

Supplemental Thoughts to Bennett's Model: Characterization of a Sojourner's Initial Experience

異文化センシティブリティ・モデルに関する一考察：
ソジョナーの定住初期における感情的特徴

Yukiko S. Jolly

Aichi Shukutoku University

James A. Jolly

Registered Foreign Lawyer

Japan Federation of Bar Associations

異文化の中で一定の期間定住する場合、ソジョナーの経験する感情についての研究は過去にも幾つか発表されているが、その数値的な例は殆ど研究されていない。本稿においては、初期の感情は『魅惑』であるとの仮説を樹立し、アンケートを実施したがその結果、被験者の反応はその仮説と一致した。

I. Introduction

A. Introductory Comments

Apart from hosting foreign visitors in one's home, probably the most likely intercultural encounter one is to have is that of traveling in a foreign country - the experience of the "sojourner" as we will discuss in this paper. As nearly probable, the most common intercultural topic of conversation or writing is of a sojourner's experience - from Homer's *Odyssey* to Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* to the imagined future tales in the most recent additions to Broder Books' science fiction shelf. As access to other points of our Global Village has become more readily available, it is becoming a common experience for most of us.

As Peter S. Adler points out, you do not have to leave your country to experience "culture shock". That can happen when farmer Brown goes to town. However, for our purposes herein, we intend to concentrate on the situation where one travels out of his/her familiar territory and native culture to a place that is truly foreign and stays in a community of different ethnic or cultural settings. For the most part, we are talking about foreign travel on a temporary basis, hence the preference to refer to the experience from a sojourner's perspective. However, at least for the initial entry period, permanent resettlement experiences need not be excluded from consideration in the discussions below. And then, foreign travel is not always a shocking encounter, and our personal experience (and the thesis of what is to follow) is that, at least initially, it is a pleasant and rewarding experience. Indeed if it were

not so, the travel industry would have collapsed long ago. The objective of this paper is to verify our personal observations with the histories of others.

It is not surprising then that the experience of the sojourner has been the topic of earlier academic writings in the field of intercultural communications. There have been several notable efforts (discussed below) in constructing a theoretical model of the common experience of people who leave their homeland and native culture and move to visit or resettle in a new land of a different culture. Additionally, a virtual industry of training programs and seminars on dealing and coping with the foreign relocation experience has grown up in recent years as competition in the international market place has forced companies to send their representative to establish offices abroad.

A review of the available literature seems to indicate that the earlier views on the subject were based upon the authors' personal experiences and gathered anecdotes and not necessarily from clinical studies or surveys. Accordingly the authors have attempted to devise a survey to test the assumption that the very initial stage of a typical sojourner's experience is positive.

B. Hypothesis and Objectives

It has been our notion, based upon personal experience and observation, that when one goes abroad either for a temporary period of study or work appointment or to more permanently relocated household, the sojourner will first experience a period of time after arrival in which he/she undergoes a mentally positive attraction or infatuation with the host culture. We are discounting as isolated incidents here the occasions where a catastrophic accident or illness interferes with the normal flow of experience to turn an otherwise neutrally influenced circumstance into something purely negative. The general and normal experience from what we have observed and read is that there is a period of time immediately after arrival (of varying length depending upon individuals and circumstances) during which the sojourner derives great joy and positive affection for the host culture.

In one of the most trying situations imaginable, one of the authors underwent the initial intercultural encounter of leaving her relatively isolated community in a large city of a southern island of culturally pre-Olympics Japan to go alone for entry into a small college in a rural community in South Dakota. The conflict of cultures and communication problems probably could not have been much greater, but the entry and initial experience were still very positive, and it is very tempting to base a whole theory on that experience. However, a test population of one makes for very unreliable statistics as someone has pointed out. This encouraged the attempt for some objective testing by way of a thematic survey.

As a means of testing the typical experience of a sojourner during the initial period of his/her foreign stay, we have devised and circulated a brief questionnaire to a number of the foreign academics, international businessmen, and foreign students in the Nagoya and Tokyo areas who have actually experienced the initial period of settlement upon their entry to Japan or other foreign countries. At the

same time, with minor modifications to fit the Japanese situation, we circulated the same questionnaire to the Japanese who have experienced long-term stay overseas. A summary of the responses to the survey appear in the tables attached and are further commented on later in this paper.

C. Summary of Established Models of Cultural Adjustment

Before going on, it might be well to briefly review some prior works in this area that have influenced this modest contribution. As far as we can tell, these writings were based upon the accumulated training and experience of the authors. They do not appear to be based upon surveys or testing as a means of statistical verification. This does not invalidate their well-reasoned arguments, rather it prompted us to try. Additionally, writings in the field posit the idea of an initial "honeymoon" period, so we feel some comfort in continuing the investigation at this point.

The first of these relate to the roller coaster ride of experience. Peter Adler cites the early 1955 writing of S. Lysgaard as establishing a "U" curve model for the sojourner's experience². Related to the process of cultural adaptation in culture different environment, K. Oberg, in 1960, describes four stages using the so-called "U-shaped Curve"³. This idea was later adapted and expanded upon by Gullahorn and Gullahorn in 1963 in presenting the "U-curve hypothesis of cultural adjustment" and the "W-curve of cultural adjustment"⁴. In all these models, the high point of the beginning of each curve is a "honeymoon" stage, which later descends into a state of disillusionment and then goes back up to a new high point of positive outlook and enjoyment following cultural adaptation and reconciliation. The "W" is produced by a repeat pattern of experience upon return and re-entry into one's home culture.

The next writing to be noted here is Peter Adler's work in 1975 which postulates a paradigm of five phases of the transitional experience⁵. He also begins at a high point, which he calls the "Contact" stage, which is at the initial contact with a second culture. He characterizes this contact stage as being "marked by the excitement and euphoria of the new experience. The individual may be captivated and enchanted by the new culture and the apparent contrast to previous experiences"⁶. He goes on to project the sojourner's continued experience through a negative "Disintegration" stage, a period of confusion and disorientation, to a low-point in a "Reintegration" stage, and then up into a more positive experience in an "Autonomy" stage, characterized by "rising sensitivity and by the acquisition of both skill and understanding of the second culture"⁷, and into the final "Independence" stage where "the individual is fully able to accept and draw nourishment from cultural differences and similarities"⁸.

And then we need to look at the current development model of intercultural sensitivity espoused by Milton J. Bennett in 1984⁹. Strictly speaking, this is not a model of the sojourner experience, but rather a paradigm of how intercultural sensitivity is developed or a model against which one's relative intercultural awareness can be measured. If we assume that a sojourner starts with little or no intercultural adjustment and grows through his/her experience, then it does have application in our later discussions. At any rate it is not a work to be ignored, and in fact it inspired the current writing.

Bennett expounds on a model consisting of a continuum that starts at a null point of a single culture (one's own) awareness and developing on to an infinite outlook that transcends all cultural limitations. He divides this continuum into two parts, one of "Ethnocentric Stages" and the other of "Ethnorelative Stages" in the developmental process of intercultural adjustment. The "ethnocentric" label is the cue that the stages included in this first part are based on the idea "that the worldview of one's culture is central to all reality" - an inward-looking viewpoint⁰. The "ethnorelative" portion contains a more mature view "that cultures can only be understood relative to one another", that "cultural difference in neither good nor bad", and that "one's own culture is not any more central to reality than any other culture"¹.

Each of these two main divisions is further divided into three substages, each of which further contains two or three defining states of cultural awareness. The Ethnocentric Stage is thus divided into the three substages labeled (from most conservative through more liberal) "Denial", "Defense" and "Minimization". The "Denial Stage" is characterized by the cutting off of potential access to or consideration of other cultures. Its defining aspects are "Isolation", where one is confined by natural barriers, circumstance or personal choice and has access to no culture other than his/her own (an island configuration), and "Separation", where contact with another culture is intentional cut off by erections of physical or social barriers (enclave or ghetto situation). The "Defense Stage" is the posturing intended to counter the impact of perceived threatening cultural differences. It is characterized by "Denigration", where persons and things of another culture are disparaged and referred to only derogatorily (negative stereotyping), "Superiority", an opposite approach by which one's own cultural attributes are extolled and aggrandized (super patriots), and "Reversal", where one abandons his native culture and embraces another which he views as superior (hostage syndrome). The third stage is "Minimization" in which cultural differences are trivialized. Its defining aspects are "Physical Universalism", which defuses difference by generalizing commonly held attributes (we are the product of our genes), and "Transcendent Universalism" where some single, universal, transcendent principle, law or imperative is determinative (all are God's children).

The other part of Bennett's bifurcated model is the "Ethnorelative Stages" with three stages of "Acceptance", "Adaptation" and "Integration". The "Acceptance Stage" represents the transition of conceptual viewpoint from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism and moving into an attitude of acknowledging and respecting cultural difference. It consists of two sections, "Respect for Behavioral Difference", recognizing and working with verbal and nonverbal behavior and rituals (fostering curiosity rather than animosity), and "Respect for Value Difference" where values are perceived as manifestations of human creativity (open-minded awareness). Next is the "Adaptation Stage" where the sojourner acquires the other culture's skills in an additive process (not detracting from his native culture). This stage has subcategories of "Empathy", where one perceives reality from the other culture's perspective (standing in the other's shoes) and "Pluralism", where one internalizes two or more fairly complete

cultural frames of reference (multiculturalism). And the continuum's final stage is labeled "Integration" in which one attains a self-identity that can function outside the constraints of any particular culture. This is expressed in the form of "Contextual Evaluation", "where one attains the ability to analyze and evaluate situations from one or more chosen cultural perspectives" (exercising judgment of relative goodness in context)¹², and "Constructive Marginality", where one transcends cultural identity to be able to consciously raise any assumptions and to operate on a level of self-reference (marginalizing cultural interference).

II. The "Infatuation Stage" as the Typical Sojourner Experience

It would appear that the norm of experience is that during a period of time after our sojourner arrives in a foreign locale, he/she experiences a pleasant and rewarding life in the new culture, regardless of the attained level of intercultural sophistication. The exact length of this period and the degree of elation are left to the individual circumstances of each case. As we readily admit throughout, the "Infatuation Stage" we are adopting herein is not necessarily new or novel. As mentioned, it has counterparts in most established paradigms. What we would like to add here is a different perspective or emphasis and a more thorough discussion of this one point in isolation. This also takes for granted that there will be occasional contrary cases due to unusual intervening forces of accident, disease or catastrophic event. These same exceptions surely apply to any model already proposed or yet to be developed in this generality.

The initial basis for this belief comes from personal experience and the observed general recollection of numerous scholars, businessmen, and students with whom we were acquainted over the years. These people are of varied ages, educations and backgrounds, yet they indicate a common experience in this regard. They report that when they visited a foreign country (other than in a tourist status) it was an enjoyable experience at least in the initial stages of the visit. Many indicated that they felt they had achieved their various expectations and hopes for an entirely new challenging experience after they had reached the desired destination. Many of them, indeed, expressed their desire to return to the host country for another protracted stay.

In many cases when the sojourners had decided to travel or were assigned to go abroad, they prepared for such endeavor by studying the language, arts and cultural features of the host people, getting familiar with the history and geography of the region, and even attended classes to learn of acceptable social and religious behaviors to avoid miscommunications between themselves and the people of the host countries. Indeed there are organized businesses that offer seminars and training to company employees or professional persons who are relocating to overseas job assignments. Also, with the development of the internet, information about the target location is abundantly and easily accessed, such that travelers are increasingly more sophisticated. The essence of such training is to boost them

along Bennett's continuum so that they can better adapt to the long-term placement in a foreign environment. There is some question, however, if such training makes any difference in the initial entry period we are looking at, or if it is more significant in preventing the later disillusionment and dissatisfaction (expressed in the "U" curve model).

Another questionable point is whether the initial experience is affected by the sojourner's motivation. It may be the case that if the sojourner is under a strict obligation or assigned duty unrelated to his personal desires, it would tend to make the experience negative. In the US military situation, it is often the case that those persons are settled within a well-protected environment where daily living continues under the US mode of social conditions and living accommodations. In such a case, their experience of a "honeymoon" stage would have been distorting within the framework of this research. However, we were able to tap into the experience of many Japanese company men sent abroad to their companies' foreign offices to get some indication of the effect of voluntary versus involuntary moves.

III. The Survey

A. Composing the survey

To test the projected hypothesis, the authors prepared a single-sheet, eight-item questionnaire for a survey of the impressions and objective judgments of various sojourners about their adjustment and intercultural sensitivity reflecting their earlier stage of settlement. Within our limited means, we sought a test population among the schools and business communities of central Japan and Tokyo with which we could establish contact. The dissemination of the survey questionnaire was to persons who had a foreign country stay experience (other than as a casual tourist). Since many of the subjects have been in Japan or have stayed in other countries more than one year, we made the special request to have them provide their best recollection of their initial impressions and experience.

In constructing the questionnaire we sought to make it easy and convenient to complete in order to minimize annoyance at the testing process that might influence the respondent's attitude in any response. The number of inquiries was limited to eight multiple-choice questions, five of which provided demographic type data and three aimed at the core inquiry. We also limited the form to one page to alleviate annoyance about the time and effort required to complete and return the form. Additionally, since the linguistic competence of the respondents may be varied, separate English and Japanese language questionnaires with the same content were prepared for their selection. A cover sheet was also provided to clarify instructions and to focus their minds on the INITIAL period of their stay in a foreign country.

The questionnaire was made in three versions to accommodate the different origins and languages we were to encounter. The first version was for the target group of Japanese individuals who had worked or studied outside Japan and were reporting in the Japanese language. The second was for

the group consisting of foreign students currently studying or taking vocational training in Japan and reporting in Japanese. The third version was for the group composed of foreigners (non Japanese) presently working or studying in Japan and reporting in English. No attempt was made to control the distribution of the questionnaire to a particular target group or type of respondent, and they were supplied to all who indicated a willingness to cooperate. However, we did consciously excluded those persons who traveled only for a home-stay experience or as tourists, since they would likely have been deliberately catered to and protected by their hosts or tour operators so as to lessen their chance to encounter a negative experience.

The questionnaire was mailed or delivered to each volunteer participant with its cover sheet of explanation along with a return envelope. The response was then completed voluntarily by each respondent and mailed back to the researchers within a few weeks. In this manner one hundred thirty-seven (137) subjects responded in this research out of the one hundred and forty (140) blank forms that were sent out.

B. Survey Response Analysis

A copy of the survey questionnaire (in English) and summary charts containing the responses of the three groups, as received, are annexed to this paper for reference, review and analysis. It is believed that the results capture a broad range of personalities, vocations, education levels, and age groupings so as to be reasonably random in selection and representation.

In analyzing the results, we first look at the background demographics of our respondent population to see its randomness and breadth. Of the total responses (from all groups), there were slightly more males (60%) than females (40%), but it may well reflect a tendency for males to travel among the business and academic sectors of the population from where our responses originated. Still we accept this as being an equal enough distribution as to avoid any sex bias. Likewise, we have a fairly good representation in age groupings as to avoid undue distortion there. Responses were received from all age groups, with a clustering of 75% in the age range between 20 and 39. This probably reflects the distribution of the questionnaire in the universities and business communities, being the age range of students and company employees. The number of respondents over 40 are likely the returned overseas businessmen or long-term foreign residents, and they comprised 24% of the surveyed. Responses from those under 20 years of age were expectedly light (1%), given that they have less opportunity to travel and that when they do, it is more likely to be tourist or home-stay travel and would not qualify as the "sojourner" as we have defined it.

As to other background data, it was interesting to note that 75% of our respondents indicated this was their first foreign stay experience, assuring more accuracy of recollection, while 25% indicated previous travel, from which we risk confusion of recollection. The reasons given for their overseas stay fell mostly in the foreign study or research grouping (69%) with business related relocations comprising

the next largest reason (11% for business employees and 10% for family accompaniment). Not too surprisingly most indicated that their overseas stay was voluntary and volitional (84%), with the other 16% indicated an involuntary placement or obligatory stay. Yet this proportion of responses indicating involuntary relocation was higher than expected, and if one assumes the likely propensity of such to turn the whole experience sour, it might be a factor in any negative results we encountered.

When we look at the results of the core questions, which were numbered 5, 6 and 7 in the questionnaire, it would appear that our base assumption is accurate in that 111 or 83% of all the responses coincided with the Infatuation Stage espoused above. Among these 111 (ranging from the most positive toward less enthusiastic views), 16% classified their experience in the "ecstatic" characterization, 31% in the "wonderful" characterization, 36% in the "stimulated" characterization and 17% in the "comfortable" characterization.

It must be admitted that the 22 or 17% negative responses received is a bit of a surprise. Within these 22, 19 (or 89% of them) indicated they characterized their experience in the "unsettled" alternative classification offered. Only one of them gave it the next worse rating in the "annoyed" category and only two ventured into the next category of "dissatisfied". No one was so disenchanting as to put his/her stay reaction in the lowest category of "angry". This may reflect some reluctance among the surveyed to judge their host countries too severely, but it does give indication that there are at least milder negative experiences in this area after all.

Another unexpected result we discovered was in relation to our question as to how long the dominant feeling from this initial period lasted. This was probably a bit difficult for many to recall exactly, but the general impression was that it endured for a relatively long time. Over half (52%) felt it lasted more than 2 months (the highest category response provided), with 11% citing at least eight weeks, 9% giving it at least six weeks, 16% indicated at least four weeks, and 16% at least two weeks. Obviously the positive impressions are longer lasting than we had anticipated, and the questionnaire should have allowed options for longer periods to provide a more accurate picture in this regard.

Finally, looking at the factors which are related to the categorization of experience expressed by the respondents, we note that the newness of the environment or living conditions in the host country was cited by 52% of the responses (positive and negative). This agrees fairly well with our expectation in that the novelty and mystic of the new surroundings keep interest high. For those of the negative category, it probably contributed to the unsettled feelings expressed. Another 28% cited colleagues and friends as the basis, giving indication that favorable host reception or treatment might be a factor. Social behaviors was cited as the contributing factor by 14% and financial conditions was cited by only 5%.

In further analyzing the negative responses, it does appear that of those who indicated they had a negative type experience, most cited the newness of environment or living conditions as the contributing factor. This might indicate some lack of skill in coping with a foreign environment, but

unfortunately without personal interview, it cannot be determined how much prior training and preparation these persons had. It can be noted that of these 22, all but three indicated this was their first overseas experience. About one half of negative responses came from the student or academic grouping, but this might be a result of the larger percentage composition of this group to the overall response population and is not necessarily indicative of any propensity to negative experience of the occupation. The age grouping among these negative responses fairly matched that of the test population as a whole, thus age does not seem a factor either. Most of the negative respondents also indicated that they felt the dominant feeling lasted for a relatively long period of time.

C. Conclusion

It has been the authors' intent and purpose to set out on a series of testing, starting with this particular study, of the established theoretical models of the sojourner experience and to provide some further insight to how his/her typical experience may change over time. It is not necessarily to prove anyone wrong or to come up with a radically different paradigm, but rather to provide some analytical insight and firm data to support a workable model.

It can be reasonably asserted, based on this study, that the "Infatuation Stage" is the typical sojourner's experience in foreign stay. This has been definitely characterized as the initial stay and short-term experience during the stay, but it appears that it is more enduring than anticipated. It will be left to further study to determine at what point it could change into a negative aspect as postulated in prior published models. Based on our relatively broad range of test subjects, we believe also that there are no particular character or training traits that can assure or promote this initial experience. We would suggest, however, that the length of the infatuation period is probably influenced by these factors and they would account for the variation in degree of enjoyment that we note in the results.

Before closing, we are tempted to apply Bennett's model to our results to find some further insights. Using Bennett's model as a measure of intercultural sophistication, we can expect (and in fact we know in many cases) that our test subjects were of various stages of that model. Probably few were of the extreme ends of the continuum -- in the limited Denial Stage or at the expansive Integration Stage. Certainly we would need further study and perhaps personal interviews as just to where to place any particular sojourner, but given the relatively high level of education of most in our sample, we can probably safely group them in lower center of that continuum. At any rate, there is a clear indication that no matter what level of intercultural awareness one has, there is still the propensity to have the Infatuation Stage experience, and the lesser certainty of encountering a negative experience.

Is it compatible to say someone of Bennett's Ethnocentric-Denial-Separation, or Defense-Denigration or Defense-Superiority level of intercultural awareness experience could certainly enjoy the Infatuation Stage suggested here? Indeed it is quite possible, since Bennett relies on the manner in which a person copes with his intercultural experience to determine his level of sophistication. Thus

one in the Denial-Separation grouping could enjoy the foreign encounter by being in a typical tourist visitor mode. Everything he/she sees or encounters is viewed as quaint, exotic, and novel at a personal distance. He/she would hold the experience at personal arms-length to avoid internalizing it and in the expectation that soon he/she will be gone from the place and leave this behind. The time spent in the foreign culture would be art or artifact viewing and appreciating. Personal comforts (food, lodging, entertainment) would be of a type as close to his/her native culture as possible. It is when the period of stay goes beyond the customary tourist visit that things would likely turn sour and the Infatuation period would end.

Accordingly, in application of the categorizations of Bennett's model, we would expect that the further along the continuum of intercultural awareness and adaptation a person is, the longer the Infatuation period will be. Since the results of this study indicated a definite expectation of a positive initial experience in a new cultural setting and that the most influential contributing factor is living conditions or environment, then pre-travel training may well be a means of enhancing the enjoyment and benefit of the foreign stay over a longer period of time. In future studies we will attempt some testing of the validity of this presumption.

Notes

- 1) Adler, Peter S. (1975) "The Transitional Experience: An Alternative View of Culture Shock", *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 15 (4, Fall) page 13.
- 2) id. p. 15.
- 3) Oberg, K. (1960) "Culture Shock: Adjustment to New Cultural Environments," *Practical Anthropology* 7, p. 178.
- 4) Gullahorn, J. and Gullahorn, J. (1963) "An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis," *Journal of Social Issues*, 19 (3) , pp. 33-47.
- 5) Adler (1975), pp. 16-20.
- 6) id. p 16.
- 7) id. p. 17
- 8) id. p. 18
- 9) Bennett, M. J. (1993) "Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity" in R. M. Paige, (ed), *Education for the Intercultural Experience*. Yarmouth, ME.: Intercultural Press, pp. 21-71.
- 10) id. p. 30.
- 11) id. p. 46.
- 12) id. p. 61.

References

- Adler, P. S. (1975). "The Transitional Experience: An Alternative View of Culture Shock." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 15 (4, Fall), pp. 13-23.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). "A Developmental Approach to Training for Intercultural Sensitivity". *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. Vol.10, pp.179-196.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). "Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity". R.M. Paige (ed.),

- Education for Intercultural Experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, pp.21-71.
- Bennett, J. M. (1998). "Transition Shock: Putting Culture Shock in Perspective", *Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication- Selected Readings* edited by Milton J. Bennett. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, pp. 215-223.
- Brislin, R. and Yoshida, T. (1994). *Intercultural Communication Training: An Introduction*. London: Sage. Chapt. 3. Emotional Challenges, pp. 57-84.
- Condon, J. C. (1980). "Cultural Dimensions of Communication. 異文化コミュニケーション: カルチャーギャップの理解. 第8章異文化との接触から学ぶ-相互理解と相互刺激について 東京: サイマル出版会, pp.237-256.
- Condon, J.C. (1981). *Interpreting Culture - Essays on Intercultural Communication* Tokyo: Seibido. Chapt. One. The Shock of Recognition, pp. 1-6.
- Downs, J.F. (1971) *What is Culture?* Ed. With notes by Toshio Saito. Tokyo: Asahi Press.
- Harvester, Wheatshaf (1995). 仁平義明監訳. フレンズ: スキル社会の人間関 Tokyo: Fukuyama Shuppan.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1991). *Bridging Differences - Effective Intergroup Communication*. 異文化に橋を架ける-効果的なコミュニケーション 東京: 聖文社.
- Gudykunst, W.B. and Kim, Y.Y. (1997). *Communicating with Strangers-An Approach to Intercultural Communication*. Third Ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Guirdham, M. (1999). *Communicating Across Cultures*. West Lafayette, IND: Purdue Univ. Chapt. 9. Skills for Working Abroad, pp. 270-299.
- Gullahorn, J.T. & Gullahorn, H.E. (1963). "An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis." *Journal of Social Issues*, 19 (3), pp. 33-47. Cited from 八代 (1998), pp. 244-246.
- 橋本良明 (編) (1997). コミュニケーション学への招待 第12章異文化コミュニケーション, pp.203-221.
- 林知己夫. (1973). 比較日本人論-日本とハワイの調査から 中公新書 東京: 中央公論社.
- 本名信行、秋山高二、竹下裕子、ベイツ ホッフア、ブルックス ヒル (1994). 異文化理解とコミュニケーション. 第5章 異文化理解の教育とトレーニング pp.98-108. 東京: 三修社.
- 星野命 (1992). クロス・カルチャア思考への招待-異文化間体験の心. 読売科学 選書52. 第2章異文化体験の心 東京: 読売新聞社 pp. 76-107.
- 星野命、斎藤耕二、菊池章夫. (1987). 異文化とのかかわり 東京: 川島書店.
- 金沢吉展 (1992) 異文化とつき合うための心理学 第6章 異文化の中でうまく生活するという事 東京: 誠信書房 pp. 92-110.
- Kim, Y. Y. (1989). "Intercultural Adaptation". *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication*, edited by Asante, M.K. and Gudykunst, W.B. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage, pp. 275-294.
- 狐野利久 (1995) 比較文化入門-衣食住から宗教まで 東京: 北星堂書店.
- Lusting, M.W. and Loester, J. (2000) *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultures*. Third Ed. New York: Longman.
- Lysgaard, S. (1955). "Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fullbright Grantees Visiting the United States." *International Social Science Bulletin*, VII, pp. 45-51. Cited from 八代 (1998), pp. 244-246.
- Martin, J. and Nakayama, T. K. (2000). *Intercultural Communication in Context*. Second Ed. Mountain View, Calif.: Mayfield.
- 水上徹男 (1996) 異文化社会適応の理論-グローバル・マイグレーション時代に向けて 第2章 異文化社会適応の調査と文化変容の概念. pp. 41-68. 第3章 ソジョナーの概念とホスト社会への居住変容 pp. 69-86. 東京: ハーベスト社.
- 御手洗明治 (1994) トランスカルチュラル・ミディエーター時代への挑戦: 新国際人論. 東京: 綜合法令, pp.63-77.
- 水原哲 (2000) コミュニケーション最前線 東京: 松柏社, pp.76-277.

- 鍋倉健悦 (編) (1990) 日本人の異文化コミュニケーション 第5章 カルチャーショック、東京：北樹出版、pp.118-144.
- 鍋倉健悦 (1997) 異文化コミュニケーション入門 丸善ライブラリー 226 東京：丸善、pp. 141-161.
- Oberg, K. (1960). "Culture Shock: Adjustment to New Cultural Environment". *Practical Anthropology*, 7, 1960, p.178. Cited from Y.Y. Kim (1989), pp. 278-279.
- Suda, Noriko. (1999). "Issues of Adjustment Abroad and Readjustment to Their Home Country of Japanese Spouses". *SIETAR JAPAN* 異文化コミュニケーション No.3, pp.25-86.
- 山本志都 (1998) 異文化センシティブティ・モデルを日本人に適用するにあたって—再定義の必要性について— Applying the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity in Japanese Context. *SIETAR JAPAN* 異文化コミュニケーション、No.2, pp. 77-100.
- 八代京子、町恵理子、小池浩子、磯貝友子 (1998) 異文化トレーニング 第6章 違いをどう考えるか：異文化への態度 pp.217-222. 第7章 カルチャーショックを超えて：異文化適応のモデル。pp. 249-256. 東京：三修社。

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Is your present stay in Japan your first overseas living experience (other than tourist travel)?

- A. yes B. no

(a) If "no", please indicate any other "foreign" country or countries where you have lived previously: _____.

Note: Please provide answers related to your prior experience in the other foreign country in the second column to the right in addition to your answers about your stay in Japan.

(b) If you have had living experience in Japan before your present stay, how many times had you lived here before?

_____ *NOTE: Please relate your responses to the following questionnaire back to the time of your first stay in Japan.*

2. What was your reason for coming to Japan?

- A. sent by home country employer B. hired by Japan-based employer
C. to attend school or cultural study D. family connection
E. other _____

3. Which of these characterize of your motivation in the move?

- A. voluntary (your idea or a choice you gladly accepted)
B. involuntary (required by someone else or a choice you reluctantly accepted)

4. How long have you been in Japan (for this stay)?

- A. less than 1 year B. 1-2 yrs C. 3-4 yrs D. 5-10 yrs E. over 10 yrs.

NOTE: If you consider yourself no longer in the "initial stage", please try to recall your impressions from that time and provide answers to be best of your recollection.

5. Which of the following best characterize your most dominant feeling about Japanese society during the initial stage of your stay? Please select only the one best response here:

- A. ecstatic (new and exciting) B. wonderful (enjoyable and appealing)
C. stimulated (challenging and interesting) D. comfortable (safe and assuring)
E. unsettled (strange and uncomfortable) F. annoyed (inconvenient and unknown)
G. dissatisfied (no fun and isolated) H. angry (host society is illogical or unresponsive)

6. How long did the feeling you selected in 5 last?

- A. 0-2 wks B. 3-4 wks C. 5-6 wks D. 7-8 wks E. more than 2 months

7. Which of the following would you attribute as the main source of the feeling you selected in 5 above?

- A. colleagues/friends B. neighbors C. living conditions
D. social behaviors E. financial condition F. other: _____

8. For analytical and comparative purposes please indicate here:

nationality or home country: _____

Sex: A. female B. male

Age: A. below 20 B. 20 -29 C. 30-39 D. 40-49 E. 50-59 F. over 60

TABLES OF SURVEY RESPONSES

| Chart No 1-1(Japanese Respondents in Japanese) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Q | R | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| | 1 | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 2 | C | C | C | A | C | D | C | C | C | C | C | B | D | C | C | C | D | D | D | D | A | D | A | C | C | |
| 3 | A | A | A | B | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | A | A | |
| 4 | A | A | B | D | C | C | A | D | A | B | A | D | C | B | A | A | B | C | B | E | C | C | D | D | A | |
| 5 | B | B | B | C | C | D | A | E | C | A | A | A | E | D | C | B | C | E | E | A | E | E | C | C | B | |
| 6 | B | B | D | E | E | E | B | B | E | D | B | A | D | D | B | B | C | B | E | A | D | / | E | E | D | |
| 7 | F | C | F | C | F | A | / | F | F | C | F | F | F | C | A | A | F | C | D | D | F | C | E | C | D | |
| 8 | Sex | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | B | B | A | B | A | B | A | A | / | B | B | B | B | A | B | A | / | / |
| | Age | C | C | C | E | D | C | B | E | D | F | D | / | E | C | B | B | B | B | B | B | E | E | C | E | E |

| Chart No 1-2(Japanese Respondents in Japanese) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| Q | R | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
| | 1 | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | 39 | 5 | | | | | |
| 2 | C | C | C | C | E | C | D | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | D | C | 3 | 0 | 30 | 9 | 2 | | | |
| 3 | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | / | / | A | A | / | A | / | A | A | / | B | A | 27 | 12 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | C | A | A | B | C | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | E | 19 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 2 | | | | |
| 5 | C | C | A | C | C | A | A | B | D | A | B | B | C | B | B | E | E | F | A | 10 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6 | E | B | E | B | E | C | D | A | E | B | E | B | A | E | A | A | A | E | E | 7 | 12 | 2 | 7 | 15 | | | | |
| 7 | F | C | C | / | A | C | G | / | G | F | A | C | C | C | F | F | C | G | F | 5 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | | |
| 8 | Sex | A | B | B | B | A | A | B | B | B | A | B | A | B | / | B | A | A | B | B | 18 | 22 | | | | | | |
| | Age | C | B | D | C | C | C | E | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | D | E | 0 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| Chart No 2-1(Foreign Respondents in Japanese) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Q | R | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| | 1 | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | B |
| 2 | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | A | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | D | D | C | D | C | C | A |
| 3 | A | A | A | A | A | / | / | A | A | B | A | A | A | / | A | / | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B |
| 4 | B | C | D | C | C | C | B | C | B | A | E | B | C | C | B | B | C | B | C | B | B | E | A | A | A | B |
| 5 | A | B | B | B | D | B | B | B | D | D | C | B | A | B | A | B | B | C | D | C | B | B | B | C | B | |
| 6 | B | D | E | C | D | D | C | B | D | C | E | E | E | E | D | E | E | D | E | C | B | E | E | E | D | |
| 7 | A | C | C | B | C | E | C | D | C | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | A | C | A | D | A | C | A | A | C | |
| 8 | Citizen | Pd | Ch | Ch | Ko | Ch | Ch | Ch | Ch | US | Ko | Ch | Ch | Ko | Ch | Ch | Ma | Ch | Ch | Ko | Ko | Ch | HK | HK | Ch | |
| | Sex | B | A | A | A | A | / | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | B | A | A | B | A | B | A | B | B | A | |
| | Age | D | B | C | C | B | B | B | B | C | C | D | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | D | B | B | F |

| | | Chart No 2-2(Foreign Respondents in Japanese) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|-----------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|--|
| Q | R | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | | | |
| | 1 | | B | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | |
| 2 | | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | D | E | C | C | D | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | | |
| 3 | | A | A | / | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | | |
| 4 | | C | C | C | B | B | D | C | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | | |
| 5 | | C | C | B | B | E | B | B | C | E | D | E | D | D | G | D | G | A | D | E | E | C | C | D | D | G | | | |
| 6 | | A | D | E | E | B | E | E | E | E | C | C | C | C | D | B | C | B | B | B | B | B | D | D | E | E | | | |
| 7 | | C | C | A | C | C | E | A | C | D | D | D | D | D | D | A | C | C | A | C | C | A | C | C | C | C | | | |
| 8 | Citizen | Ch | Ch | Ch | Tw | Tw | Ko | US | Ch | Ch | Ch | Ch | Ch | Ch | Ch | Br | Ch | Au | Ch | Ch | Ko | Ch | / | Ch | Ch | Ch | | | |
| | Sex | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | A | A | A | B | B | A | A | / | B | B | B | B | B | B | A | | | |
| | Age | D | B | B | B | B | C | B | A | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | | | |

| | | Chart No 2-3(Foreign Respondents in Japanese) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|-----------------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|--|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Q | R | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | | | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | / | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | A | B | A | A | | | 42 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | C | A | C | C | | | 3 | 0 | 47 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | A | B | A | B | | | 43 | 6 | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | A | E | D | E | | | 19 | 15 | 13 | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | D | D | C | C | | | 4 | 18 | 11 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | C | / | E | E | | | 1 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 21 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | A | A | A | D | | | 20 | 1 | 22 | 9 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Citizen | Ch | Ch | Th | Vi | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sex | A | B | A | A | | | 34 | 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Age | B | D | D | D | | | 2 | 39 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | Chart No 3-1(Foreign Respondents in English) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|----------------------------------------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Q | R | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| | 1 | | A | B | A | B | A | A | A | A | B | B | B | A | A | B | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | B | B | B |
| 2 | | B | E | E | B | E | C | E | B | B | E | E | A | B | C | B | B | B | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| 3 | | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | / | A |
| 4 | | D | E | D | D | E | E | E | C | C | C | E | C | A | D | A | A | D | E | B | A | D | A | B | B | C |
| 5 | | E | C | C | B | A | C | C | C | E | A | E | C | C | E | C | B | C | C | E | B | D | D | B | B | C |
| 6 | | E | / | B | E | A | E | B | C | C | B | E | E | C | E | E | E | E | B | B | E | E | E | E | E | / |
| 7 | | A | C | C | A | C | F | F | A | B | A | D | A | A | D | C | C | C | D | F | A | C | C | A | E | A |
| 8 | Citizen | Au | / | Au | Ca | Ph | Ge | / | Au | Gk | US | Ca | / | US | Fr | US | US | US | Tw | Th | Ph | Sr | Th | Au | In | Hu |
| | Sex | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | A | A | A | B | B | A | A | / | B | B | B | B | B | B | A |
| | Age | D | B | B | B | B | C | B | A | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B |

| | | Chart No 3-2(Foreign Respondents in English) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|----------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Q | R | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | / | | | |
| | 1 | | A | B | B | B | B | B | A | A | B | A | A | B | A | A | B | | 22 | 18 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | E | C | C | C | D | C | C | C | C | C | C | E | E | E | D | | 1 | 8 | 19 | 2 | 10 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | | 37 | 2 | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| 4 | | B | B | D | B | B | C | A | C | B | D | D | C | B | D | E | | 6 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 7 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | A | C | G | D | C | C | C | C | A | C | E | C | C | C | B | | 4 | 6 | 20 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | | | |
| 6 | | B | E | E | B | E | E | E | B | B | E | / | B | D | E | C | | 1 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 21 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | C | A | D | D | C | C | E | C | D | A | C | E | A | C | C | | 12 | 1 | 15 | 6 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 8 | Citizen | In | No | Sy | Mo | / | In | Ni | In | US | Ba | Ba | Au | US | US | US | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sex | A | B | A | A | B | A | A | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | A | | 25 | 12 | | | | | | | 3 | | | |
| | Age | C | B | C | B | B | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | F | | 0 | 10 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 4 | | | | | | |