has concentrated on locations and groups where language policy involved controversy. While traditional linguistic prestige research has tended to generate measurable stereotypes regarding speakers using different linguistic codes, such as in Bourhis and Giles (1976), these significant differences may be dependant on the local language controversy rather than on inherent prejudices, as the current research, carried out in a non-controversial context, failed to generate significant differences between the experimental conditions. Long (2004) also failed to generate significant differences between all the conditions in his research into the effect of spoken language and ethnicity on Japanese interactants' speech and impressions of conversation partners. Yet it is unlikely that a string of studies carried out in settings with little linguistic controversy are likely to reverse the tide of continuing prestige studies, though it may encourage less global and more localized explanations for the influence of language coding on character attributions. One reason it is unlikely that prestige research will slow is that there are several motivations for doing language research in areas where language policy and linguistic coding exhibit controversy:

1. Interesting experimental influence of accent on character attributions
2. Statistically significant results
3. Perpetuates popular view of minority discrimination
4. Research funding is available for study in areas where language is controversial

Limitations of such experiments include:

1. The influence accent has on character attributions may be localized and the results of socioeconomic and political realities and histories, and not dependant on a simple measure of prestige
2. Often University students are used in experiments, and it is difficult to guarantee they represent the total population
3. Character attributions dependent upon language coding are associated with controlled laboratory tests and may not correlate with behavior in natural environments

When research in general fails to generate statistically significant results, researchers and editors often view such research as a failure, a paradigm perpetuated in the field of culture and stereotype research as well. Leung and Iwawaki (1988:39), for example, blame similar individualism scores between Japanese and American students on an insensitive scale, then later go on to suggest, tentatively, that there may indeed be no difference between the individual and collective tendencies of the American and Japanese students used in their study (Leung and Iwawaki 1988:45).

CONCLUSION

Research into language prestige and culture dimensions has until recently tended to concentrate on simple models of human behavior and their relationship with speech and culture. Two such models, culture dimensions and linguistic prestige, have been studied and referenced extensively since the 1960s. Yet researchers remain divided as to how effective these models are. While Yamagishi (1988a & 1988b) cast doubts on the universality of Hofstede's dimensions, in 1991 Hofstede published a new retrospective of his research, in which Yamagishi isn't referenced (Hofstede 1991). Language prestige has also proposed to have increased understanding of the relationships between accent, linguistic choices in bilingual environments, and how they effect character impressions. Yet many of the findings of linguistic prestige research seem unique to the regions and the populations studied. While Bourhis and Giles (1976) found that in Wales bilingual Welsh speakers reacted negatively to RP English, Price *et al.* (1983) found that in a different part of Wales, bilingual pre-juvenile school children rated RP English and Welsh equally highly. Their findings complicated the picture of linguistic prestige, adding the variables of percentage of bilingual speakers in the population, age of subjects, and the language of the administrator of the measures (Price *et al.* 1983:157). Such additional complications contradict the simpler model proposed by Bourhis and Giles (1976).

Simple models of behavior are convenient for researchers to test and easily transported from one context to another, but a picture is emerging that seems to indicate human behavior is more complex than current models can accommodate (Yamagishi 1988a & 1988b and Price *et al.* 1983). Unfortunately, problems with simple models, such as those outlined by Matsumoto (1999), haven't been addressed in continuing research. Kashima et al. (1995:927) even manipulated their sample by excluding ethnic Asians from their Western group to ensure they would find significant differences between their Western (Australian and American) and Eastern (Japanese and Korean) subjects. Perhaps such manipulations are necessary not because of inconsistencies in the sample populations, but are indicative of flaws in the assumption that a simple, all-pervasive model of cultural and linguistic behavior is a practical option.

Just as language research has evolved from the assumption that languages are static and rule-defined, to the realization that they are dynamic and context-dependent while being rule-defined at the same time, perhaps research into culture variation needs to adopt a dynamic model of cultural evolution, where scores on Hofstede's (1980) measure are subject to constant change resulting from sociological and historical factors. Such research would seek to understand and solve practical problems in communication as they arise through multinational business interactions and international cooperation projects, such as military coalitions and NGO projects. The objective would be to understand problems as they arise in distinct situations and between specific interactants. Klein *et al.* (2001 and 2003) have already made inroads into such an application of cross-cultural research. Unfortunately their models still rely on Hofstede (1980) to explain cultural differences, despite doubts cast on the universality of those findings (Matsumoto 1999). Also, Klein *et al.* (2003) used computer-based training to train cultural sensitivity. It may be productive to test the veracity of such top-down, self-paced training programs against a program where people from two different cultures are asked to work together in a bottom-up model of sensitivity training.

Changing training programs from top-down to bottom-up might encourage a shift in the ownership of culture dimensions and prestige from professional researchers to cross-cultural interactants. It is well-established in the literature that researchers can measure subjects' stereotypes and present them as static measures of gaps in equality between majority and minority ethnicities (Luhman 1990 and Soukup 2000), but a more productive application of research might involve manipulating initial stereotypes to raise minorities' prestige on the scales used. Perhaps closing the prestige gap between ethnic groups lies not in centralized, government-sponsored campaigns but in decentralized, interpersonal, conversational settings where participants have an opportunity to both measure their initial stereotypes then work to lower those prejudices. Klein *et al.* (2003) developed a model where multinational collaborators with UN security forces could acclimate themselves to the differences between their cultures and the cultures of other nations' collaborators. Though, again, their explanations relied on Hofstede's (1980) culture dimensions, which may promote stereotypes rather than eliminate them.

Despite flaws, the research based on culture dimensions and language prestige has promoted the differences as positive and not indicative of superiority in one culture and inferiority in another (Hofstede 1991:6). It has also provided convenient explanations for difficulties that have arisen through multinational communication. An unfortunate side-effect has been to draw lines between countries and ethnicities and portray them as being incompatible or somehow fundamentally different. Since the conclusion of biological science is that the human genome isn't divisible between ethnicity, perhaps it would be appropriate to apply the same conclusion to cultures of the world; while there may be differences between people from two different countries, they should both be attributed with indivisible humanity, and it should be assumed that they all think rationally. They may set different priorities in the decisions they make and the company they keep, but perhaps different priorities shouldn't make for different peoples, as some modern research has apparently claimed.

APPENDIX 1: THE JAPANESE QUESTIONNAIRE

ご来場のお客様へ
アンケートへのご回答をお願い申し上げます。

(お客様の個人情報が特定される内容は一切ございません。)

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| ①ご来場日をご記入下さい | 8月 [] 日 |
| ②ご鑑賞映画に○印を付けて下さい | { () 「(例) ハリーポッター」(日本語吹替版) |
| | { () 「(例) ハリーポッター」(字幕スーパー版) |

★以下の①～⑥の各項目について、最も当てはまるもの1つに○印をつけて下さい。

- ① 本劇場においていただきましたのは、今日で何回目ですか。
 今日始めて 3回目
 2回目 4回目以上
- ② 平均して1ヶ月におよそ何本の映画をごらんになりますか。映画館、DVD、ビデオ、テレビなどあわせてお答え下さい。
 月に 0～1本 月に 4～6本
 月に 2～3本 月に 7本以上
- ③ 平均して1ヶ月におよそ何回、映画館にいらっしゃいますか。
 月に 0～1回 月に 4～6回
 月に 2～3回 月に 7回以上
- ④ あなたは、現在英語を学習していらっしゃいますか。(学校、英会話学校、テレビやラジオの放送、その他どのような形でかまいません。)
 はい いいえ
- ↓
- ④-1 前の4で「はい」とお答えの方におたずねいたします。
 およそ1週間にどのくらい英語を学習していらっしゃいますか。
 週 1回程度 週 2回程度 週 3回以上
- ④-2 前の4. で「はい」とお答えの方におたずねいたします。
 どのようにして英語を学習していらっしゃいますか。もっとも中心的なものを1つお答え下さい。
 英会話学校、英会話教室で習っている
 自宅で個人学習をしている(番組、通信教育、市販の教材など)
 公民館などの公的機関で習っている
 学校、大学で学習している(公開講座などを含む)
 その他 []
- ⑤ これまでに海外旅行、海外出張をされたことがありますか。
 はい いいえ
- ↓
- ⑤-1 前の7. で「はい」とお答えの方にお尋ねいたします。
 これまでの海外滞在で、もっとも長期間の滞在はどのくらいでしたか。
 1ヶ月未満 1ヶ月～1年 1年以上
- ⑥ 今度、次のタイプの映画の中から1つ選んで映画の劇場でご覧になるとしたら、どの映画に関心がありますか。
 洋画(日本語字幕スーパー)
 洋画(日本語吹替版)
 邦画

◎協力：長野県興行生活衛生同業組合

★アンケートへのご協力、誠にありがとうございました。

REFERENCES

- Archer, C.** (1986) 'Culture Bump and Beyond', in Joyce Merrill Valdes. *Culture Bound: Bridging the Cultural Gap in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bond, R. & R. Smith** (1996) "Culture and Conformity: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Using Asch's (1952b, 1956) Line Judgment Task". *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, pp. 111-137.
- Bourhis, R. & H. Giles** (1976) "The Language of Cooperation in Wales: A Field Study" *Language Sciences*. October.
- Buruma, I. & A. Margalit.** (2004) *Occidentalism*. London: Atlantic Press.
- Clark, H.** (1996). "Communities, Commonalities and Communication". In J. J. Gumperz and S. C. Levinson (Eds.) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, pp. 324 - 355.
- Fairbrother, L.** (2004) "Japanese native speaker reactions to nonnative speaker deviations: How far does ethnicity play a part?". Paper given at Sophia University, Tokyo; Asian Studies Conference Japan 2004.
- Giles, H. & N. Coupland** (1991) *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Hofstede, G.** (1980) *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G.** (1986) 'Cultural Differences in Teaching and Learning'. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 10, pp. 301-320.
- Hofstede, G.** (1991) *Cultures and Organizations*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Book Company Europe.

- Hofstede, G. & M. Bond** (1984) 'Hofstede's culture dimensions: an independent validation using Rokeach's Value Survey', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 15, pp. 417-433.
- Hunston, S. & S. Laviosa** (2000) *Corpus Linguistics*. Birmingham: Centre for English Language Studies, The University of Birmingham.
- Kashima, Y., S. Yamaguchi, U. Kim, S. Choi, M. Gelfand, & Y. Masaki** (1995) 'Culture, Gender, and Self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, pp. 925-937.
- Klein, H. & B. Hahn** (2003). "Preparing for multinational collaboration: From the laboratory to the field". Paper given at The 6th Naturalistic Decision Making Meeting. Pensacola, Florida.
- Klein, H., G. Klein, & R. Mumaw** (2001) "A Review of Cultural Dimensions Relevant to Aviation Safety". Wright State University.
- Lambert, W., R. Hodgson, R. Gardner, & S. Fillenbaum** (1960) "Evaluational reactions to spoken languages". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60, pp. 44-51.
- Leung, K. & S. Iwawaki** (1988) "Cultural Collectivism and Distributive Behavior". *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 1, pp. 35-49
- Lie, J.** (2001) *Multiethnic Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Long, C.** (2004) "The Effect of Non-Native Speaker Status on the Use of Linguistic Accommodation by Native Speakers of Japanese" Paper given at Sophia University, Tokyo; Asian Studies Conference Japan 2004.
- Luhman, R.** (1990) "Appalachian English stereotypes: Language attitudes in Kentucky". *Language in Society*, 19, pp. 331-48.

- Markus, H. & S. Kitayama** (1991). "Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation". *Psychological Review*, 98(2), pp. 224-253.
- Matsumoto, D.** (1999). "Culture and self: An empirical assessment of Markus and Kitayama's theory of independent and interdependent self-construal". *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2(3), pp. 289-310.
- Miller, R.** (1977) *The Japanese Language in Contemporary Japan: Some Sociolinguistic Observations*. AEI-Hoover Policy Studies, 22. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Stanford, California: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University. In S. Ross and I. Shortreed (1990), p.137.
- Ostheider, T.** (2004) "'Communication with Foreigners' in Japan: Reconsidering a Concept" Paper given at Sophia University, Tokyo; Asian Studies Conference Japan 2004.
- Pan, Y., Scollon, S. W. and Scollon, R.** (2002). *Professional Communication in International Settings*. Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Price, S., M. Fluck, H. Giles** (1983) "The Effects of Language of Testing on Bilingual Pre-Adolescents' Attitudes Towards Welsh and Varieties of English". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 4, 2&3, pp.149-161.
- Ross, S. & I. Shortreed** (1990) "Japanese Foreigner Talk: Convergence or Divergence?". *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 1, pp.135-146
- Said, E.** (2003) *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Soukup, B.** (2000) 'Y'all come back now, y'hear!?' *Language Attitudes in the United States towards Southern American English*. MA thesis, University of Vienna.
- Thorp, D.** (1991) 'Confused encounters: differing expectations in the EAP classroom', *ELT Journal*, 45, pp. 108-118.

Triandis, H., C. McCusker, H. Betancourt, S. Iwao, K. Leung, J. Salazar, B. Setiadi, J. Sinha, H. Touzard, & Z. Zaleski (1993) 'An etic-emic analysis of individualism and collectivism'. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24, pp. 366-383.

Yamagishi, T. (1988a). Exit from the group as an individualistic solution to the free rider problem in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 24, pp. 530-542.

Yamagishi, T. (1988b) "The Provision of a Sanctioning System in the United States and Japan". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51(3), pp. 265-271.