

**INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE INFLUENCE OF AN
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION FOUNDER – MICHAEL H.
PROSSER AND HIS CONTEMPORARY SCHOLARS**

by

Zhang Long

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate School and College of English

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of Master of Arts

Under the Supervision of Professor David Henry

Shanghai International Studies University

May 2009

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I offer my sincerest gratitude to the intercultural communication program, to all the faculties and especially to Professor Michael Prosser. Without them, this thesis would not have been completed or written.

The intercultural communication program, which is the best program I have ever attended, has inspired me and motivated me through my two years' graduate study whilst allowing me the room to work in my own way. One simply could not wish for a better M.A. program. I gained much knowledge and wisdom studying and communicating with the faculty and fellow students here, and I believe it will be life-long treasure for me.

My infinite appreciation goes to Professor Michael Prosser, who patiently helps me know him and the field of intercultural communication from different perspectives. His recommendation and revision opinions give me much confidence in the thesis writing.

My gratitude also goes to my supervisor David Henry, who constantly offers me enlightenment. Professor Steve Kulich gives many thought-provoking lectures during my study in SISU and provides me fresh ideas to improve my thesis, for which I will be thankful forever.

I am also deeply thankful to these scholars who responded to my survey, which deepened my understanding in Professor Michael Prosser and the development of the field of intercultural communication: Donal Carbaugh (University of Massachusetts at Amherst), Carley H. Dodd (Abeleine Christian University), Ray T. Donahue (Nagoya Gakuin University), D. Ray Heisey (Kent State University), Wenshan Jia (Chapman University), Young Yum Kim (University of Kansas), Paul Pederson (Syracuse University/ East West Center, University of Hawaii), Herbert Simons (Temple University), and William J. Starosta (Howard University).

Finally, I give my heartfelt thanks to my beloved partner Helen, who supports me in my

academic pursuit and care for me all the time. Her understanding renewed my confidence in times of difficulties and frustration.

To all of these, and to the many others who have knowingly and unknowingly contributed to my study, I offer my warmest thanks.

Abstract

This thesis examines the contributions of Michael H. Prosser and his other early and contemporary intercultural communication scholars to the development of the study of intercultural communication, especially during the 1970s, and late 1990s – 2008 .

This thesis basically takes a historical approach, plus comparative studies. The discussion is approached from the following three aspects: (1) Comparing Michael Prosser's books (authored or edited) with books written or edited by other scholars of the same period; (2) Surveying Michael Prosser's former colleagues, and Communication, Research and Theory Network (CRTNET) readers. (3) Surveying Prosser's intercultural communication students in China.

This thesis outlines Prosser's main ideas and features of mapping the foundations and early studies of intercultural communication, and his contributions to the cultural dialogue between China and America, for the purpose of which, the author has interviewed several of his intercultural communication students in Shanghai and did a study of his website: www.michaelprosser.com.

This thesis comes to the tentative conclusion that Michael Prosser, as well as his early colleagues, indeed contributed significantly to the development of intercultural communication study. Prosser is one of the founding fathers who helped make intercultural communication a well established academic discipline in North America. Later, Prosser also helped to enhance the mutual understanding and reduce the cultural prejudice between Americans and the Chinese. His approach to intercultural communication is mainly rhetorical and interpersonal intercultural communication.

Key Words:

Cultural dialogue, historical approach, intercultural communication, international communication, media, Michael H. Prosser

摘 要

本文研究了麦克·普罗斯教授和其他跨文化奠基时代的学者对跨文化交际学科研究发展的贡献，特别是 1970 年代期间和 1990 年代后期到 2008 年。

本文基本上采用历史主义的研究方法，加上比较研究。讨论主要从以下三个方面进行：

1. 比较麦克·普罗斯所著或所编的书与同时期其他学者所著的书。
2. 调查麦克·普罗斯的早期同事，以及“交流、研究与理论网 (CRTNET)”浏览者。
3. 调查普罗斯在中国的跨文化交际学生。

另外，为了总结出普罗斯在跨文化交际的奠基与前沿研究中的主要思想和特点，尤其是他对中美间文化对话的贡献，本文作者采访了一些他在上海所教授的英语系跨文化方向的硕士研究生，并且对他的网站：www.michaelprosser.com 做了深入的研究。

本文最后得出了初步结论：麦克·普罗斯，以及他的早期同事确实对跨文化交际学科的发展做出了重要贡献。普罗斯是最早促成跨文化交际学科在北美诞生并确立的学者之一。之后，普罗斯还来到中国，帮助促进了中国人和美国人的相互理解，减少了两国人民间的偏见。他对跨文化交际的主要研究方法是演说学分析和跨文化人际交流。通过他不懈的努力，普罗斯确实促进了中美间的“文化对话”和相互理解；他的很多学生都非常珍视和他及其他美国学者的友谊。

关键词：

对话，历史主义方法，跨文化交际，国际交际，媒体，麦克·普罗斯

Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
摘 要	iii
Introduction	1
1. Purpose of this Study	1
2. Key Definitions in the Field of Intercultural Communication	4
3. Brief History of Michael H. Prosser's Intercultural Life	7
4. Brief History of Michael H. Prosser's Influences and Contributions to Intercultural Communication	9
5. Meaningfulness and Innovation of this Thesis	13
Chapter 1 Literature Review	15
1.1 Intercultural Communication Development during the Late 1960s and through the 1970s	15
1.2 Intercultural Communication Development during the 1980s and Early 1990s ..	18
1.3 Intercultural Communication Development during the Late 1990s up to 2008	22
Chapter 2 Methodology	26
2.1 The Main Research Question	26
2.2 The Specific Survey Questions	26
2.2.1 Survey of Prosser's Former Colleagues and CRTNET Readers	26
2.2.2 Survey of Prosser's Intercultural Communication Students in China	27
2.3 Respondents	27
2.4 Research Processes	28
Chapter 3 Investigating Prosser's Major Works in Comparison with Other Intercultural Communication Scholars in the Same Periods	29
3.1 Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples (1973)	29
3.1.1 In Comparison with Alfred Smith's Communication and Culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction (1966)	30
3.1.2 In Comparison with Samovar & Porter's Intercultural Communication: A Reader (1972)	31
3.2 The Cultural Dialogue (1978, 1985, 1989)	34
3.2.1 In Comparison with Harms' Intercultural Communication (1973)	36
3.2.2 In Comparison with Arthur Smith's Transracial Communication (1973)	38
3.2.3 In Comparison with Condon and Yousef's An Introduction to Intercultural Communication (1975)	39
3.2.4 In Comparison with Sitaram and Cogdell's Foundations of Intercultural Communication (1976)	42
3.3 Diplomatic Discourse (Donahue & Prosser, 1997)	44
3.4 Civic Discourse (Sitaram & Prosser, 1998, 1999)	45

3.5 Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication (Kulich & Prosser, 2007)	..48
3.6 Michael H. Prosser’s Cultural Dialogue in China49
3.6.1 Survey of Michael H. Prosser’s Intercultural Communication Students at Shanghai International Studies University51
3.6.2 Investigations into Michael H. Prosser’s Website51
 Chapter 4 Analysis of the Surveys of Michael H. Prosser’s Contemporaries and Colleagues54
4.1 Prosser’s Contributions in General54
4.2 Prosser’s Contributions in His Academic Works55
4.3 Prosser’s Contributions in Conferences and Associations57
4.4 Prosser’s Other Unique Contributions57
4.5 Summary of the Chapter58
 Chapter 5 Conclusions59
5.1 Summary of the Study59
5.2 Limitations of the Study63
5.3 Suggestions for Future Research63
5.4 Conclusions and Field Comments63
 References65
Appendix A Academic Survey Questions & Answers74
Appendix B Survey of IC Majors at SISU93
Appendix C: L.Gostin. (2007), The Journey of an Intercultural/International Scholar: An Interview with Dr. Michael Prosser. <i>China Media Review</i> .	
Appendix D. Michael H. Prosser’s “Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium” Series Books from www.amazon.com	

Introduction

1. Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the contributions and influences made by Michael H. Prosser together with his former and current colleagues to the development of intercultural communication study, thus hoping to discover some of the main features of intercultural communication study during the 1970s and as the study of intercultural communication developed and matured. Some conceptual foundations and academic interest had already been cultivated by the early work of Franz Boas and his students, specifically Ruth Benedict, Florence Rockwell later to marry Clyde Kluckhohn, as well as their work with Talcott Parsons and his associates, and also the seminal and most influential summaries of Edward T. Hall.

The major research questions are **1. How did Prosser integrate those ideas, and contribute to launching an area of study in the communication field? 2. What were the connections or the continuity of intercultural communication development directions in the 1980s and 1990s? 3. What were the main contributions of such contemporaries of Prosser such as K.S. Sitaram, John C. Condon, William Howell, Arthur L. Smith (later Molefe Kete Asante), Edward C. Stewart, Edmund S. Glenn, Grace Layman (of Canada) Carley H. Dodd, D. Ray Heisey, Fred L. Casmir, Beulah Rohrlich, Hubert W. Ellingsworth, Larry A. Samovar, Richard E. Porter, Paul Pederson, and others, including also Prosser's Indiana University graduate students, such as William J. Starosta, Barbara Monfils, and Sherry Ferguson, who combined, and not always working together, ushered in the new age of intercultural communication study in later periods. 4. What contributions has Prosser made to the study of intercultural communication in China?**

In the 1980's and 1990's as the field matured, the study, research, and training in intercultural communication developed many second and third generation leaders, and spread to several different countries, including China where it is now flourishing. This thesis continues its consideration of Prosser's published contributions to the development of intercultural communication in the period of 1997 to the present, both in the US and in

China, and the contributions of his contemporaries during this period as well.

Furthermore, through the intensive study of Prosser's intercultural sojourn in China during the first decade of the 21st century, this thesis sheds light on the detailed yet significant effort of Prosser's teaching intercultural communication in China and making friends with many young Chinese whom he taught and met.

The reasons for this study are multiple. First, the intercultural communication field in China is younger (officially starting with the 1995 Harbin conference that launched the China Association for Intercultural Communication, CAFIC) than that of the US, and Prosser arrived at a time when it was just beginning to flourish. The presence of a notable scholar at the biennial conferences starting from the 4th in Xi'an (2001) giving keynotes at every one since, 2001, 03, 05 and 07, inspired many students, teachers and young scholars, to the point that recently a doctoral candidate from Wuhan University, Gloria Xi, was assigned to explore in her doctoral study Prosser's contributions to the development of intercultural communication before and after coming to China. The Wuhan University School of Journalism and Communication has established a data base (www.jcscholar.com) of journalism and communication scholars in which Gloria Xi was responsible for detailing information about Prosser.

As he became more widely known in China, he gave lecture series at Beijing Language and Culture University, Shanghai International Studies University, Xiamen University, Jilin University, and China Mining and Technology University in Xuzhou, as well as lectures in Peking University, Tsinghua University, China Mining and Technology University, Beijing Business School, Forestry University, Communication University, Agricultural University, and Astronautics University all in Beijing, as well as Yangzhou University, Nanjing Normal University and Xiantan University. In his eight years in China, he gave lectures to more than 6800 Chinese secondary and college students.

Next, the fertile environment at Shanghai International Studies University developed by early language and culture scholars like DAI Weidong, HE Zhaoxiong, HU Shuzhong and ZOU Shen (each of whom directed master's and doctorate degree students interested in intercultural communication) set the foundations for SISU to launch the first full intercultural post-graduate program under the direction of Steve J. Kulich starting in 2002. As that program gained success and popularity (with 31 students enrolling in the first three

years), Professor Kulich invited Prosser to join the program as it was made an independent major direction in the College of English in 2005. Student enrollments soared (21 in 2005, 26 in 2006, 38 in 2007, and scaling back for quality, 21 in 2008) in the years following, as well as the University inviting Kulich and Prosser to start a concurrent program in the College of Journalism and Communications (CJC), enrolling 3 in 2007 and 2 MAs in 2008. With so many students having met, been taught and influenced by Prosser, it seems important to document and clarify his long-term scholarly contributions to the study of intercultural communication.

Third, as the intercultural communication program at SISU and other universities develops, there is a growing call for the establishment of an intercultural discipline at the level of the Chinese Ministry of Education. Understanding the origins of the early intercultural communication literature is a key part of “standing on the shoulders of the giants of the past” for future development. Currently, the SISU Intercultural Institute (SII) headed by Professor Kulich and for which Prosser serves as the chairman of the international academic advisory board, and senior co-editor with Kulich for the SISU Intercultural Institute intercultural research series is working closely with the SISU Library under a Ministry of Education 211 disciplinary development project to carefully document all the textbooks, monographs and research articles related to the development of the intercultural communication field. There is now such an extensive level of publications to qualify intercultural communication for disciplinary status. This thesis can hopefully contribute one important link to that development and related “history and status” projects.

Fourth, since this (2008-09) is the last academic year of teaching in China for Professor Prosser, Professor Kulich proposed for me to consider doing this project for a Master’s thesis in intercultural communication. As Prof. Kulich stated it, “while we have Michael here, while we have full access to his materials and memories, while many of the other co-founders and key influencers are still alive, and as a kind of crowning summary of his fifty years of teaching, editing and publishing, this is a great opportunity for us to ask him all the questions we need to, to document the history as he and his colleagues remember it, and get others to contribute their thoughts to how the field was founded and developed” (conversations with Steve J. Kulich, October 15, 2008 and January 20, 2009). Since Kulich and Prosser co-teach the “Foundations and History of Intercultural

Communication” course which focuses on the history and status of the intercultural communication area of study, Professor Kulich felt that “much of the oral history that Michael talks about in class needs to be more carefully written up so that future students who no longer have the privilege of sitting in his classes can continue to “hear” about those dates and anecdotes.”

These were some of the reasons that motivated the original conception and development of this thesis. But the next challenge was that of methodology. In some ways this thesis is built on “auto-ethnographic” narrative methods, where I as the author have extensively interviewed Professor Prosser, checking through the details with him and seeking to construct the historical timeline and identify the significant historical events. Then I have sought to do “historical checking,” comparing the information supplied by the primary subject (Professor Prosser) with other informants through responses to the mailed survey questions and e-interviews. The second part of the research has been to do comparative and contrastive reading to see what synchronic sources were focusing on in relation to Michael Prosser’s books. Attempts will be made to see if he was promoting ideas that were mainstream or innovative, whether his ideas were being implemented in other works, or whether his voice as a conference convener or author was being heeded or overlooked. YIN Guoliang’s (2006) excellent historical analysis of the 35 years of Samovar and Porter’s *Intercultural Communication: A Reader* will be consulted to compare trends, as questions in the on-line distributed survey to see what others in the field thought about Prosser’s contributions. For this step, some citation analysis will be used (e.g. what sources quoted or cited Prosser or included him in their texts or readers). Additionally, the responses from the survey to the SISU intercultural communication list will provide personal and practical examples of his influence on students enrolled in the intercultural communication MA program at the Shanghai International Studies University.

2. Key Definitions in the Field of Intercultural Communication

Some of the key definitions in the field of intercultural communication study can make clear what each concept means, and how those early intercultural communication scholars have applied those terms and contributed in a variety of academic fields and from

different approaches or with different emphases. The key definitions I shall discuss here are: *intercultural communication*, *cross-cultural communication*, *interpersonal communication*, *mass communication*, *international communication*, *interracial communication*, and *social discourse*.

Intercultural Communication

“Intercultural communication can be defined simply as that interpersonal communication on the individual level between members of distinctly different cultural groups” (Prosser, 1978/1985/1989, p. xiii).

Intercultural communication, sometimes also called cross-cultural communication or transcultural communication. Here it is defined as the interpersonal communication which has the added characteristics of similarities and differences in language, nonverbal cues, attitudes, perceptions, norms, values, and thought-patterning. It is subsumed in the cultural level of the hierarchical model and is related to such subsets as intra/interracial, intra/interethnic, countercultural, and intracultural communication. While intercultural communication is seen as much more spontaneous and unplanned with a relatively small number of persons, crosscultural communication is considered the interaction on a much more formal, planned, and routinized basis. Intercultural communication is considered much more two-way communication, while crosscultural communication is considered one-way, from a small group to a larger group (Prosser, 1978/1985/1989, p. 299).

“Intercultural communication is a transaction, symbolic process involving the attribution of meaning between people from different cultures” (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, p. 17).

I believe there three sets of definitions of intercultural communication by Prosser and other scholars are the basic guideline for our future research on this field.

Cross-cultural Communication

“Cross-cultural communication can be defined simply as the collective communication between cultural spokespersons of different cultural groups or between

whole cultural groups” (Prosser, 1978/1985/1989, pp. xiii-xiv).

“It is herein as that communication which takes place between members of whole cultures in contact with each other, or between cultural spokespersons, or in the context of making a comparative base between cultures. It is also called transcultural communication. Cross-cultural communication tends to be collective, with one-way directionality, and much planned and systematic interaction, generally only with routinized or ritualized response” (Prosser, 1978/1985/1989, p. 293).

“While this term often is used as a synonym for intercultural, the term *cross-cultural* traditionally implies a comparison of some phenomena across cultures. If we examine the use of self-disclosure in Japan *and* Germany, for example, we are making a cross-cultural comparison. If we look at how Japanese use self-disclosure when communicating with Germans and how Germans use self-disclosure when communicating with Japanese, in contrast, we are looking at intercultural communication” (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, p. 18).

There is currently no single agreed definition, but the three definitions mentioned here clearly show the trend of the cross-cultural communication.

Interpersonal Communication

“Interpersonal communication involves a small number of people, typically with much two-way communication, much unplanned, spontaneous interaction, and with considerable opportunity for feedback” (Prosser, 1978/1985/1989, p. 299).

Mass Communication

“Also called mass communications, it is a form of collective communication which typically is directed by a small group toward a large group. Messages tend to be planned and systematic, and feedback is routinized or ritualistic” (Prosser, 1978/1985/1989, p. 300).

International Communication

“International communication is interaction at national, rather than cultural, levels. The purpose of international communication is to affect political, economic, and defense policies of other nations” (Sitaram & Cogdell, 1976, p. 39).

Interracial Communication

“Interracial communication refers to communication between people from different races” (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, p. 19).

“Interracial communication occurs when the source and the receiver exchanging messages are from different races” (Samovar, Porter, & Stefani, 1998, p. 48).

Social Discourse

“The means by which most cultural traditions, norms, perceptions, and values are transmitted. Since culture assumes the social context, it is also a prerequisite for culture” (Prosser, 1978/1985/1989, p. 302). Social discourse is an important concept, from which Prosser defined “civic discourse”, which is one of his major contributions to the study of intercultural, international and global communication. He was the innovator on this topic with his series on “Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium” with 18 books published from 1998 to 2004.

3. Brief History of Michael H. Prosser’s Intercultural Life

Growing up monoculturally in Indiana, Prosser studied at Our Lady of the Lake Seminary in 1949-1951, and at St. Meinrad Seminary from 1951-1954. He traveled to Europe at twenty-two and twenty-three, when he was among the early US visitors to the Soviet Union, as well as visiting Europe a number of other times. Growing up monoculturally, through his studies and travels to Europe, he became increasingly Euro-centric. Later, in his travels to Asia in 1974 and 1980, and in his teaching in China from 2001 to 2009, he became increasingly Asia centric. His year teaching in Swaziland, Africa and his hosting in his home of a number of young Africans, also made him more Africa centric. Gradually, he became more multiculturally centric.

He is the father of three children, Michelle, Leo, and Louis and the grandfather of nine grandchildren Christine Ann (16), Elizabeth Marie (15), Mary Catherine Rose (13)—children of his son Louis and wife Bernadette; Darya Serenity Michelle Evans (12), Sanders Stephen Gabriel Evans (10) and Sophia Lilia Grace Evans—children of his

daughter Michelle; and Conner Michael (10), Jordan Faith (8), and Luke Patrick (5)—children of his son Leo and his wife Hope.. His daughter, Michelle, graduated from the University of Virginia with a double major in communication and political science, then received her MA degree there in communication, and is the author of *Excuse me, Your God is Waiting* (2008: Charlottesville, VA. Hampton Roads Press). She is president of her consulting company, Energy Focus. His two sons, Leo Michael and Louis Mark both graduated from Radford University in Virginia. Leo Prosser works as a trainer for Verizon Mobile Phones and Louis Prosser works as an agent for New York Life.

His Master's thesis at Ball State University in American literature was entitled "Solitude in the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne" (1959, Muncie, IN. Ball State University). Later, on the basis of the thesis, he published an article on the concept of alienation in his works in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* (1968). His Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Illinois was entitled "A Rhetorical Analysis of the Addresses of Adlai E. Stevenson at the United Nations General Assembly in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth General Assemblies" (1964; Urbana, IL: University of Illinois). This dissertation produced his collections of addresses by Adlai Stevenson (1969) and by heads of state and government at the United Nations (1970, 2 volumes). He traveled to Europe when he was 22 and 23, and was among the first 15,000 Americans according to a *Newsweek* cover article visiting the Soviet Union in the late 1900s, and returned to travel in Europe again in 1975, 1977, 1983, 1986, and 2006. In 1980-81, he was among a 26 person faculty-study delegation to Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, and its occupied territories. Totally, Prosser has visited 56 countries.

Prosser was a teacher of Latin in Urbana Junior High School, Urbana, Illinois, (1960-63); Assistant Professor in Speech Communication at State University of New York at Buffalo (1963-69); Associate Professor and Director of the MA program in Speech Communication at Indiana University (1969-72); Professor (and Chair, 1972-77) in Speech Communication at the University of Virginia (1972-2001), Fulbright Professor, Department of English, University of Swaziland (1990-91) where he founded the communication major; and William A. Kern and Distinguished Professor in Communication, Rochester Institute of Technology (1994-2001). Additionally, he had short visiting appointments at Queens College of the City University of New York (summers, 1966 and 67); California State

University at Hayward (summer quarter, 1971); Memorial University of Newfoundland, where he taught the first course in a Canadian university in intercultural communication (third semester, 1972); St. Paul University and the University of Ottawa (summer, 1995); the United States Information Agency for mid level executives and co-chair of USIA Scholar-Diplomat Seminars (autumn semester, 1977); Distinguished Visiting Professor, Kent State University (winter and spring quarters, 1978); George Washington University (1994); and State University College of New York at Brockport (1997-98). As a result of his USIA teaching and co-leading the Scholar-Diplomat Seminars, he edited *USIA Intercultural Communication Course: 1977 Proceedings* (1977), and he developed four day training courses for new career officers in the USIA. Through the Agency's assistance, he gave lectures on intercultural communication in South Korea and Singapore (1980).

During 1982-85, he was the President of the Albemarle County and Charlottesville, Virginia, American Field Service Chapter working with intercultural communication on a practical exchange student level. He was host father for international high school exchange students from Sweden, Belgium, France, Brazil, Spain, and South Africa. He brought two high school students from Swaziland to Charlottesville for additional education in 1991, following his Fulbright Professorship at the University of Swaziland. During the 1996-2001 period he was the family host of a series of refugees from Southern Sudan. He chaired eight "Global Awareness Days" for a total of 2200 high school students, including 500 international students, at the University of Virginia (1983-90), and later "Model UN Security Competitions" for a total of 800 high school students at Rochester Institute of Technology (1995-98). He was the advisor for Rochester Institute of Technology students at Model United Nations in Toronto and Montreal (1995-98). He was a faculty advisor for the RIT student Global Union (1996-2001).

In recent years, he has been teaching at Chinese universities, 2001-02 in Yangzhou University, as a Distinguished Professor in the College of English 2002-05 in Beijing Language and Culture University (BLCU), and 2005-09 in Shanghai International Studies University (SISU), teaching first as a Distinguished Professor in the College of English (2005-07), and later in the College of Journalism and Communication (2007-09). At Yangzhou University, he taught mass communication for junior English majors, intensive reading for senior English majors; intercultural communication, rhetoric and public

discourse for MA students there, and oral English for instructors in various university departments and colleges. At Beijing Language and Culture University, he taught Western civilization for seniors in the English Department; debate, model UN Security Council, and advanced writing for juniors there. He taught oral English for sophomore English majors at Beijing Business College (2002-03). While teaching for the SISU College of English, he taught public speaking for senior majors; model UN Security Council for juniors; and oral English for freshmen and sophomore majors. He currently teaches intercultural communication, global media and culture, and model United Nations Security Council courses for MA students in the intercultural communication MA program in the Shanghai International Studies University (SISU). Since coming to China he has also given lecture series at Lucknow University in Lucknow, India (2003), Kursk State University in Kursk, Russia (2005), and Volgograd State Pedagogical University in Volgograd, Russia (2008), and has attended international conferences in Canada, Greece, Germany, Italy, Peru, and Russia while teaching in China. He taught as a volunteer, kindergarten, primary school and junior middle school students English at the Kingston Foreign Language School near Yangzhou during 2001-2002. He traveled widely in China, visiting more than 30 cities, and traveled with Chinese students both in these experiences and also with travels accompanied by young Chinese to Vietnam, Cambodia, South Korea, India, Europe, the Philippines, Russia, Australia and New Zealand, thus helping to internationalize them as well.

4. Brief History of Michael H. Prosser's Influences and Contributions to Intercultural Communication

He was the Executive Secretary for the New York Speech Association (1965-68), and the Editor of *Today's Speech*, the Journal of the Eastern Communication Association, 1968-70, and initiated ten theme oriented issues, including such topics as nonwestern communication, social justice and human rights, war and peace, religion and atheism, and law and justice. These interests are early indications of some of his developing major themes in intercultural and international communication.

Prosser was one of the founders of the study of intercultural communication in North

America (late 1960's and 1970's), chairing the Commission of the Speech Communication Association for International and Intercultural Communication (1971-73), and chairing the first three North American conferences to establish the study of intercultural communication (1971, 1973, and 1974), serving as vice president and the third chair of the Division of Intercultural and International Communication of the International Communication Association (1974-77) and coordinated 13 programs for the Berlin conference in 1977; and as a founding Governing Council member (1973-75), chair of its 1980 international congress in Pennsylvania; Vice President (1983-84) and President of the International Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR International 1984-86). He supervised the Society's international congresses in 1983 in Italy, and 1984 in San Antonio, Texas. Prosser was the chair of the International and Development Board of the Midwest University Consortium of International Developments (1971-72). He was the coordinator for 24 programs on intercultural communication for the world-wide English programs of the Voice of America (1979-80). He was awarded a 1994-95 Fulbright Professorship to the American University of Bulgaria in Sophia, but declined it to assume the position of the William A. Kern and Distinguished Professor in Communication at the Rochester Institute of Technology in 1994.

Chairing the first three US conferences on intercultural communication in North America, the first one 1971 – the Indiana University (Brown County) consultation sponsored by the Speech Communication Association was held to found the area study of intercultural communication with an emphasis both on developing the *substance* of the sub discipline of communication, and the *process* in establishing it.. The 1973 conference was a syllabus-building conference in intercultural communication and communication and social change at the University of Virginia (Massenetta Springs Conference), which resulted in Prosser's edited collection, *Syllabi in Intercultural Communication* (1974 and 1975), and the 1974 Chicago conference, co-sponsored by the Speech Communication Association, the International Communication Association, and SIETAR International in which 200 persons utilized Edward C. Stewart's "Outline of Intercultural Communication" to help establish a substantive content for the field. Nemi C. Jain, Michael H. Prosser, and Melvin H. Miller, co-edited *Intercultural Communication: Proceedings of the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference, X* (1974).

He was one of 32 American participants in the 1974 bicultural Japanese-American research conference on intercultural communication in Nihonmatsu, Japan, which he highlights in a bicultural dialogue between Japanese and American participants in his book, *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1978, pp. 220-286). While at the Rochester Institute of Technology, he hosted a 33 lecture series on intercultural and international issues, giving 11 of the lectures. Additionally, he attended Fulbright conferences, third world study conferences, and nongovernmental organization conferences at the United Nations annually while a faculty member at the Rochester Institute of Technology. In the early 1980's, he was cited in a survey done by Kent State University faculty as "among the 33 on the cutting edge of the communication discipline."

More recently, he and K. S. Sitaram co-chaired six Rochester Intercultural Conferences (1995-2001), the first of which celebrated the 1970-71 founding of the study of intercultural communication in North America, with the title, "Intercultural Communication: The Last Twenty-five Years and the Next," followed in 1996, "Intercultural, International and Global Media," 1997, "Communication, Technology and Values," (no conference in 1998), 1999: "Intercultural Communication and War and Peace," 2000, "Social Justice and Human Rights," and the final conference, 2001, "Computer Mediated Communication." Typically, these conferences attracted about 100 scholars and graduate students annually from the United States and abroad, plus RIT faculty and students. This annual conference provided peer reviewed awards for the outstanding papers and outstanding student papers. The nature of these conferences focused late in the careers of Sitaram and Prosser their continuing dedication to scholarship in intercultural communication. The Global Focus conferences, modeled on their Rochester conferences, established the "Prosser-Sitaram Award for Scholarship in International Communication" for young scholars which was given annually while the conferences met annually.

He is the editor or author of seven books during the 1960s and the 1970s, including ; *An Ethic for Survival: Adlai Stevenson Speaks on International Affairs, 1936-65* (1969); (with Thomas W. Benson) *Readings in Classical Rhetoric* (1969, 1972, 1985, 1989, 1995); *Sow the Wind, Reap the Whirlwind: Heads of State Address the United Nations* (1970, in a deluxe, limited, numbered and boxed two volume set for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations); (with Joseph M. Miller and Thomas W. Benson) *Readings in*

Medieval Rhetoric (1973); *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973); *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1978/1985/1989), which was translated into Japanese by Roike Okabe and published by Tokai University Press in Tokyo in 1982 and his edited *USIA Intercultural Communication Course: 1977 Proceedings* (1977).

Ray T. Donahue and Prosser co-authored *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations* (1997); with K.S. Sitaram, he co-edited *Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Global Communication* (1998) and *Civic Discourse: Intercultural, International, and Global Media* (1999); with ZHOU and Lu Jun, he co-edited *Sino-American Compositions of Shared Topics* (2003), and with Steve J. Kulich, he co-edited *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (2007). Currently, he and Kulich are co-editing *Values at the Theoretical Cross-roads of Culture: Intercultural Research Volume 2* and *Values: Dynamics and Dimensions across Cultures: Intercultural Research Volume 3*, both for the Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.. He initiated and was the series editor for “Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium” for Ablex, Praeger, and Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998-2004 from which eighteen books were published, two of which were related to China. Two of the books in his series won national awards in 2000.

Among his published articles and essays relating to international and intercultural communication, the following are illustrative:

(1973). Major Books on Intercultural Communication. Washington, D.C. SIETAR.

(1975). Teaching Intercultural Communication: An Illustrative Syllabus and Bibliography, *Speech Teacher*. XXIV, 3 September, 242-250

(1977). Communication Media and Attitudinal and Social Change, in *The Social Uses of Mass Media*, edited by M. B. Cassata and M.K. Asante, Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo Press.

(1978) Intercultural Communication: Major Constructs: An Overview, in

Communication Yearbook II. Edited by Brent Ruben, New Brunswick: Transaction

(2007). One World, One Dream: Harmonizing Society through Intercultural Communication: A Prelude to China Intercultural Studies. In S. J. Kulich and M. H. Prosser (Eds). *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

(2007). China: Selected Books in English. [online] *Review of Communication*.

(April, 2008). The Palestine Issue in the Eyes of Jimmy Carter: A Book Review. *Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies (in Asia)*.2. .

(forthcoming) Universal Rights as Universal Values, in S. J. Kulich and M.H. Prosser, (Eds), *Values at the Theoretical Crossroads of Culture: Intercultural Research, Volume 2*.

5. Meaningfulness and Innovation of this Thesis

Through the intensive study on the contributions of Michael H. Prosser and his contemporaries, we can better understand the development of intercultural communication especially during its critical period in the late 1960's and the 1970s and its mature period in the 1980's and 1990's, as well as now in the first decade of the twenty-first century in China. The research methods and the approaches to the study of intercultural communication are connected with the past. Consistency and innovation happen hand in hand along the way. Since no exclusive study on Prosser's contributions has been done before, this thesis serves as a milestone for Prosser, as well as a brief summary of intercultural communication development through its history of about 50 years (See Prosser, 2007, pp. 22-91 for a more detailed history of the field's development in North America and China).

When he came to China in 2001, his teaching of more than 2200 Chinese students, lectures to more than 6,800 university and middle school students; serving as a keynoter at

a dozen Chinese communication conferences, his appearances on a dozen China Central TV International “Dialogue” programs, his eight 2004-05 essays for *New Oriental Magazine*, the article featuring him in the national Chinese magazine *China Talent Semimonthly* (in Chinese, July 2005), his lecture series in Chinese universities, India, and Russia, and his contributions to the Shanghai International Studies University MA program in intercultural communication all speak to Michael Prosser’s contributions in intercultural communication, both in North America, and more broadly. At SISU, he has taught a large number of the 121 MA graduates in intercultural communication (as of May 25, 2009), and has read at least half of all of the MA theses in intercultural communication.

With nearly fifty years of teaching courses in intercultural communication, his scholarship, and his professional leadership, it is clear that he has had offered an important contribution to the broad study of intercultural communication over its approximately sixty years of history, not only in North America, but also China, India, and Russia.

The following chapter offers a brief literature review of the developments in intercultural communication from the late 1960s to 2009, including Prosser’s contributions.

Chapter 1 Literature Review

1.1 Intercultural Communication Development during the Late 1960s and through the 1970s

Robert T. Oliver's *Culture and Communication* (1962) and Alfred Smith's *Communication and Culture* (1966) reflect the continuous effects made by early intercultural communication scholars in the 1960s. Smith's collection of essays on human communication covers thirteen types of communication studies. "Although only four articles on intercultural communication are included in the book, their presence confirms the status of intercultural communication as a field of study" (Chen & Starosta, 1998). The 1970s witnessed rapid developments in establishing the study of intercultural communication in North America. Intercultural communication has become a well established academic field since the early foundational work of Edward T. Hall's *The Silent Language* (1959) and his *Hidden Dimension* (1966) provided a broad understanding of non verbal and spatial communication. His *Beyond Culture* (1976) established the concepts of high and low context and monochronic and polychronic time. He can properly be called the "grandfather" of intercultural communication. Professor Prosser met him briefly at the ICA conference in Berlin in 1977. In 1972, after three years of refining his model of intercultural communication, social psychologist Edward C. Stewart presented his unpublished "An Outline of Intercultural Communication". This "Outline" served as the basis for the 1974 Chicago conference, chaired by Prosser, in establishing the substantive issues to be considered essential to the study of intercultural communication (See Stewart's "Outline" in Casmir, 1984).

Prosser had a dozen MA and Ph.D. students taking courses and writing theses and dissertations on intercultural communication at Indiana University which awarded perhaps the first doctoral degree in intercultural communication under Michael Prosser's supervision, according to the claim of William J. Starosta (Chen & Starosta, 1998). Many books on intercultural communication became available in the 1970s, the most influential including Samovar and Porter's *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, which has now had twelve editions over its 37 years (See Lin, 2007). Also, during the 1970s as the foundational decade of the study of intercultural communication, several books were edited

or authored, including Prosser's *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973) and *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1978/1985/1989), Harms' *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1973). Arthur Smith's *Transracial Communication* (1973), Condon and Yousef's *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1975), Barnlund's *Public and Private Self in Japan and United States* (1975), Brislin, Bockner, and Lonner's *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Learning* (1975), Sitaram and Cogdell's *Foundations of Intercultural Communication* (1976), Fischer and Merrill's *International and Intercultural Communication* (1976), Hall's *Beyond Culture* (1976), Dodd's *Perspectives on Cross-Cultural Communication* (1977), Weaver's *Crossing Cultural Barriers* (1978), and Kohl's *Survival Kit for Overseas Living* (1979) and Asante, Blake and Newmark's *Handbook of Intercultural Communication* (1999) and others.

The publication of Asante, Blake, and Newmark's *Handbook of Intercultural Communication* in 1979 highlighted the achievements of intercultural communication scholars in the 1970s. Introducing their book, they noted that at that time there were two major trends in the development of intercultural communication, "cultural dialogue" represented especially by Prosser, and emphasizing similarities among cultures and an inclusiveness toward world or global culture and peace, and "cultural criticism," represented primarily by Edward C. Stewart and others, and emphasizing differences among cultures, and a comparative/contrastive consideration of cultures. In this case, Prosser's books *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973) and *The Cultural Dialogue* (1978, 1985, 1989) and other views in the trend, "cultural dialogue," led later to the study of multicultural and global communication, while the trend "cultural criticism" led more to the development of cultural diversity and cross-cultural studies. Basically, the early edited and authored books developed very few theories that could be empirically tested, but they did establish foundational trends and concepts, such as the study of attitudes, stereotypes, prejudice, beliefs and values; subjective versus objective culture; linguistic and non verbal communication; culture shock' conflict resolution, ethnic identity studies; peace studies; multiculturalism and diversity; international, diplomatic and global communication; and the role of intercultural communication in the media, business and training, among others. The foundational goal of SIETAR International, which Prosser

helped to found, specifically emphasized the inclusionary aspects of intercultural education, training and research.

In addition to these books, *The International Journal of Intercultural Relations* began publication in 1977, under the ownership and editorship of Dan Landis, and served for many years as the official journal of SIETAR International until toward the end of the Society as a physical organization, when it became a virtual society at its twenty-fifth anniversary in Japan in 1998. The journal significantly influenced research in the field of intercultural communication in the years that followed. Today, this is the most referenced academic journal in the study of intercultural communication, publishing mostly empirical studies testing intercultural communication theories.

“Disorder characterized the initial development of the field. Intercultural communication scholars pursued their own directions and definitions, with few attempts at integration. It was not until the 1980s that the field began to move from disarray to a more coherent focus” (Chen & Starosta, 1998). Tapio Varis, writing in his foreword to K.S. Sitaram and Michael H. Prosser’s co-edited *Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, and Global Communication* (1998) has offered the following assessment of this early period, and the early contributions of Sitaram and Prosser:

In 1969, Professor Sitaram and some of his colleagues initiated discussions about establishing a separate organization for studying intercultural communication. In 1970, more than 25 colleagues submitted a petition to the International Communication Association (ICA) Board of Directors to establish a separate Division for Intercultural Communication. Sitaram submitted a position paper titled: ‘Intercultural Communication: The What and Why of It.’ According to the ICA Board of Directors at their meeting on May 6, 1970, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the paper was presented to the Board. According to the minutes of the meeting, Darrell Piersol moved and Malcolm MacLean seconded that Division V be established as the Intercultural Communication Division. The motion carried – seven for and zero against. The board’s positive response added this new division to its then ‘Four Basic Divisions’ at ICA. Sitaram became the founding chair and 25 years later, he explained that although the ‘founders’ did not have an acceptable definition

of intercultural communication, they all knew there was an important place for it in academic studies.

In 1971, the Speech Communication Association (SCA – now National Communication Association – NCA) selected Professor Michael Prosser as the founding Chair of its Commission on International and Intercultural Communication (later formed as a Division in SCA). With co-sponsorship of the Canadian Speech Communication Association and SCA, and the presidents of these two organizations, Grace Layman of Memorial University in Newfoundland and William Howell of the University of Minnesota present, Prosser chaired the first ‘consultation’ on forming an area as a subset of the broader field of communication of intercultural communication at Indiana University, with 12 academics and 12 Indiana University graduate students meeting in Brown County State Park, Indiana. The group discussed various ingredients for establishing a subfield of intercultural communication, such as the need for undergraduate and graduate courses; graduate degrees with an emphasis on intercultural communication; the establishment of divisions in regional, national, and international communication organizations; publication of journal articles and texts; the creation of one or more journals or yearbooks; and conferences devoted to the subject. They also discussed what should be the substantive issues to be studied under the framework of intercultural communication, noting specifically the earlier contributions of Edward T. Hall, Alfred Smith, and Robert T. Oliver. Later in 1973, Prosser chaired the first national conference on intercultural communication, sponsored by the University of Virginia which emphasized the construction of syllabi in both intercultural communication and social change and national development, and then chaired the second national conference in 1994, cosponsored by SCA, ICA, and The International Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research (SIETAR International – which he also helped found). For the latter conference, Edward C. Stewart’s ‘Outline of Intercultural Communication’ was discussed and debated by more than 200 participants. K.S. Sitaram was an active participant in that conference.

1.2 Intercultural Communication Development during the 1980s and

Early 1990s

Scholars who received formal academic training in intercultural communication in the late 1960s and the early 1970s began to make their contributions in research and teaching by the 1980s. Many of their mentors had been trained in rhetoric, including John C. Condon, Michael H. Prosser, William Howell, and Arthur Smith (later Molefi K. Asante), whose students and colleagues defined the maturing study of intercultural communication in the 1980s and 1990s. For example, at the University of Minnesota, Janet Bennet, Milton Bennet, Mitchell Hamner, and William B. Gudykunst were all Ph.D. students of William Howell, and each one made major impacts on the intercultural communication field. Hamner, and the Bennets wrote many important articles, and Gudykunst was the single most productive academic writer in the field before his death in 2005. Five volumes published in the 1980s as *the International and Intercultural Communication Annual* advanced an agenda for the study of intercultural communication: Gudykunst's *Intercultural Communication Theory: Current Perspectives* (1983), Gudykunst and Kim's *Methods of Intercultural Research* (1984), Kincaid's *Communication Theory: Eastern and Western Perspectives*, Kim and Gudykunst's *Theories in Intercultural Communication* (1988), and Asante and Gudykunst's *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication* (1989).

Theory building and methodological refinement characterized intercultural communication study during this decade. This effort at self-definition enlivened numerous sessions at professional communication conferences and the syllabus-building conferences sponsored by the University of Virginia under a USOE (United States Office of Education) grant. The Stanford University training conferences, and later the Portland, Oregon Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication (SIIC), have introduced hundreds of graduate students and teachers to the importance of intercultural communication. The result was a more focused and mature discipline in the 1990s in which rhetoric became a secondary concern, behind that of interpersonal communication and social psychology and in which "mass media issues were all but neglected" (Chen & Starosta, 1998; see also Prosser, 2007, pp. 22-91).

The International Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research

(SIETAR), whose first president was Molefi K. Asante (later the founder of African American Studies in the US), and the first Executive Director was David Hoopes, later followed by Executive Director Diane Zeller. The second set of presidencies under the leadership of Stephen Rhinesmith (later the US Cultural Ambassador to the Soviet Union), Paul Pedersen (an intercultural counselor and frequent writer on such counseling at Syracuse University and later at the East West Center at the University of Hawaii), Pierre Casse of Belgium (a leading intercultural consultant in Europe), Beulah Rolerich (Professor of Communication at Syracuse University), and Michael Prosser (then Professor of Rhetoric and Communication Studies at the University of Virginia), William Cosgrove of the World Bank, intercultural trainer Sandra Mumford Fowler, and Alvino Fantani of the School for International Living in Burlington, Vermont, and others, took up the consideration of intercultural training issues. The final President of the physical SIETAR International was Jacqueline Waskelewski at International Christian University in Japan in 1998. There are presently several regional SIETAR organizations still functioning. SIETAR International was founded in the United States in 1973 by a few dedicated individuals, such as David Hoopes, Edward C. Stewart, Toby Frank, Margaret Pusch, George Renwich, Nessa Lowenthal, Lynn Tyler, Stephen Rhinesmith, Paul Pederson, and Michael Prosser and others to draw together professionals at a conference at the University of Pittsburg, under the leadership of David Hoopes, and, including teachers, researchers and intercultural trainers engaged in various forms of intercultural learning and engagement research and training in order to establish the Society..

Originally called SITAR when it was a regional organization at the University of Pittsburg, the name was later changed to encompass education and the Society became SIETAR. Nessa Lowenthal (an intercultural trainer) and Prosser were the co-authors of the Society's charter. Its goal was to provide a forum for exchanging ideas about training, theory, and research, and to learn from each other as well as to provide a place where interculturalists could strengthen their bonds with each other. Later, Prosser established the Society's annual award programs.

They envisioned an exchange between people in different disciplines and professional activity as well as geographically diverse that would strengthen the theoretical development and practice of intercultural communication. The Society gradually grew

beyond the borders of the United States attracting people from around the world who had similar concerns and interests and was named SIETAR International in 1982.

Michael H. Prosser became Vice President at the 1983 International Congress at San Geminano, Italy, coordinating the George Mason University international congress in 1985 under the leadership of Carley Dodd of Albelene Christian University and Frank Montalvo of St. Mary's University in San Antonio and the 1986 international congress at the Royal Institute of Development in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and President of SIETAR International during 1984-1986. During the period 1983 to 1986, SIETAR International also held two regional conferences at Lund University in Sweden in which Prosser had leading roles. Several regional SIETAR organizations remained active, such as those in North America, Europe, and Japan. In 2008, SIETAR International held its first international congress since 1998 in Barcelona, Spain. Its website identifies itself as SIETAR Global Council (www.SIETAR.com) with a new regional organization in India.

During the early period of development, there were more broad topics or trends than theories developed. However, *Theories in Intercultural Communication* by Kim and Gudykunst (1988) featured two approaches to theory building. First, they claimed that the study of intercultural communication draws upon existing communication theories in constructivism, coordinated management of meaning, uncertainty reduction theory, communication accommodation theory, network theory, and convergence theory. Second, most intercultural communication theories presently focus on the interpersonal communication level with a brief mention of rhetoric. These two characteristics served to define the mainstream study of intercultural communication in the 1980s. The shift in focus can be seen by noting the eclectic contents of Smith's *Communication and Culture* in 1966, the rhetorical features in Prosser's *Intercommunication among nations and peoples* (1973) and *The Cultural Dialogue* (1978), the emphasis on international communication in Fischer and Merrill's *International and Intercultural Communication* (1976), and the largely interpersonal, intercultural perspective of Asante and Gudykunst's *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication* (1989), which highlights the studies of intercultural communication in the 1980s.

Methodologically, the traditional quantitative and rhetorical-interpretive research methods used in the communication discipline were also applied to the study of

intercultural communication. Gudykunst and Kim's *Methods of Intercultural Communication Research* (1984), included six articles each on quantitative and qualitative research, describing a number of methodological possibilities, although, in reality, quantitative research methods dominated intercultural communication study in the 1980s, especially in articles published in *The International Journal of Intercultural Research*. Fortunately, scholars resumed work in rhetorical, semiotic, linguistic, and ethnographic methods of intercultural communication research by the mid-1990s. Examples of these are Sitaram's *Communication and culture: A world view* (1995), Donahue and Prosser's *Diplomatic Discourse* (1997) and Sitaram and Prosser's co-edited two volumes of *Civic Discourse* (1998, 1999).

From the 1970s to the early 1990s, the direction for the study of intercultural communication has been determined mainly by three major influences: (1) the *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* (IICA), (2) the Speech Communication Association (SCA) (now the [US] National Communication Association, and (3) the International Communication Association (ICA). Early volumes of *IICA* were edited by Fred Casmir and Nemi C. Jain. Beginning in 1983, each volume of *IICA* focused on one specific topic. *Intercultural Communication Theory: Current Perspective* (Gudykunst, 1983) and *Theories in Intercultural Communication* (Kim and Gudykunst, 1988) are two of the *IICA* volumes. The editorial direction of *IICA* was strongly oriented toward quantitative research in the 1980s and early 1990s. The annual has now become a quarterly journal of the [US] National Communication Association.

This trend was reversing in the mid-1990s because of calls for methodological pluralism, a renewed place for rhetorical study, the rise of interpretivist and critical methods in the communication discipline, ethnic identity studies, and a concern for coverage of domestic co-cultures. These focal points have been particularly led by the work of such scholars as Judith Martin and Thomas Nakayama with their book *Intercultural Communication in Contexts* (now in its 3rd edition, 2003), William B. Gudykunst, Young Yum Kim, Milton and Janet Bennett, Mitch Hammer, Stella Ting-Toomey, Mary Jane Collier, Donal Carbaugh, Guo-Ming Chen, William J. Starosta, D. Ray Heisey and others. Critical, interpretative studies are increasingly a primary research approach of media studies and their corresponding audience influence. In China, while

intercultural communication has been dominated by departments and colleges of foreign language studies, gradually mass media and journalism associations are beginning to turn their attention to the study of intercultural communication, mostly from an empirical method, but with some qualitative studies being undertaken.

SCA, now NCA (the [US] National Communication Association), and ICA are the two major professional associations for communication study (though there are also smaller groups like the World Communication Association (WCA, and regional societies like the Pacific Area Communication Association, PACA, or US regional associations like the Eastern Communication Association (founded in 1909), the Central States Communication Association, the Southern Communication Association and Western States Communication Association). Both of the main associations have a division promoting research and study in intercultural communication, the International and Intercultural Communication Division of the NCA, and Intercultural/Development Communication Division of the ICA now separated into the Intercultural Communication and the Global Culture and Media Divisions. In addition to NCA and ICA, other associations, including SIETAR (SIETAR Global Council), and journals sponsored by these associations also make significant contributions to the development of the field of intercultural communication.

1.3 Intercultural Communication Development during the Late 1990s up to 2009

In this period, intercultural communication study has continued to advance to deeper and broader levels. Towards the end of the 1990s, three additional journals, *The Howard Journal of Communications*, initiated by William J. Starosta, *Intercultural Communication Studies*, created by Guo-Ming Chen and *World Communication*, a publication of the World Communication Association, have begun to specialize exclusively on the cultural issues of communication research. The former SIETAR International journal, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* (IJIR), which Dan Landis founded, owned and still edits, became linked with the newly formed International Academy of Intercultural Research at Fullerton, California which he helped create, in 1998 and continues to be the first-tier publication

dedicated to intercultural research (mostly in the quantitative communication science tradition). The Academy has many prestigious peer-selected members throughout the world.

The more language- and literature- based group, which is correspondingly more descriptive and critical-studies oriented, primarily in China, the International Association of Intercultural Communication Studies (IAICS) and their journal, *Intercultural Communication Studies* (ICS) have been an important publication outlet for some media and pop culture analyses. The on-line *Journal of Intercultural Communication* (sponsored by the Nordic Network for Intercultural Communication) is a very representative journal of text and media analysis related to the impact of pop culture. There is a new journal, the *Chinese Journal of Communication*, at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, founded in 2008. The National Communication Association online *Review of Books in Communication* has included many reviews of books in intercultural communication, including Prosser's "China: Selected Books in English" (2007).

Donahue coauthored with Prosser *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the UN – Addresses and Analysis* in 1997. This book has two major approaches to analysis, discourse analysis (text based) and rhetorical analysis (speaker-audience-message based). In the following two years, Prosser co-edited with K.S. Sitaram two volumes of *Civic Discourse* as a part of his "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium" series, which has published 18 books (1998-2004) dealing both with national, regional, and global issues, but also such topics as human rights, social justice, peace, and women throughout the world in entertainment and the arts.

This renewed momentum of the rhetorical approach is partly because of the keen awareness of the needs for the mutual understanding among different peoples and nations in an age of more diversification and at the same time more conflicts. The nuclear threat is still looming at the background. There was the genocide in Rwanda in 1994, the Bosnian-Herzegovinian War in 1992-1995, the Kosovo War in 1999, the constant hatred hostilities between Palestinians and Israelis, the Gulf and Iraq wars, the Afghanistan war, and between Pakistanis and Indians, and the unfortunate misunderstandings between some Muslims and Christians. Samuel Huntington's book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order* (1996), indicated that people became more aware of the

importance of the application of intercultural communication research in the arena of politics, foreign affairs, and international relations.

Many works deal with intercultural conflict management and cultural comparisons. *Chinese Conflict Management and Resolution* (Chen & Ma, 2001) has done abundant studies on the relationship between culture and conflict behaviors from different disciplines. *Managing Intercultural Conflict Effectively* (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001) brings intercultural research and theory together and develops a practical framework for understanding intercultural conflict, leading to some very specific suggestions for how we can deal with it more effectively. “When people from different cultures engage in conflict, they often have different expectations of how the conflict should be handled” (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). Ting-Toomey developed her face-negotiation theories to help people who are involved in intimate relationships, group work, and manager-employee relationships and need to know the cause and solutions for intercultural conflict. Updated from its first edition *Culture’s Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values* in 1980, Hofstede’s *Culture’s Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations* (2001) emphasizes more on “comparing” different values and the “mental programs” that define people’s behaviors.

Gudykunst’s edited book *Cross-cultural and Intercultural Communication* (2003) contains “state-of-the-art summaries of research and theory in cross-cultural communication (Part I) and intercultural communication (Part II)” (Gudykunst, 2003, p. vii). Gudykunst as the editor and the authors in the book overview all the important cross-cultural and intercultural communication theories to date, give their scientific evaluations of the theories, and point out the future directions of theory development in the intercultural communication field. Different from the previous *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication* (Asante & Gudykunst, 1989), which is more suitable for college level studies, this book featuring theoretical summary is more suitable for graduate level reference. Gudykunst’s edited book *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication* (2005) fully treated the updated versions of 17 established intercultural communication (in its broader sense) theories with their respective applicatory situations in seven major categories. Prosser in his website www.michaelprosser.com summaries some of the most up-to-date theories in this book (e.g. the Intercultural Accommodation, Adaptation and

Co-cultural Theories, and Prosser applied them to explain the Election of Barack Obama; and the three established identity theories at the Shanghai Normal University, 2008 conference on :”Identity and Intercultural Communication.”: Identity Management Theory (IMT) as proposed by W. R. Cupach and T. Imahori, Identity Negotiation Theory (INT), developed in large part by Stella Ting-Toomey, and Cultural Identity Theory (CIT), presented by M. J. Collier and M. Thomas, and Prosser explained the application of them in the election of Barack Hussein Obama; (please see <http://www.michaelprosser.com/article.asp?id=98>, and <http://www.michaelprosser.com/article.asp?id=102> or Prosser’s website, www.michaelprosser.com).

In the 1990s, intercultural communication theories were widely introduced to China thanks to the introductory work of HU Wenzhong (1990, 1994), GUAN Shijie (1995), WANG Hongyin (1996), LIN Dajin (1996), and JIA Yuxin (1997), among others. In 1995, the first Chinese conference on intercultural communication was held in Harbin, Northeast China’s Heilongjiang Province at the Harbin Institute of Technology. It was at that conference that the China Association for Intercultural Communication (CAFIC) was established. It “ushered in a new era for the development and booming of IC studies in China” (Guan, 2007).

Michael Prosser joined the faculty of the College of English of Shanghai International Studies University (SISU) with Steve J. Kulich, David Henry, Cooper Wakefield, and Zhang Hongling, initiating the first independent intercultural communication direction of the postgraduate English major in the autumn of 2005. He became Distinguished Professor in the College of English then until 2007 and then in the College of Journalism and Communication at SISU in 2007 until 2009. Under the joint efforts of Steve J. Kulich and Michael H. Prosser, as well as other faculty members at SISU, Shanghai International Studies University has established its SISU Intercultural Institute for which Prosser is the Chair of the International Advisory Board and Chief Co-Editor of the Institute’s Intercultural Research Series. Kulich and Prosser coedited *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (2007), which according to GUAN Shijie (2007, p. xiv) “comes as good news as the authors are trying to overcome some of the deficiencies in China’s IC studies”. GUAN in the Foreword of the book (pp. ix-xvi) offers several specific

contributions which this book and the two editors make to the study of intercultural communication in China, including:

1. It serves an interdisciplinary platform for China's IC research.
2. It emphasizes on the importance of scientific methodology in IC research.
3. It focuses on the localization of IC research.

And GUAN (2007, p. xvi) commented that "Professors Kulich and Prosser have committed themselves to the education and research of IC in China for years; and with their initiatives, Shanghai International Studies University has established its SISU Intercultural Institute. They have made positive contributions in promoting China's IC studies with their unique perspectives and connections with Western scholars, and are widely applauded among the Chinese IC scholars."

Among awards which Michael Prosser has received are Ball State University's Outstanding Alumni Award (1978), ICA's Outstanding Service Award (1978), SIETAR International's Citizen of the World Award (1986), its Senior Interculturalist Award (1990), the naming of the Global Fusion Conference Prosser-Sitaram Award for International Communication Research for younger scholars (2001); and listing in various issues of *the Marquis Who's Who in American Education*, *Who's Who in America*, the inaugural (2007) and subsequent volumes of *Who's Who in Asia*, and the 2009 *Who's Who in the World*. He has been frequently listed in *The International Dictionary of Biography*.

This chapter has broadly discussed Prosser's and other scholars' contributions to the development of the study of intercultural communication. The following chapter identifies the descriptive/historical methodology of the thesis.

Chapter 2 Methodology

To fully explore the influence that Michael H. Prosser has been exerting and the contributions he has been making in the field of intercultural communication, the first analyzing step is to compare his works with other intercultural communication scholars in the same periods, especially the early time frame, which will be discussed in Chapter 3. Besides, research questions were raised, surveys were designed and information was collected and analyzed. This chapter will give a detailed explanation of the methodology applied in the qualitative part.

2.1 The Main Research Question

This thesis has aimed to reveal what Michael H. Prosser's influence is on the intercultural communication field in relation to other contemporaries in this area. To explore the details, I carried out a historical/comparative/contrastive study, in which I planned to discuss the above question from the following three approaches:

- Comparing Prosser's books where possible (edited or authored) with books written by other scholars of the same period, particularly in the early development of the study of intercultural communication.
- Surveying Prosser's former and current colleagues, as well as CRTNET readers, about Prosser's and their contributions to the field.
- Surveying Prosser's former and current intercultural communication students at Shanghai International Studies University for their assessment of their own development in the MA program in intercultural communication, especially as it relates to the teaching and advising of Professor Prosser.

2.2 The Specific Survey Questions:

2.2.1 Survey of Prosser's Former Colleagues and CRTNET Readers

Michael H. Prosser has designed ten questions (as it is attached in Appendix A) for the survey of his former and current colleagues and CRTNET readers for this specific research, with questions including "are there any contributions to the development of the

intercultural communication field by Michael Prosser that you consider noteworthy?”, “If you are familiar with his early books such as his edited *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973) and his authored book *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1978, reprinted in 1985, 1989), were there any specific contributions which these books or your own books made to the development of the intercultural communication field?” “Are there any contributions by Michael Prosser or his books which you consider relevant to the study of intercultural communication?” and the like.

I have acquired the commentators’ permission to quote their answers or comments to the questions (as attached in Appendix A as well).

2.2.2 Survey of Prosser’s Intercultural Communication Students in China

Since the students may not be knowledgeable about Prosser’s contributions as the academics, Prosser has developed a new questionnaire of ten questions for surveying his former or current intercultural communication students at Shanghai International Studies University (SISU). This survey encompasses questions such as “In general, how would you rate Michael’s PowerPoint presentations in any of these classes” “If you have read any of Michael’s essays in his website, are there two or three that you found especially helpful in your understanding of intercultural communication?” and “Has Michael had other characteristics or contributions which have helped you in your understanding of intercultural communication?”. The complete survey is attached in Appendix B

2.3 Respondents

Respondents to the survey questions include:

- a) Michael H. Prosser’s former or current professional colleagues: Donal Carbaugh (University of Massachusetts at Amherst), Carley H. Dodd (Ableleine Christian University), Ray T. Donahue (Nagoya Gakuin University, Japan), D. Ray Heisey (Kent State University), Wenshan Jia (Chapman University), Young Y. Kim (University of Kansas), Paul B. Pederson (Syracuse University and the East West Center, University of Hawaii), Herbert Simons (Temple University), and William J.

Starosta (Howard University). K.S. Sitaram (Southern Illinois University) had indicated to Prosser in November, 2008 that he would give responses to my survey when he returned from India to the United States, but he died on December 26, 2008 before he had the opportunity to answer the survey. Prosser was the Ph.D., supervisor of William J. Starosta at Indiana University, and his faculty colleague for six years at the University of Virginia, as well as a number of other Indiana University MA and Ph.D. students, but he has not taught in the same institutions with any of the other respondents. However, at Kent State University, he temporarily replaced D. Ray Heisey while he was serving as President of Damivand College in Iran in 1978.

b) CRTNET readers did not respond; probably because the survey was too detailed. In fact, Ray T. Donahue indicated that it took eight hours to complete the survey since he knew all most all of the aspects of the survey questions quite well.

c) Michael H. Prosser's former or present intercultural communication students in Shanghai International Studies University; but only 4 of the former or present MA students responded.

d) Michael H. Prosser's current colleague Steve J. Kulich at SISU.

2.4 Research Processes

I sent the survey questions in 2.2.1 through emails to Michael H. Prosser's former and current professional colleagues, and posted the questions twice also on CRTNET to get feedback from CRTNET readers which has 6,000 subscribers (however they did not respond). This survey was sent twice to former and present professional colleagues of Prosser and also to CRTNET. I sent the other set of questions in 2.2.2 through emails to Michael H. Prosser's former and present intercultural communication students at Shanghai International Studies University (SISU). With my appreciation, Steve J. Kulich also responded to the survey and shared with me his reflections on Prosser's influence years ago when he was a college MA student and his thoughts about Prosser's contributions to

the development of the field of intercultural communication in China, and especially in SISU now.

Then I am comparing the responses I collected from those scholars and also Prosser's intercultural communications students. This is similar to qualitative interviews as a methodology. The brief analysis will be discussed in the following chapters.

Chapter 3 Investigating Prosser’s Major Works in Comparison with Other Intercultural Communication Scholars in the Same Periods

Before discussing the survey answers from Michael H. Prosser’s former or current professional colleagues and students, this chapter first examines the major works by Prosser in comparison with other intercultural communication scholars. Five works with his contribution, namely *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973), *The Cultural Dialogue* (1978, 1985, 1989), *Diplomatic Discourse* (Donahue & Prosser, 1997), *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (Kulich & Prosser, 2007), and *Civic Discourse* (Sitaram & Prosser, 1998, 1999) are chosen for contrast and comparison. Then his on going cultural dialogue in China will be briefly analyzed as well..

3.1 *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973)

This edited book is one of the early collections of essays in the intercultural communication area of study (in its broader sense) with topics spanning “theoretical perspectives”, “attitude formation and opinion development”, “the communication of leadership”, “communication in conflict resolution”, “communication as agent and index of social change”, “propaganda”, “freedom: communication rights and censorship”, and “the integrative role of intercommunication” His title links both international communication among nations and intercultural communication among peoples from different cultures. In 1973, when the field of intercultural communication had just been formed within two or three years, the publication of this valuable collection had helped to promote the development of the academic studies of international and intercultural communication, especially useful for teaching and learning in the newly set up intercultural communication classes, as Prosser dedicated the book “TO MY STUDENTS.” Steve J. Kulich, Executive Director of SISU Institute and Professor of Intercultural Communication, commented on this book with his own experience when he was a young MA student of China Studies at the University of Kansas: “...in my second semester I took the graduate intro class to IC offered by Prof. Asuncion-Lande. Her approach was a course

packet of articles, but I later learned that several of these seminal chapters were taken from Prosser's first edited reader, *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples*. The article by Dell Hymes on the ethnographic approach and by Walter Ong on "world as view and world as event" left an enduring impression on me..." (Kulich, 2009) Indeed, Prosser's reader may have inspired at least a generation of young intercultural communication scholars. D. Ray Heisey indicates that he was particularly pleased, as a then young scholar, to have his article on Middle East communication reprinted in Prosser's edition. At the same time, some of the scholarly reviewers of this edition noted that there was far too much content diversity to clearly set out an emerging field of intercultural and international communication and questioned why some of the topics were included. Nonetheless, several of these topics such as communication control, conflict resolution, and social change all became topics in Prosser's teaching and scholarship, and also either of scholarly articles or edited or authored books written by others in the field and in his many lectures.

3.1.1 In Comparison with Alfred Smith's *Communication and Culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction* (1966)

As stated earlier, Smith's *Communication and Culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction* (1966) is a collection of essays on human communication covering thirteen types of communication studies, of which only four are directly related to intercultural communication studies. Nevertheless, this book is one of the first collections of essays treating the close relationship between communication and culture, and heralded the establishment of intercultural communication as a solid field of study in the early 1970s.

The International Communication Association (ICA) established a separate Intercultural and International Communication Division in 1970. In the following year, as stated earlier, the Speech Communication Association (SCA – now National Communication Association – NCA) selected Professor Prosser as the founding Chair of its Commission on International and Intercultural Communication (later formed as a Division in SCA and presently having 1100 members, one eighth the total membership of NCA). In 1972, Edward C. Stewart wrote an unpublished "An Outline of Intercultural

Communication.” This “Outline” served as the basis for the 1974 Chicago conference in establishing the field. And in the same year, 1972, Samovar and Porter’s *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, was published by Wadsworth. So in this context of officially establishing the intercultural communication field, and an urgent need for such a textbook and essay collection for college use, Prosser edited his *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973). This collection mainly addresses the critical need for “renewed and constructive dialogue, reasoned discourse among and between cultures, nations, and peoples” (Prosser, 1973, p. x). Altogether, there are 41 scholarly written essays dealing with communication and social change, anthropology, intercultural communication, international communication, and mass communication.

3.1.2 In Comparison with Samovar & Porter’s *Intercultural Communication: A Reader* (1972)

Samovar and Porter co-edited their first edition of their Reader in 1972. They probably would not have imagined that intercultural communication has become so strong an academic area of study today and their *Reader* has gone through 12 editions to date. Kulich regards it as a classic, “worth reading in any edition” (Kulich, 2008). And Kulich also listed Prosser’s *Intercommunication between Nations and Peoples* (1973), as “the Early Foundations: Books by the Pioneers, Teachers, Trainers, Generalists”, in his List of Core Books Abroad (2008).

Jeff YIN’s excellent MA thesis in 2006 treated in detail the eleven different editions of Samovar and Porter’s *Intercultural Communication: A Reader* over the span of 35 years, and probed into the historical development of intercultural communication study in America. In his thesis, YIN compared, contrasted, and analyzed the 11 editions of the *Reader* from a historical perspective. *Yin* concluded that, “this book is a work that has greatly contributed to the development of intercultural communication” (p. 93). He argued that, to some extent, these eleven editions have reflected the growth of intercultural communication in America or at least from a significant editorial viewpoint (p. 93). YIN summarized four features of the general development of America’s intercultural communication study (pp. 94-95):

- (1) Pragmatic and goal-oriented.

- (2) Interdisciplinary.
- (3) Fragmented.
- (4) Indigenous and international.

In the first edition of the *Reader* (1972) in particular, there are six chapters dealing with \ closely related topics. According to the “Preface” (Samovar & Porter, 1972) of the book, in Part 1, they introduce the reader to intercultural communication, with essays that discuss what intercultural communication is and what it tries to do. Parts 2, 3, and 4 trace the intercultural communication experience by means of a chronological sequence. Part 2 examines some of the inherent social psychological factors in terms of *what we bring* to the intercultural encounter. By examining the cultural differences in what we bring to an intercultural communication act, we are better able to understand and appreciate what goes on during the communication event itself. In Parts 3 and 4, their analysis focuses on the problems of *taking part* in intercultural communication. Part 3 looks at the cultural differences in language, thought patterns, and use; and Part 4 considers cultural differences in nonverbal communication as we move from culture to culture. Here they find readings that bring us the knowledge and experiences of successful intercultural communication, as well as practical suggestions for improving our intercultural communication. In Part 6, the final section, they examine and explore questions of intercultural communication research, suggest directions for research, and discuss the difficulties and unique problems of this research.

Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples, deals with eight major themes and obviously, Prosser’s *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* deals with a wide scope of intercultural communication studies. Comparing the different themes of the two books, we can see that Samovar and Porter selected the essays from an introduction to research framework, with an emphasis on the intercultural communication process, and therefore they selected essays like “Psychology and Intercultural Interaction” (by Regina M. ‘Goff), “The Gift of Tongues” (by Clyde Kluckhohn), “The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis (by Harry Hoijer), and more interestingly Otto Klineberg’s essay: “Emotional Expression in Chinese Literature;” while Prosser emphasized more the social aspects or contexts of intercultural and international communication, or social discourse, and therefore he selected many essays on themes like the communication of leadership, mass

communication ethics and censorship, and international conflict resolution.

As to the need or purpose of such a reader, Samovar and Porter (1972) wrote:

Intercultural Communication: A Reader is designed to meet three specific needs.

The first comes from our belief that successful intercultural communication is a matter of highest importance if man and society are to survive. This book then is designed to serve as a *core text* for courses providing theoretical and practical knowledge about intercultural communication processes, as offered in speech-communication, business, political science, and related disciplines. Our intention is to make this book useful not only to the student of communication theory but also to readers seeking practical and immediately usable knowledge. Second, the book should be useful as a supplementary text in existing basic communication, and mass communication as well as courses in anthropology, sociology, social psychology, business, and political science or international relations. It may also serve as a resource manual for persons who find themselves in programs and situations necessarily involving intercultural communication.

Prosser (1973) wrote about his purpose and propositions in his book:

In this volume, I propose to demonstrate varied aspects of intercommunication between nations and peoples, the failures inherent in such events, and their possible remedies. Seeking to discover what unites, rather than what separates, men is at best difficult. Nonetheless, it leads us to consider whether there are communication universals which transcend national and cultural boundaries. The study of intercultural and international communication is shared by the best efforts of anthropologists, political scientists, public opinion analysts, sociologists, historians, communicologists, and varied other scholars. Representing both American and foreign scholars and journals of widely diverse backgrounds, we shall search for a broader understanding of theoretical and methodological perspectives on intercommunication, attitude formation and opinion development, the communication of leadership, communication propaganda, communication rights as aspects of freedom,

and the integrative role of intercommunication. Since communication often fails, these failures, and sometimes solutions and remedies, will be studied within and between cultures throughout the volume. My own view of cautious optimism that men can communicate without resorting to the final plateau of communication, violence, is represented also by many of the writers whose essays have been collected here. This perspective offers at least a ripple of hope for the integrative function of intercommunication to which Colin Cherry, one of our earliest and foremost students of international and intercultural communication, alludes in the final essay (Thoughts on the Relevance of the 'Communication Explosion' to the Future of World Order) in the volume."

3.2 *The Cultural Dialogue (1978, 1985, 1989)*

Prosser's first authored book in intercultural communication (1978) was republished in paper back by SIETAR in 1985 and 1989, with reasonable sales and was translated into Japanese by Roike Okabe and published by Tokai University Press in Tokyo in 1982. The translation had moderate popularity in Japan and provided modest annual royalties to Prosser until early in the twenty-first century. This book has four parts, plus an Introduction: Basic Concept and an Epilogue. Part One concerns itself with the principles of similarities and differences across cultures, along with such other issues as control, conflict, technology, cultural stability and change, and cultural imperialism and dependency, all play a major role in establishing and affecting the relationships between communication and culture. Prosser had already included such topics in his edited *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples*.

The role which the components of communication play in any contact between communities or culture is important. Part Two stresses these components. When we seek to isolate a communication event for a detailed analysis, we need to consider how the interesting components work within the event. Hall in *Beyond Culture* discusses linear time oriented western cultures, and Eastern cultures as event oriented. What are the differences between linear time and event time? According to Prosser, chief among all of the

components is the message. “Messages require focused interaction and function in various ways. They powerfully affect our cultural communication. Their selection and control become a significant factor in relating communication to culture.” Other important components of communication include the participants; communication codes, both verbal and nonverbal; and the channels and media of communication.

Prosser argued that cultural components and linkages specifically help to develop the interacting relationships between communication and culture: this is the main subject of Part Three. Such theoretical orientations toward culture as cultural evolutionism, cultural functionalism, cultural history, and cultural ecology allow us to distinguish specific cultural units which interact with communication interculturally and cross-culturally. An emphasis on values and value orientations suggests it as the most cultural of cultural forms. Among the most individual aspects of culture, subjective culture is the study of human cognitive processes. Within the emphasis of subjective culture, the role of perception becomes an important element. Prosser leans heavily on such scholars as Dell Hymes and Harry Triandis, and thus summarizes earlier theories from anthropology and psychology more than adopting his own theories. He calls himself a synthesizer of intercultural ideas.

In Part Four, the book shifts from a synthesis of key theories and their applications to an actual bicultural dialogue between a group of American and Japanese professionals at the a 1974 bicultural communication workshop in Japan in which Prosser was a participant. First Prosser includes an essay written specifically for the book by Muneo Yoshikita, “Some Japanese and American Cultural Characteristics,” which helps to set the stage for his own lengthy description and analysis of the intercultural dialogue and problems taking place in the conference. This section offers a practical application of many of the theories and examples cited in a rewarding but somewhat difficult intercultural setting. The use of a dialogue between Americans and Japanese offers us an opportunity to see individuals from essentially contrasting cultures interacting. Prosser noted that some disagreements in the eight small groups of 4 Americans and 4 Japanese were more intensively dysfunctional among the members of one of the two cultures, rather than between the two cultural groups. At this time, Prosser had no involvement in Chinese culture, and Japanese-American bicultural communication was the norm for pointing out very strong intercultural differences, rather than between Chinese and Americans. Also, at this time, China was just

beginning its opening up to the western world and thus was not analyzed much by interested scholars.

Prosser suggests that both communication and culture are complicated processes. Their interaction is constant, whether by accident or by deliberate plan. Technological advances have made it impossible for us to avoid continuous and intense contact in social interaction within and between cultures. He argued that some of us serve cross-culturally as spokespersons while some of us are already bilingual and bicultural. A few of us can be expected to become multicultural persons – people on the boundary between our cultures and other cultures – in a state of tension between the cultural norms and restrictions imposed upon us by very different cultures in which we are involved, a concept which he developed on the basis of Peter Adler’s concept of the multicultural person.. Prosser noted that we are likely to be participants in cultural dialogue for most of our lives. He became more fully interested in multiculturalism, as can be seen in Sitaram’s and his book *Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, and Global Communication* (1998). More recently, Prosser has emphasized Socrates’ statement as his favorite secular quote “I am neither a citizen of Athens nor of Greece, but of the world” as one of his major themes in the twenty-first century, with the goal of not only making individuals more multicultural, but also world citizens through intercultural communication. His recent power point lecture, “English as THE Global Language: Creating World Citizens through English and Intercultural Communication” has been given by him at several of his university lectures in China as well as in his December, 2008 keynote address for the New Oriental School Symposium and at Jilian University.

The purpose of *The Cultural Dialogue*, according to Prosser, is not only to provide a humanistic view toward communication theory and practice as an important aspect of our humanness, but more importantly, to place communication, both unplanned and deliberate, within the context of the cultural setting. If we have indeed created ourselves by building cultural structures, he argues, those cultural structures and barriers are developed within and between cultures by our ability to communicate. He believes that we communicate because our cultures have provided us with the ability to use and make symbols and tools. Culture and communication are always seen in a framework of interaction. Prosser writes that this this interaction can be called the “said of social discourse.” It shapes and molds

our cultural dialogue, both with members of our own culture and with members of other cultures. He has developed this theme in many of his lectures and lecture series in China.

3.2.1 In Comparison with Harms' *Intercultural Communication* (1973)

Harms' book probably was the first one with the title, *Intercultural Communication*. It was drafted during a sabbatical study tour and developed during more than a decade of research, teaching, and practical experience in the area of intercultural communication. The first few chapters and several of the later units were written in Geneva, Switzerland. Other units and subunits were drafted in London, Paris, Istanbul, Delhi, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Honolulu, and "elsewhere in the world." The actual writing was done in hotel rooms, cafes, parks, public libraries, and airplanes, as Harms explains.

The text is written for the beginning students of intercultural communication. Prosser's *The Cultural Dialogue* is also written for the threshold learners of intercultural communication. Therefore, the two books are both introductory textbooks in the field of intercultural communication with Harms' book serving as a model for later books in the emerging field. Harms' book is organized into five major sections. Chapters 1-3 provide a general foundation for the study. They are intended to be read first and in sequence. Chapters 4-7 are devoted to the specific topics of intercommunity communication, international communication, world communication, and future trends of intercultural communication. Harms claims that these chapters may be read in any desired order, which is somewhat confusing for the beginning reader.. Appendix A sets forth the ideals of the United Nations regarding human dignity and cultural diversity. These lofty principles, when considered from both philosophical and realistic standpoints, may provide the source for stimulating class discussions. A number of student projects are outlined in Appendix B. Since Prosser had written his doctoral dissertation on Adlai E. Stevenson's speeches as the US ambassador to the United Nations (1961-65), two of Prosser's books deal directly with the UN, first his 1970 two volume edition of addresses by heads of state and government in the first twenty five years of the UN's history, and second in Donahue and Prosser's book, *Diplomatic Discourse* (1997).

A few of the problems of intercultural communication are identified and examined in

Harms' book. Yet the emphasis of this text is not the *problems* so much as the *possibilities* that await the communicator who engages successfully in intercultural communication. This book is written for the cautious optimist. So is Prosser's book. Actually, Prosser asserted himself as a cautious optimist in view of the potential of successful intercultural and international communication (See e.g. Prosser, 1973, p. x). In fact, some later scholars identified early trends in the field of intercultural communication either as represented by the cultural dialogue approach which Prosser represented as stressing *cultural similarities*, or the critical crosscultural approach as represented by such early founders of the study of intercultural by psychologists such as Edward C. Stewart, which stresses *cultural differences*.

3.2.2 In Comparison with Arthur Smith's *Transracial Communication* (1973)

Arthur Smith's (now Molefi Kete Asante) *Transracial Communication* is the product of "an intellectual adventure supported in part by an earnest eclecticism." It is a book about how human beings, in the course of interacting, come to communicate effectively with those of different ethnic or racial groups. While it deals with human behavior and bases, many of its concepts upon behavioral research, it also contains systematic subjective discussions of how communication is patterned in transracial situations. Later we see such important books as Kim and Gudykunst's *Communicating with Strangers* as an important successor to the work of such earlier transracial and interracial scholars as Asante, Andrea Rich, and Dorothy Pennington. Although Prosser says that he became a favorite professor of a large part of the African American student community at the University of Virginia, where one third of his students were typically African Americans, his own concept of the academic importance of studying interracial or transracial communication in a scholarly manner was rather limited at the time that *Transracial Communication* was published. In *The Cultural Dialogue* Prosser has no index items for African-Americans or black communication, subsuming it under "interethnic communication," even though he had attended the Martin Luther King, Jr. rally in Soldier's Field in Chicago in 1968 and later sponsored and hosted a one day workshop with African American students at Indiana

University in the early 1970's. His attention to China was also very limited at that time.

Communicating with another person is a multifaceted event involving psychological, physiological, and physical processes in the view point of Smith (Asante). How persons send and receive messages from other persons who do not share similar histories, heritages, or cultures is of critical importance to our understanding of contemporary society. Because conventional works of communication theory seldom treat transracial constructs, this book draws heavily upon several fields in an effort to synthesize factual information for a concise presentation of transracial communication concepts. For this reason, much that is written in this thin volume is of a heuristic character. Its purpose is to define an area, raise questions, and advance answers. Therefore, this text is not an encyclopedia of communication theory; rather, it is an approach to interracial transracial communication. And in a kind of introductory way, it has endeavored to provide ideas that will educe discussion.

This book contains eight chapters: 1. Introduction, 2. Directions in Transracial Communication, 3. Culture and Transracial Communication, 4. Structure of Transracial Communication, 5. A Model of Transracial Communication, 6. Elements of Transracial Noise, 7. Symbols in Transracial Communication, 8. Determinants of Normalization.

Compared with Prosser's *The Cultural Dialogue*, Smith's book is also innovative, and also was a precursor to many later books dealing with specific ethnic cultural groups, such as the Hispanic and Asian populations.. The latter carries also the task of defining intercultural communication as an academic field, but primarily in terms of its racial implications. It focuses on transracial [or interracial] communication, which is a kind of intercultural communication, but intercultural communication is not necessarily transracial. The people within the same race or ethnic group, however, can, as Smith argues, conduct intercultural communication across genders, ages, educational levels, beliefs, or different religions.

3.2.3 In Comparison with Condon and Yousef's *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1975)

Condon and Yousef's *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication*, according to

Russel R. Windes in his Editor's Foreword (Condon & Yousef, 1975), was the first comprehensive introduction to the vital subject of interpersonal communication across cultures. Prosser considers it one of the best authored books in the 1970's on intercultural communication and found it a useful model for his own book, including their ideas on thought processes, the interaction of these processes, and the authors' expansion of the earlier value orientations into twenty-five, families, and their homes.

There had been a number of books which had touched on selected aspects of intercultural communication: the mass media and international communication; nonverbal behavior; communication in or with specific cultures; cultures and subcultures. Some articles on intercultural communication had been collected into books of readings. But thus far no book had attempted to provide the student of culture and the student of communication with a thorough background of the many issues which underpinned the study of intercultural communication. One simply cannot always take relevant but scattered articles from different disciplines, written from different perspectives for different purposes, and easily put them together to make a unified course of study. There must be a basis for selection, a sense of emphasis and balance, and, above all, some unifying themes and assumptions which not only bring necessary issues together, but hold them together. *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* is the first book in its field to make this attempt.

Professors Condon and Yousef were highly qualified by education and experience to write an introductory book in intercultural communication. Professor Condon, who prepared a major share of the book, had spent ten years studying and teaching abroad – in Mexico, Brazil, Tanzania, and Japan. He taught for five years at Northwestern University. His first book, *Semantics and Communication* (Macmillan, 1966), continues to be an important book in the discipline and he has published more than thirty articles in several nations. Professor Yousef also brought impressive credentials to the task. Born and raised in Egypt, he spent many years working with Americans in the Middle East and in Europe. His studies at the University of Minnesota centered on intercultural communication, and he published several important articles in the field. Between the two of them, the authors spoke and understood eight languages and had spent over twenty years outside their own cultures at the time that they coauthored this book.

By choice of topics, organization, and balance of theory and example, this introduction to intercultural communication is an innovative, practical, and fascinating book. Because its emphasis is on communication, and not only on all facets of culture, the introduction, Chapter One, surveys selected principles of interpersonal communication. It not only provides common ground for a potentially diverse readership, but it makes even familiar concepts seem fresh as they are viewed in their application across cultures. Chapter Two, in which the authors present a series of cases drawn from actual intercultural encounters, sets the tone for the remaining chapters of the book. Its overall purpose is to make the reader aware of some of his own culture-bound assumptions and some of his own difficulties in knowing what other people might be thinking, as well as what he might or might not do in simple but unfamiliar situations.

Chapters Three, Four, and Five form the core of the book: an introduction to the concepts of values and value orientations, followed by a study on value orientations and cultural beliefs. Often the relationship to communication is left implicit, but never far from the surface. The reader should emerge from these chapters, according to Condon and Yousef, with a far clearer sensitivity to the cultural roots of his own behavior, as well as a sensitivity to the richness and variety of alternative values and assumptions of persons in other societies. These chapters are impressive not only for the wealth of insights drawn together, but because they leave the reader with a means of interpreting other cultures not specifically referred to in the chapters. Thus, most valuable here is the perspective and framework for further analysis.

Because of the structuring of the book, the reader finds himself well into the theory before he begins to consider in some detail those specific topics that often, individually, masquerade for the whole of “intercultural communication.” Chapter Six, on nonverbal behavior and communication across cultures, is selective enough to complement other more exhaustive studies of nonverbal communication. Following this, Chapter Seven describes home styles and communication patterns, reminding us that culture, if not always charity, begins at home.

Chapter Eight, on language in culture, is no less original in its content and design. The much discussed “Whorfian hypothesis” is included, but it is included in the perspective of more recent linguistic theories. Here, as elsewhere throughout the book, the writing is

neither technical nor popularized. Information and examples provide insights and at the same time raise significant questions. Another original contribution, a consideration of the importance of translation and interpretation, follows in Chapter Nine. Up to now, almost no information has been available on the many roles and influence of those anonymous people providing the link between speakers of different languages.

Chapter Ten discusses the issues which once comprised almost the entirety of the speech discipline: rhetoric. Viewing rhetoric, language, and cultural values as essentially interdependent, we believe that this chapter alone is sufficient to revise many traditional and culture-bound treatments of reasoning and persuasion.

The final chapter, Eleven, written in question-answer format, gives a partial review of some of the most important considerations raised by the previous chapters. It also underscores two important themes in the book: first, the knowledge that both the study and facility in interpersonal communication across cultures begin with the awareness of our own culturally influenced patterns of communication; second, the importance of realizing that each intercultural encounter is unique and complex. Thus, the prescriptive advice of “do this,” or “don’t do this,” must be regarded with suspicion.

For many years, Condon has been one of the major authors in the field of intercultural communication, and has been a trainer at the Portland Summer Intercultural Communication Training Programs in Portland, Oregon for most of its more than 30 year history. A number of the MA students at the Shanghai International Studies University have met him and admired his extensive theoretical and practical wisdom at these training sessions.

3.2.4 In Comparison with Sitaram and Cogdell’s *Foundations of Intercultural Communication* (1976)

Sitaram and Cogdell’s *Foundations of Intercultural Communication* is similar in scope and around the same period of Prosser’s *The Cultural Dialogue*. In light of the development of the area of study, the two books both treated many key definitions in the field of intercultural communication, such as, interethnic, international, interracial communication, intracultural, global, and mass communication, and social discourse. Both

books are foundational books and introductory textbooks of intercultural communication.

However, the contents of the two books are quite different. Sitaram and Cogdell's book outlines the basic concepts and process in intercultural communication, especially at a psychological level, such as perception, expression, and value systems. Therefore, this book can be regarded as an early introductory book on cross-cultural psychology. In contrast, Prosser's book carries the anthropological traditions of Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict and Edward Hall, giving emphasis on social issues, successful rhetoric, conflict resolution, and issues of mass communication.

Sitaram and Cogdell's book is unique in several ways, especially considering the stress given to non-Western thought. A tremendous amount of attention has been given to cultures in Japan, China, India, Africa, and other third world nations which have been ignored traditionally in scholarly writings. Although Prosser's book also treated a variety of cultures, such as African, Hispanic, Vietnamese and the Cambodian war, it focused on the "dialogue" between Americans and Japanese. It gives much discussion on Japanese way of life, cultures, behavior, and their particular way of communication. Intercultural communication between the Japanese and Americans was at that time a very popular framework for developing the field. At that time, for example, comparisons between the Chinese and American cultures had not yet started to be studied in the intercultural communication context. Sitaram's later book, *Communication and Culture: A World View* (1995) greatly expands his views of the intercultural communication of major Asian world religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam. Also, in that book, Sitaram defines the Western model of values as linked to freedom, democracy and individualism, and the Asian model as based on responsibility, and ingroup membership.

While both Sitaram and Prosser could correctly be identified as among the important founders of intercultural communication as a field of study, their distinctive bicultural collaboration and deep friendship began with the first of the six Rochester Intercultural Conferences which Prosser and Sitaram co-chaired, and in their co-editing of the two books in Prosser's "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium." In 2001, the first Global Focus conference, modeled on Sitaram and Prosser's Rochester Intercultural Conferences, and sponsored by both universities and communication associations, established an award in their honor: "The Prosser-Sitaram Award for Outstanding International Communication

Research.” Curiously, both scholars shared the same birthday and were the same age. Professor Sitaram, an Emeritus Professor in the College of Radio and Television at Southern Illinois University, had indicated in November, 2008 to Professor Prosser that he would respond to my questions about their collaboration together for my thesis after his return in late December from India. Unfortunately, K.S. Sitaram died suddenly after his return to the US on December 26, 2008. Prosser announced his death to first year MA students in intercultural communication at SISU soon after, as a loss for the intercultural communication field and also as a great personal loss in their 38 year friendship.

3.3 *Diplomatic Discourse* (Donahue & Prosser, 1997)

Ray T. Donahue, who has taught at Nayoga Gakuin University in Japan for many years, and who was a graduate student in Prosser’s University of Virginia Rhetoric of the United Nations course, suggested to Prosser that they co-author a book on discourse at the United Nations. The co-authors write that “Diplomatic Discourse is the first of its kind. It breaks new ground in the field of international communication – the study of diplomatic speech-making at the United Nations. As far as we know, there are no college textbooks that address this kind of study, especially in combining discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis” (Donahue & Prosser, 1997, p. 1).

“This text develops a basis for applying discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis to speech communication at the United Nations. UN speech addresses involve important world issues and, through related conflicts, help exercise analytical skills applicable at either level, international or intercultural. International communication essentially involves person-to-person. Regardless of the level, critical communication requires analysis. Sample analyses are taken from the genre of diplomatic addresses given at the UN during its first 50 years, with guidance for independent analysis” (Donahue & Prosser, 1997, p. 1).

This work seeks to provide insight into the role that discourse and rhetorical analysis play in the crucial area of international conflict resolution and diplomatic processes. Using analyses of situations that have come into play in the United Nations as the backdrop to their study, Donahue and Prosser first develop the concept of discourse analysis and the various approaches to it, including the role of genre and culture. They then turn their

attention to rhetorical analysis, from its classical beginnings through to contemporary Western perspectives. The emphasis on the classical rhetorical traditions comes from Benson and Prosser's co-edited *Readings in Classical Rhetoric* (1969). The final part of the work applies the tools of discourse and rhetorical analysis to an understanding of various modern historical conflicts (including the Middle East conflict) and issues of current and future interest (such as human and women's rights). The book extensively utilizes materials from Prosser's *Sow the Wind, Reaping the Whirlwind: Heads of State Address the United Nations* (1970, 2 volumes) showing a progression of thought on his part to 1997. His two volume 1970 collection of addresses at the United Nations, with his introduction on the use of the archetypal metaphor in the included addresses and by his systematic address commentaries, illustrate the influence which the study of classical rhetoric had had on Prosser as an early editor, and later author on diplomatic discourse, as well as Prosser's continuing interest in the United Nations as one of his major scholarly research activities. In the case of the former book, Prosser was the editor of the addresses, while in the second book, Donahue and Prosser laid out an academic framework for both discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis to understand the underpinnings of conflict resolution in the United Nations and more broadly in the international arena. From a practical level, Prosser has taught courses related to the rhetoric of the United Nations or the model UN Security Council more than 40 times at the University of Virginia, Kent State University, the Rochester Institute of Technology, Beijing Language and Culture University, and Shanghai International Studies University, thereby influencing the understanding of conflict resolution at the United Nations to thousands of his students over time.

3.4 Civic Discourse (Sitaram & Prosser, 1998, 1999)

Sitaram & Prosser's books on *civic discourse* are a two-volume thick collection. Volume 1 is *Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, and Global Communication* (1998). It contains five sections plus an introduction by Sitaram and an epilogue by Prosser. **Introduction:** Multicultural Communication for a Higher Humanity. **Section I** Overview: Intercultural, Multicultural and Global Communication Theories and

Issues. **Section II** Overview: Cultural Diversity: Ethnicity, Race, and Gender. **Section III** Overview: Comparative Studies of Culture and Communication. **Section IV** Overview: Multicultural and Multinational Organizations. **Section V** Overview: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, and Health. **Epilogue:** Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and the Sharing of Power in the Global Society.

Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, and Global Communication is one of the first books of Prosser's entire new Ablex series, "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium," for which Prosser was the series editor (1998-2004). However, Donahue and Prosser's *Diplomatic Discourse* is considered the predecessor to the series, and has been identified by Prosser as really the first book in the series. The concept of the series links the role of civic discourse and communication to their connections to civil society, both domestically, and more broadly on a global basis. Books focus on communication in Africa, Canada, China, Eastern Europe, Japan, the Middle East, South Africa, the Soviet Union, Thailand, and the US, among others. Additionally, such topics as human rights, social justice, and peace are included. Two of the books received national awards in 2000 at the National Communication Association Convention, including one on China and one on human rights.

Volume 2 is *Civic Discourse: Intercultural, International, and Global Media* (1999). It contains four sections plus an epilogue by K. S. Sitaram. **Section 1** Overview: Cyberspace, Cybernetics, Cyberpower. **Section 2** Overview: North American Media. **Section 3** Overview: International and Global Media. **Section 4** Overview: Comparative Studies in Media. **Epilogue:** The Interculturalness of Electronic Communications.

The rapid development of information technology is profoundly changing the economic and cultural systems around the world, thus creating a new type of world culture, Tapio Varis (1999) argues in the first chapter in Volume I that such a media culture has three dimensions: the religious, the aesthetic, and the economic. Varis supports his arguments with opinions of eminent scholars. Efforts toward globalization of communication have already begun in the form of Europeanization, distance learning, and data banks in which communication technology is playing the most important role. Volume II concentrates on the media studies and Section I is very original in devoting to the research and analysis of cyberspace communication. The second volume includes

considerable coverage of computer mediated communication and cyber-culture. The final Rochester Intercultural Conference in 2001, a month before Prosser came to teach in China, emphasizes computer mediated communication, which began to develop in the second volume by Prosser and Sitaram.

This volumes also include chapters by the following conference award winners, selected by independent faculty juries at SIU-Carbondale and RIT: James Brant McOmber, “The Ideology of Technology on the World Wide Web: The ‘Blue Ribbon Campaign’ in a Global Context” (presented at the 1997 RIT conference); Sorin Matei, “Virtual Community as Rhetorical Vision and Its American Roots” (presented at the 1997 RIT conference); Chris Stephenson, “The Text of New Relationships: Building Deaf Community in E-Space” (presented at the 1997 RIT conference); Elizabeth P. Lester and Usha Raman, “International News for Kids: Defining the World for Atlanta’s Children” (presented at the 1996 RIT conference); Michael L. Maynard, “The Power of Foreign Images: Intercultural Signs in Japanese Television Advertising” (presented at the 1996 RIT conference); and John M. Public, “Structured Perceptions of United States-China Relations” (presented at the 1995 RIT conference).

I have not made comparisons between these two books and others at the similar period by contemporary editions as they were not easily accessible to me. However, it is clear that the two volumes, both emphasizing intercultural, international and global communication are highly complementary to each other. Also, we can see Prosser’s own intercultural thinking developing from his early edited and authored volumes to these later books in his theme and topic emphasis. The series itself, though not widely known because of the very high price of the books and the unwillingness of Greenwood Publishing Group to provide desk copies to teachers of communication and intercultural communication, can be considered an important editorial accomplishment on the part of Prosser in promoting the field of intercultural communication. Three additional books were completed by 2000, either from the Rochester Intercultural Conferences or based on Prosser’s own interests, *Communication, Technology, and Cultural Values*, *Human Rights Communication*, both edited by Sitaram and Prosser and *African Communication*. edited by Prosser and were submitted to Ablex Publishers in 2000. However, in the meantime, Greenwood Publishing Group had purchased Ablex, and refused to publish these books which were approximately

the same length as the first two books co-edited by Sitaram and Prosser, without cutting one third of the material from each book. Both Sitaram and Prosser, as well as many of the chapter authors, were very unhappy that these books eventually did not get published by Greenwood. Other contracted books in the series by an additional dozen authors did not get completed by the time that the series ended its publication in 2004. However, at the recommendation of Prosser, D.Ray Heisey was contracted to create a special series of books relating to Chinese communication, and as series editor he was able to produce five of these very valuable books to introduce Chinese communication scholarship more broadly before this specialized series was also canceled by Greenwood.

Sino-American Compositions of Shared Topics (2003), co-edited by Zhou, Lu Jun, and Prosser, is a handbook for Chinese students preparing to take the College English Test Band 4 and College English Test Band 6. Zhou introduces the book in Chinese; Prosser adds a brief introduction in English; and Lu Jun and Prosser each write about 100 short 150-200 word essays on the formulative topic, and several Chinese and American students also add essays on the same topics. Prosser analyzes the topic discussions for the first 50 of the approximately 100 essay topics in the book. Unfortunately, the first printing of the book included about 200 grammar errors in its 300 pages, as it was not proof read by a native American speaker/writer. Apparently, it had reasonable popularity for college and senior middle school Chinese students, but has not, as far as Prosser is aware, been issued in a second printing with the errors corrected as Prosser undertook when it was first published.

3.5 *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (Kulich & Prosser, 2007)

Intercultural Perspective on Chinese Communication is the first volume of the Intercultural Research series co-edited by Steve J. Kulich and Prosser. As GUAN Shijie has commented in the Foreword, this book mainly has three features:

1. It serves an interdisciplinary platform for China's IC research.
2. It emphasizes the important of scientific methodology in IC research.
3. It focuses on the localization of IC research.

GUAN makes very positive comments about Kulich and Prosser toward the end of his foreword:

Professors Kulich and Prosser have committed themselves to the education and research of IC in China for years; and with their initiatives, Shanghai International Studies University has established its SISU Intercultural Institute. They have made positive contributions in promoting China's IC studies with their unique perspectives and connections with Western scholars, and are widely applauded among the Chinese IC scholars. This Intercultural Research series is born out of years of their hard work. The publication of this series is an occasion to celebrate for the entire Chinese IC community. (Guan, 2007, p.xvi).

According to Kulich, writing in his introduction to the book (2007), in recent decades, cross-cultural studies have grown in the Chinese mainland as well. The work of pioneering intercultural educators like HU Wenzhong and GUAN Shijie and social-linguists like JIA Yuxin are notable, as are the national sociological studies of SHA Lianxiang. Yet these various studies have still not been brought systematically together to present a broader intercultural perspective of the trends or variations among Chinese populations. Such a project might not only broaden or challenge our typical conceptions of east and west or of "the Chinese" as a homogeneous whole, but also might help us begin to understand the growing diversity among various Chinese contexts. This timely volume heeds the calls for increasing the link between intercultural and China studies.

The book was the result of the involvement of the SISU Intercultural Institute in the Second World China Studies Conference, supported by the Shanghai Academy of Social Science. It allowed Professor Kulich to bring together both mainland China communication scholars and scholars from overseas. This co-edited volume's first half emphasizes the humanities with a special emphasis on sociolinguistics. Prosser has a 70 page essay, "One World, One Dream: Harmonizing Society through Intercultural Communication: A Prelude to China Intercultural Communication Studies" in which he gives a detailed discussion of the history of intercultural communication in North America and China, with historical views of cross-cultural values including leading contributors, ideas, books, and topics, and even intercultural training, but not having a section on

important topics like intercultural mass media (which Prosser did address in earlier books), and intercultural business communication. Prosser summarized cross-cultural values in his book, *The Cultural Dialogue*, in this essay, and in his forthcoming essay, “Universal Rights and Universal Values. The academic understanding of cross-cultural values is a major focus on the part of Kulich’s teaching and research, and thus Prosser’s interest in the same topics is complementary to the academic and scholarly thrust of the SISU Intercultural Institute under the executive leadership of Professor Kulich.

3.6 Michael H. Prosser’s Cultural Dialogue in China

Prosser came to China in 2001. First teaching in Yangzhou University in 2001-2002, he was delighted to meet his students, some of whom became very good friends. As he wrote in his essay “Meeting Chinese People for the First Time” at <http://www.michaelprosser.com/article.asp?id=70> or in his website, www.michaelprosser.com, :

On the streets, friendly young teenagers would say, ‘Hello, how are you? I am fine, thank you, and you?’ I began to call Yangzhou the ‘hello’ city because so many young people greeted me in this way. Foreigners were not so unusual there as in other smaller cities that I visited in China during my first year. I became a friend of an 11 year old boy whose father had a photo shop near our campus. Outside our campus, called ‘the delicious food’ street, there were many different restaurants where my students and I had many good meals together...

He was invited to be interviewed on the first of his twelve “Dialogue” programs on CCTV 9 International Channel in the fall of 2001. So instead of being at Yangzhou, University, he was in Beijing Language and Culture University (BLCU) for the Thanksgiving that year, where he met several computer science students who later became his friends. Over the twelve interviews, he discussed intercultural and international communication, the Lunar New Year Festival, Chinese leaders’ speeches, and events in the Middle East He shared many intercultural stories with his students at Yangzhou University

and at the Beijing Language and Culture University both in his classes, but also in his more than 120 Friday evening “Open Houses” which typically had more than 30 students present weekly, often representing six of seven universities in the Haidian district neighborhood of BLCU. Since many Chinese students at each institution came often to his open houses, he perhaps had a total of more than 3600 students with whom he had regular intercultural communication contact through these open houses. At the Shanghai International Studies Universities, he invited many postgraduate students to parties at his apartment, including especially his own MA student advisees. At all three universities, three big parties annually attracted a large number of students, Halloween, Christmas, and his birthday, with the final one celebrating his seventy-third birthday in 2009 at which more than 50 faculty and students were present. At all three of the universities, Prosser was involved in giving an annual Christmas concert which attracted hundreds of students and at Beijing Language and Culture University, a concert arranged by him, other faculty, and students, “A Touch of American Music” concert more than 600 students attended the two different concerts. His Christmas concerts over eight years in China, also attracted several hundred students each year. In 2008, he and a faculty colleague both served as co-Santa Claus for the concert. He also taught frequent English classes for primary school, junior middle school, and even kindergarten twice a month in 2001 and 2002. He taught 200 primary school students, 200 junior middle school students, and 60 kindergarten students at each visit, teaching them many American songs. Also, in Beijing, he taught winter English sessions for children in a program offered during the Spring Festival period. His popularity with students at many different levels was considerable, partly because of his attraction as a foreign teacher. The first gift which he received in China by the owner of the Kingston Foreign Language School was “the laughing (or happy) Buddha.” He enabled 15 Yangzhou University students the opportunity to co-teach with him at the school, thus helping to internationalize them. Prosser considers himself an optimist, and appreciates the ideas of Aristotle in *The Nicomachian Ethics*” where he describes and prescribes happiness as a key goal in life, based on a good family, good friends, good community, good education, good health, sufficient wealth for one’s station in life, as well as great loyalty for one’s own country.

3.6.1 Survey of Michael H. Prosser's Intercultural Communication Students at Shanghai International Studies University

Prosser's students have highly praised his contributions to the intercultural communication field, especially those to the Chinese local education of intercultural communication. They have indicated that they learned a lot from him, and they are very reluctant to see his scheduled leaving from China in July, 2009. Most commonly, many of the students have developed deep friendships with him, as he often invited them to his apartment in Shanghai, for talking, laughing, photographing, singing, drinking and eating (usually pot-luck in Chinese style), and sometimes also academic discussions, during weekends as well as at his three big annual parties and frequent smaller group dinners at his apartment or at local restaurants. Unfortunately, because many former students had taken new jobs or were in search for them, and current students were in the process of writing their own theses, and were involved in internships, only a very small number responded to the specific survey about Professor Prosser's contributions to the study of intercultural communication at SISU. However, in surveying many of the MA theses in intercultural communication at SISU since Prosser was a Distinguished Professor here, I found that many students acknowledged both the quality of his teaching courses such as global media and culture, co-taught courses with Professor Kulich in intercultural communication, and his classes in the Model UN Security Council, as well as for his assistance editorially in their theses on intercultural communication.

3.6.2 Investigations into Michael H. Prosser's Website www.michaelprosser.com

There are many pages of essays that are written about his living, experiences, and feeling of his "cultural dialogue" in China in his webpage, beginning with its creation up to the present. Some of the essays, initially published in CRTNET, the Communication Research and Theory Network of the National Communication Association, are very practical studies in intercultural communication, including essays, poems, and magazines of his students at Beijing Language and Culture University, and Chinese student versus

foreign student cultures there, the culture of Chinese trains, cities, and his street at SISU, plus his travel to foreign counties while living in China. It includes his more scholarly essays relating to the study of intercultural communication, as well as comments about the 2008 US election of Barack Obama. He includes an essay set of ten questions done about him, “The Intercultural Journey of an Intercultural Communication Founder: Michael H. Prosser,” and an interview essay about D. Ray Heisey.

His daughter, Michelle Prosser, the author of *Excuse Me, Your God Is Waiting* (2008)’s book promotion is included, and the website mentions that his daughter, her three children, Darya, Sanders and Sophia visited him in Shanghai and they traveled widely in the immediate region, Suzhou, Changzhou and Yangzhou in Jiangsu Province, Huangshan Mountain and Ma’anshan, in Anhui Province, June 18 – July 10, 2008, in most cases visiting with Professor Prosser’s own young Chinese friends and their families. In this way, he introduced his grandchildren interculturally to his young Chinese friends. In Michelle Prosser’s book which she partially dedicates to her father, she writes: “Once when I meditated..., I saw a vision of myself drowning in a rushing river, swollen with my own tears. Just as panic overtook me, a giant sea turtle appeared and carried me on his back. Surprised, I realized the turtle represented ...[both my spiritual adviser] and my father, my sea turtle totems.”. (Please see his website, www.michaelprosser.com or <http://www.michaelprosser.com/article.asp?id=103> or extensive references to him in www.google.com and some also in www.baidu.com plus www.jcscholar.com the data base of journalism and communication scholars at Wuhan University).

Prosser, with three of his former MA students (Jacky Zhang Shengyong, Zizi Zhao Zhao, and Anthea Yang) was invited to be an interviewee the “Culture Matters” for three “Intercultural Friendship” programs on the International Shanghai Channel in April, 2008. The programs were scheduled to be aired in May, 2008 but were delayed until June, 2008 because of the Sichuan Province earthquake. The programs were aired again in the spring of 2009. It basically featured his own intercultural friendships with his Chinese students, hosted by the well-known anchor Sammy Wang, with the first and third program including Zizi Zhao Zhao, Jacky Zhang Shengyong and Prosser, the second including Anthea Yang, Jacky Zhang and Prosser, and the fourth featuring Prosser, an Irish and a Chinese podcaster. Later, in the 2008 US election period, he was a co-interviewee with a Chinese professor, on

the International Shanghai Channel's program "Maintalk." Several million viewers watched the five programs, just as had been the case in 2002-2004 on China Central TV International's "Dialogue" programs. In the summer of 2008, in Charlottesville, Virginia he was featured in a widely syndicated public radio program concerning his thoughts about the Beijing Olympics and Chinese education. One of Prosser's goals after returning to the US is both to give lectures about contemporary China, and to write a popular book to be entitled, *China's Youth: China's Future*. His 31 journals since he came to China and his extensive experience will serve as a database for the book.

In general, Michael Prosser has been actively contributing to the field of intercultural communication from the early budding of this discipline, in the late 1960's and 1970's to the present. In the recent eight years, he has focused much of his enthusiasm on bringing this field of study to China and since 2005, teaching and collaborating with their three volumes which have been or will be published by Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press with Professor Kulich with their edited books and articles. He is listed as a member of the editorial team in the Press's ten published books on intercultural communication and also in various other books published in China. He has reviewed proposed articles for *Communication Quarterly*, *the Asian Journal of Communication*, and *The Journal of Communication*. He is a member of the editorial board as the English polisher of *Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies (in Asia)*, published by SISU's Middle Eastern Institute, including his book review essay, "The Palestine Issue in the Eyes of Jimmy Carter: A Book Review" (April, 2008). His efforts and fame in this area are more than noteworthy.

In this chapter, I have provided an understanding of my historical, longitudinal and comparative study of several of Prosser's edited or authored books, as they related in the early period to other scholars' work in intercultural communication, my understanding of his own "cultural dialogue" during his eight years in China, and my brief discussion of SISU MA students' perceptions of his intercultural teaching and their thesis reviews in intercultural communication. I have also briefly considered the importance of his website as it helps to demonstrate his own intercultural progress. I have received very helpful comments on his intercultural communication contributions from several scholars, Donal Carbaugh, Ray T. Donahue, Carley H. Dodd, D. Ray Heisey, Wenshan Jia, Young Yum

Kim Steve J. Kulich, Paul Pederson, Herbert Simons, and William J. Starosta. I have included their extensive comments in Appendix A. In Chapter 4, I will briefly discuss some of these comments.

Chapter 4 Analysis of the Surveys of Michael H. Prosser's Contemporaries and Colleagues

This chapter focuses on discussing Prosser's influence on the intercultural communication area of study by comparatively and contrastively analyzing the academic survey of Michael Prosser's former or current professional colleagues. All of the responding scholars confirmed Prosser's contributions, as expected, to the intercultural communication area of study. Some also commented on their own contributions to the study of intercultural communication. All of their responses can be categorized as four aspects, namely, Prosser's contribution in general, in his academic works, in conferences and associations Prosser has been involved in and in other ways.

4.1 Prosser's Contributions in General

In responding to the question "Are there any contributions to the development of the intercultural communication field by Michael Prosser that you consider noteworthy", seven scholars including prominent figures in the field of intercultural communication such as Y. Y. Kim, P. B. Pedersen, D. Ray Heisey, and W. J. Starosta, as well as Chinese indigenous scholars such as W. S. Jia gave detailed illustrations. They acknowledged Prosser's impressive input in building this research discipline and his contribution in bringing this field in China. He was a major initiator the field of intercultural and international communication in the National Communication Association (called Speech Communication Association or SCA earlier during that time) as early as the 1970s.

According to Y. Y. Kim, when she entered the field of intercultural communication after completing her Ph.D. degree in 1976, Professor Prosser was one of the most prominent figures in the field. Professor Pedersen commented that his contribution have been especially strong in networking and developing a professional identity for intercultural communication in the field of communication.

The Chinese scholar Wenshan Jia also spoke very highly of Prosser's contribution in China, as he mentioned that he is a visionary with a broad and inclusive and forward-looking intellectual vision on humanity and human communication across cultures. He lives his life, lecturing, researching and teaching by this vision, according to Jia.. While

a majority of communication scholars in the US are fearful of going to China due to the media's influence, Prosser has already taught in China for 8 years.

D. R. Heisey's statement can be a very good summary to Prosser's contribution in general:

His contributions were in two areas. First, personally he was a leader among his peers in taking the initiative in calling attention to the need for moving out in this area of the field of speech communication. He led in establishing the need for a division of intercultural and international communication within the field and in holding workshops and conferences at SCA and at RIT, his institution. Second, intellectually he was a leader in focusing on international and intercultural communication with an emphasis on the rhetorical implications and applications for this area of research. He came out of the classical rhetoric dimension of communication where many others came from the interpersonal and quantitative research areas. Thus his emphasis was unique. (Comments to question 1, Appendix A.)

4. 2 Prosser's Contributions in His Academic Works

As mentioned in early chapters that Prosser edited *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973) and authored book *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1978, reprinted in 1985, 1989) in the early days. He also coauthored with Ray T. Donahue *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations* (1997), and co-edited books with K.S. Sitaram: *Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Global Communication* (1998), and *Civic Discourse: Intercultural, International, and Global Media* (1999), and his co-edited book with Steve J. Kulich, *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (2007) in the most recent years. These outstanding academic works also received quite good comments from his contemporaries and colleagues.

For these early works,. Kim regarded *The Cultural Dialogue* to be one of the first solid efforts to offer a conceptual grounding for the study of intercultural communication, which echoed with. Heisey, saying that Prosser's *Cultural Dialogue* was an outstanding early textbook for those teachers and scholars in the intercultural area. Starosta who assisted

Prosser both in his *Sow the Wind: Reap the Whirlwind* and *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples*, commented that “the *Intercommunication* book was more interdisciplinary than almost any book of its day. It was early, it forced us to look closely at definitions, and it gave us a platform to see intercultural communication more rhetorically than is done today.” Dodd responded that “*The Cultural Dialogue* made a huge impact on my early writing, where several articles in the book highly influenced aspects of 3 chapters in one of my textbooks. I cannot begin to tell you how grateful I am for this contribution, which helped the entire field develop and begin to grow.”

Regarding the unique contributions of Prosser’s early books, Donahue offered the comment that:

Cultural Dialogue is important not just because it was an early textbook in the field, but it is one of the few, if not the only one, to document an intercultural T-group learning experience. The T-group is an important learning mechanism, which will likely to continue to be one. *Nations and Peoples* (1973), as mentioned, helped communication studies take a broader view, a cultural one, especially at a time when cries for support of diversity in the U.S. were just starting to be heard.

For Prosser’s more recently edited books such as the “Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium” series, few of the respondents have read any of the books. They may realize the importance of these books, but because of their exorbitant prices and the unwillingness of the publisher to supply desk copies, very few of them could afford to buy them. Such an absence of availability may have a significant impact not only on Prosser and Sitaram’s two books in the series, as well as Donahue and Prosser’s authored book, but also in relation to all of the authors whose books are in the series.. Heisey seemed to be very familiar with the series and commented that,

I think these publications by Michael and his associates during this period were very important in the development and extension of the research in international and intercultural communication because of the focus he gave to the field. It was phenomenal in the way that he continued to publish extensively in year after year thus giving great opportunity to other authors and editors to be involved in the publishing of intercultural research.

Moreover, the textbook *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (2007) co-edited by Prosser and Steve J. Kulich is quite influential in China, which testifies his continuous influence in China with his publishing.

4. 3 Prosser's Contributions in Conferences and Associations

The survey also contained questions regarding to Prosser's involvement in several international conferences and associations relating to intercultural communication. Prosser chaired the International and Intercultural Communication Commission (later Division) of the Speech Communication Association from 1971-73; was the third Chair of the Intercultural Division of the International Communication Association, 1975-77, and was a founding Governing Council member, 1973-1977, and later President of SIETAR International, 1984-1986. Besides these leadership positions, he and K.S.Sitaram co-chaired six Rochester Intercultural Conferences from 1995-2001. Altogether, Prosser chaired the first three foundational conferences to establish intercultural communication as an area of study in North America (1971, 73, 74), the 1980 SIETAR International congress, and the six Rochester Intercultural Conferences (1995-2001).

To respond to questions related to the conferences and associations, Pedersen mentioned that "Michael made a great contribution through SIETAR in taking intercultural communication across disciplines." Dodd commented, "Michael's influence and encouragement lead to this entire set of events that would not have happened without him. Moreover, his SIETAR leadership carried the organization into a world recognized level."

The comprehensive answer from Donahue, who indicated that he took eight hours to respond to the ten questions, is also very encouraging,

Several points about these conferences, some of which might be overlooked by others:

- 1) Prosser evinced both internationalism, cooperation, and collaboration by greatly encouraging contributions from abroad and more significantly insisting that he and co-organizer K.S. Sitaram take turns in being the "first" conference coordinator or book editor, despite that the conferences were really Prosser's own, coming from his endowed chair at RIT and sole support by his institution.
- 2) Prosser organized expert readers (faculty at RIT) to evaluate conference submissions

prior to the conferences, not solely by abstract, a usual practice, but by the whole paper.

3) Prosser gave enthusiastic encouragement to young researchers (including students) and to people of color for their participation.

4.4 Prosser's Other Unique Contributions

Besides the above mentioned questions and answers, scholars also commented on Prosser's years of teaching in China from 2001-2008, and his posted "China Continuing" comments to CRTNET (Communication Research and Theory Network of the [US] National Communication Association..

According to Simons, "the CRTNET posts also provide abundant evidence of Prosser's scholarly and pedagogical contributions to intercultural communication in China. I know of no one in my field that has done more in that general area".

. Heisey summarized Prosser's contribution in China,

These excellent contributions from Michael in the field where he was teaching and guiding Chinese scholars were outstanding glimpses into what was happening in communication studies in China. As a newly emerging field in that country, he was instrumental in helping to develop the departments at several universities by his presence and his teaching.... He also shared with CRTNET such informative items as the abstracts of his and Steve Kulich's M.A. students so we could know what their students were researching. This was a very valuable service that he performed.

4.5 Summary of the Chapter

In the aspects of general contributions, academic publishing, conferences and association and other unique influence Prosser has in the field of intercultural communication, his contemporaries and colleagues mostly spoke very highly of him, which confirmed the founding role he has and the on-going contribution he is making.

Originally, one part of this thesis planned to collect responses from Prosser's MA students in Shanghai International Studies University. Yet, because of limited amount of time, this survey did not get enough data. Here, only a brief summary was made. Four

respondents, who are current intercultural communication students, expressed that Prosser, being wise, knowledgeable, kind, encouraging and supportive has broadened their horizon. “I think these confirmed Michael Prosser’s two major contributions to his class: horizon-broadening, and being supportive. He has left us an intangible fortune: global view and friendship.” Prosser was the thesis and dissertation advisor of such Indiana University graduate students as William J. Starosta, perhaps the first Ph.D. in intercultural communication in the US, which would make him the first Ph.D. dissertation advisor in the US, as well as Barbara Monfils, and Sherry Ferguson, all of whom made their own significant contributions to the study of intercultural communication. When Professor Prosser gave a speech at George Mason University in 2007, one of the faculty participants mentioned that he was present at the 1974 foundational conference in Chicago chaired by Prosser, and this event led him into creating his own courses in intercultural communication. A thorough survey into the intercultural contributions of Prosser’s MA students at SISU could be quite beneficial and it could be carried out in the future as a follow-up study.

In the final chapter, I offer my conclusions, limitations to the study, and recommendations for future research, plus a summary of Prosser’s contributions to the study of intercultural communication longitudinally over his professional career.

Chapter 5 Conclusions

5.1 Summary of the Study

To conclude this thesis, we can consider Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the study of intercultural communication longitudinally. In considering his books, two co-edited books can be identified as contributing to the study of classical and medieval rhetoric: *Readings in Classical Rhetoric* (1969, 1972, 1985, 1989, 1995) and *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric* (1973) ; two can be identified as edited books in international public discourse: *An Ethic for Survival: Adlai Stevenson Speaks on International Issues, 1936-1965* (1969) and *Sow the Wind, Reap the Whirlwind: Heads of State Address the United Nations* (two volumes) (1970). The latter book and his co-authored book, *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations* (1997) both deal with his intense interest in the United Nations which related to his doctoral dissertation analyzing addresses in the United Nations. The latter book also merged the two authors' (Ray T. Donahue and Prosser) interests in discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis.

Three of his books were among the founding ones in the field of intercultural and international communication in the 1970's: his edited *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973) and his authored *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1978, 1985, 1989) and translated into Japanese in 1982, and *USIA Intercultural Communication Course: 1977 Proceedings* (1977). Additionally, in the 1970's, two additional works included his edited *Syllabi in Intercultural Communication* (1974, 1975) and his co-edited *Intercultural Communication: Proceedings of the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference, X* (1974).

Later, his co-edited works in intercultural and international communication included:

Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Global Communication (1998), *Civic Discourse: Intercultural, International and Global Media* (1999), *Sino-American Compositions of Shared Topics* (2003), and *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (2007). Currently, Steve J. Kulich and he are co editing two additional volumes: *Values at the Theoretical Crossroads of Culture: Intercultural Research Volue 2* and *Values: Dynamics and Dimensions across Cultures, Intercultural Research Volume 3*. A future goal of Prosser is to write a popular book to be entitled

China's Youth: China's Future. In general,

Prosser has seen himself more as an editor than as an author, having served as the editor of the Eastern Communication Association *Today's Speech* as it was in transition from a popular magazine to a scholarly journal (1968-1972); as editor of the books listed above, as one of the editors for his daughter, Michelle Epiphany Prosser's book, *Excuse Me, Your God Is Waiting* (2008), as the English editorial polisher for the SISU *Middle East and Islam (in Asia) Journal* (2008--), as the English polishing reviewer for more than sixty of SISU's 121 MA theses in intercultural communication (2006-2009), and as the series editor for "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium" with eighteen books published by Ablex, Praeger, and Greenwood Publishers (1998-2004).

Not only has Prosser been a frequent editor or author in the field of intercultural and international communication, but he was among the early founders of the study of intercultural communication in North America in the late 1960's and 1970's, having served as the chair of the first three national conferences in the US to develop the field of intercultural communication. He has also held leadership roles in the field for the [US] National Communication Association as the founding Chair of the first commission on the subject (1971-73); the International Communication Association where he was Vice President and third Chair of the Intercultural and International Communication Division (1974-1977); and the International Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR International) where he was a founding Governing Council member, Vice President (1983-84), and President (1994-86) and served as the chair for the 1980 international congress. In 1995, he and K.S. Sitaram established the Rochester Intercultural Conferences (1995-2001). In the 1980's, he was the host father for international high school students from Sweden, Belgium, France, Brazil, Spain, and

South Africa. Following his Fulbright Professorship to the University of Swaziland (1990-91), he brought two young men from Swaziland to the US to further their high school education, and from 1996-2001, he hosted one or more refugees in his home from South Sudan.

In the 1980's he chaired eight "Global Awareness Days" for a total of 2200 high school students, including 500 international high school students, at the University of Virginia; at the Rochester Institute of Technology in the 1990's he hosted a total of

800 high school students for four annual competitive Model United Nations Security Council sessions. He was the faculty advisor for the Institute's student Global Union and faculty advisor for student delegations to international model UN events in Toronto and Montreal, Canada. He was President of the United Nations Association of Rochester (1997-98) and founding President of the Rochester Area Fulbright Association. He hosted 33 lectures at the Institute on intercultural and international issues, and gave 11 of these lectures, plus in other distinguished lecture series there.

In China since 2001, he has given lecture series on intercultural and international communication at several Chinese universities, as well as in India and Russia. He has been a keynoter for approximately a dozen Chinese communication conferences; has been interviewed twelve times for China Central TV International's "Dialogue" program, seen by several million viewers (2002-2004), was featured in the national "China Semi Monthly Talent Magazine (in Chinese, 2005); and featured in four International Shanghai Channel "Culture Matters" programs and one "Maintalk" program all seen by several million people(2008), and he has been a frequent interviewee in China Radio International's "People in the Know" program (2006-2009). He has taught his Model UN Security Council course both at the undergraduate and graduate levels at Beijing Language and Culture University and Shanghai International Studies University a dozen times, as well as Global Media and Culture and Intercultural Communication several times at SISU. Of his classes to more than 2200 students whom he has taught in China, probably more than half have related to intercultural and international communication and to the United Nations.

Prosser describes himself in his lectures as growing up monoculturally centric, becoming Euroculturally centric, emerging as Asia and Africa centric, increasingly becoming multiculturally centric, and hoping eventually to becoming a world citizen as he recalls his favorite secular quote by Socrates, "I am neither a citizen of Athens, nor of Greece, but of the world." In fact, in 1986, SIETAR International gave him its "Citizen of the World" award, the only time that the Society gave this particular award. After being listed a number of times in the Marquis *Who's Who in American Education* and *Who's Who in America*, for the inaugural and subsequent editions, he was selected for inclusion in *Who's Who in Asia* (2007), and for the 2009 edition of *Who's Who in the World*.

A number of his concepts, ideas, and his summaries or synthesis of others'

intercultural and international concepts, theories, and ideas have been consistently developing throughout his career. He has long been associated with the “cultural dialogue” trend in the study of intercultural communication which emphasizes similarities over differences and moves toward the establishment of a more peaceful world and overcoming conflicts interculturally and internationally. His early summary of the work done to the point of his writing his chapter, “Cultural Values and Cultural Orientations,” in *The Cultural Dialogue* (1978, 1985, 1989) has continued to develop, especially as a faculty member in the Intercultural Communication MA Program at SISU, where the study of values is of great importance. At recent conferences in China, Prosser has given keynote addresses related to classical Greek and Confucian views of values and language, and has recently written a chapter for Kulich and Prosser’s forthcoming co-edited volume, *Values at the Theoretical Crossroads of Culture*, entitled. “Universal Rights as Universal Values.” He has emphasized the importance of language more than nonverbal communication in his books, lectures and speeches both in his early and later works. One of his well received lectures is “English as THE Global Language: Creating World Citizens through English and Intercultural Communication.” Another is his lecture: “Great Western Literature: Homer, the Bible, and Shakespeare.” He regularly gives lectures on his own development in the field of intercultural communication, the United Nations, the culture of war; the culture of peace, globalism and globalization, discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis, international and global media and social justice and human rights. The role of media in the study of intercultural and international communication has been a growing interest of his, both in his first two volumes in the area, and later in his “Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium” books both as a co-editor of two books and also as the series editor, as well as in teaching courses such as International Media and Global Media and Culture. His website (www.michaelprosser.com), established for him in 2003 while he was teaching at BLCU, clearly shows his developing interest in Chinese culture until the present.

Consistently throughout his adult life, Prosser has had an intense interest in intercultural and international communication. He says that if he had had the opportunity as an undergraduate, he would have been an international relations major, but his university did not offer such a major, and the field of intercultural communication was not developed until much later. Several of the respondents to my questionnaire about Prosser’s

contributions and those of his contemporaries to the field of study have made a number of very helpful statements about his long interest and accomplishments, which have added greatly to my description and analysis of Prosser's contributions and those of others in this field for which I am grateful. Additionally, the ten questions posed to him for *China Media Reports* (see Appendix C) give us an even broader autobiographical understanding of his own perception of his contributions. Guan Shijie, in his "Foreword" to Kulich and Prosser's *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* states "[Kulich and Prosser] have made positive contributions in promoting China's IC studies with their unique perspectives and connections with Western scholars, and are widely applauded among the Chinese IC scholars" (2007).

5.2 Limitations of the Study

First of all, the questionnaire which was sent to the scholars was too complicated, as at least one respondent indicated that it took him eight hours to complete the survey. A simpler survey might have obtained a larger number of respondents. Although there are 6,000 or more subscribers to CRTNET, most members are not involved with teaching and researching intercultural or international communication. Early developers of the field of intercultural communication such as William Howell, Grace Layman, Beulah Rohlerich, Edmund Glenn, and K.S. Sitaram have died. Several others are five or six years older than Prosser, for whom email addresses were not accessible as was the case for several of his former SIETAR International colleagues.

Secondly the survey of Michael Prosser's students was done at a rather late time and the students who might have responded to the IC student survey at SISU had either just recently finished their MA theses, and were thus engaged in job placement, or that a large number of them were currently completing their MA theses in the spring of 2009, and thus had no time to respond to the survey in time. A number of the potential contemporary books for which comparisons could be done with Prosser's books were not accessible to me.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research

Future research can be built on this thesis. Researchers can discuss contributions of other early intercultural communications scholars, several of whom have identified their own books and essays in the Appendix. They can even focus on the comparative study between the rhetorical approach to intercultural communication study and the interpersonal or intercultural approach, as well as the mass communication, business, or counseling approaches to intercultural communications study. They can highlight the contributions made by bicultural or intercultural teams, such as Sitaram from India and Prosser from the US, or the many intercultural collaborations of such scholars as William Gudykunst, Guoming Chen, Stella Tin Toomey, or Young Yun Kim. Or they can try to analyze the different disciplines of social sciences that have helped develop such a cross-disciplinary field as intercultural communication.

5.4 Conclusions and Final Comments

The future moves forward from the past. Understanding the early history of a field can provide lessons for shaping its future. It is my hope that this discussion on Prosser and some of his contemporaries' influence on the intercultural communication field motivates others to move carefully to the study of other scholars, while some of whom are still alive and can be interviewed as I had the privilege of doing with Professor Prosser.

This thesis has primarily shown us:

1. The history of Prosser's career, books, publications,
2. The content of Prosser's writing, both practically and scholarly,
3. The motivation of Prosser's teaching and authorship,

Thus with this piece of intercultural communication history in place, I hope that further work can keep extending the knowledge base of the field. Prosser's own webpage, www.michaelprosser.com can provide much more information about his contributions than this thesis has provided, and I encourage interested scholars, students, and others interested in intercultural communication to consult this website and the extensive citations about him in www.google.com, www.baidu.com, www.jcscholar.com or www.amazon.com.

I wish to offer special thanks to the following scholars who shared their comments about Professor Michael H. Prosser with me: Donal Carbaugh, Carley H. Dodd, Ray T. Donahue, D. Ray Heisey, Wenshan Jia, Young Yum Kim, Steve J. Kulich, Paul Pederson, Herbert Simons, and William J. Starosta.

References

- Asante, M. K., Blake, C., & Newmark, E. (Eds.). (1979). *Handbook of intercultural communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Asante, M. K., & Gudykunst, W. B. (Eds.). (1989). *Handbook of international and intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Barnlund, D. C. (1975). *Public and private self in Japan and United States*. Tokyo: Simul.
- Benson, T. W., & Prosser, M. H. (Eds.). *Readings in classical rhetoric* (1969, 1972, 1985, 1989, 1995). Boston: Allyn and Bacon; Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press; Sacramento, CA: Hermagoras Press.
- Brislin, R. W., Bockner, S., & Lonner, W. J. (Eds.). (1975). *Cross-cultural perspectives on learning*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Carbaugh, D. (1983). Oral tradition as spoken culture. In I. Crouch and G. Owen (Eds.), *On oral traditions* (pp. 17-30). Las Cruces, NM: New Mexico State University Press.
- Carbaugh, D. (1990). Toward a perspective on cultural communication and intercultural contact. *Semiotica*, 80, 15-35. [Reprinted in R. Porter (ed.), *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, Wadsworth, 7th edition, 1993.]
- Carbaugh, D. (Ed.). (1990). *Cultural communication and intercultural contact*. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carbaugh, D. (1993A). "Soul" and "self": Soviet and American cultures in conversation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 79, 182-200. [Distinguished Article Award in International and Intercultural Communication Award, 1994, from the Speech Communication Association; Translated into Russian in the Russian journal, *Russia and the West: Dialogue of cultures*, 1996, (pp. 165-183), Russian Academy of Sciences; and translated in another *Russian Academy of Sciences Journal*.
- Carbaugh, D. (1993B). Cultural pragmatics and intercultural competence. L. Lofman, L. Kurki-Suonio, S. Pellinen, & J. Lehtonen (Eds.), *The Competent Intercultural Communicator: A FinLA Yearbook 1993. Publications de l'association finlandaise de linguistique appliquée*, 51, 117-129.
- Carbaugh, D. (1995A). "I can't do that" but "I can actually see around corners": American Indian students and the study of public communication. In J. Lehtonen (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Communication Research and Pedagogy* (pp. 215-234). St. Ingbert, Germany:

- Rohrig Universitätsverlag. [Reprinted in J. Martin, T. Nakayama, & L. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in Cultural Contexts* (pp. 160-172). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1998.]
- Carbaugh, D. (1995B). "Are Americans really superficial?": Notes on Finnish and American cultures in linguistic action. In Liisa Salo (toim./ed.), *Kieli & kulttuuri oppimisessa [Language and culture in teaching and learning]* (pp. 53-60), Publications of the Department of Communication, University of Jyväskylä. [Reprinted in the European journal, *Tempus*, 4, 1995, 6-9; also reprinted in L. Samovar and R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, Wadsworth, 8th edition.]
- Carbaugh, D. (1999A). "Just listen": "Listening" and Landscape among the Blackfeet. *Western Journal of Communication*, 63 (3), 250-270.
- Carbaugh, D. (1999B). "Listening" and landscape: A Blackfeet discourse in its cultural and natural place. In Carla Gallo Barbisio, Laura Lettini, & Daniela Maffei (Eds.), *La rappresentazione del paesaggio* (pp. 63-76), Turino, Italia: Tirrenia Stamatori.
- Carbaugh, D. (2001). "The people will come to you": Blackfeet narrative as a resource for contemporary living. In J. Brockmeier & D. Carbaugh (Eds.), *Narrative and Identity* (pp. 103-127), Amsterdam: J. J. Benjamins. [Reprinted in S. Pratt (ed.), *Communicating Indianness*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.]
- Carbaugh, D. (2002). "I speak the language of the universe": A universally particularizing form of native American discourse. In David Li (ed.), *Discourse in Search of members: A festschrift in honor of Ron Scollon* (pp. 319-334). New York and Oxford: University Press of America.
- Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carbaugh, D. (2007). Cultural discourse analysis: The investigation of communication practices with special attention to intercultural encounters. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 36, 167-182.
- Carbaugh, D. (2008). Culture and communication: Ethnographic perspectives. W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*, vol. 3, 1122-1126. Oxford and Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Carbaugh, D. (2008, November 28). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long.
- Carbaugh, D., & Berry, M. (2004). Communicating Finnish quietude: A pedagogical process for discovering implicit cultural meanings in languages. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 4, 261-280.

- Carbaugh, D., & Berry, M. (2001). Communicating history, Finnish and American discourses: An ethnographic contribution to intercultural communication inquiry. *Communication Theory*, 11, 352-366.
- Carbaugh, D., Berry, M., & Nurmikari-Berry, M. (2006). Intercultural discovery via an email dialogue between a Finnish “comfort with quietude” & US American “discomfort with silence.” In N. Aalto & E. Reuter (Eds.), *Aspects of Intercultural Dialogue* (pp. 209-222), Koln, Germany: SAXA Verlag.
- Carbaugh, D., Berry, M., & Nurmikari-Berry, M. (2006). Coding Personhood through Cultural Terms and Practices: Silence and Quietude as a Finnish “natural way of being”. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 25, 203-220.
- Carbaugh, D., Berry M., Innrater-Moser, C., Nurmikari-Berry M., & Oesch W. (2008). “That’s not me”: Learning to cope with sensitive cultural issues.
- Carbaugh, D., & Boromisza-Habashi, D. (in press). Discourse beyond language: Cultural rhetoric, revelatory insight, and nature. In Christian Meyer and Felix Girke (Ed.), *The Interplay of Rhetoric and Culture*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Book Studies in Rhetoric and Culture III. 32.
- Carbaugh, D., Boromisza-Habashi, D., & Ge, Xin-mei (2006). Dialogue in cross-cultural perspective. In N. Aalto & E. Reuter (Eds.), *Aspects of Intercultural Dialogue* (pp. 27-46), Koln, Germany: SAXA Verlag.
- Carbaugh, D., Gibson, T., & Milburn T. (1997). A view of communication and culture: Scenes in an ethnic cultural center and a private college. In B. Kovacic (ed.), *Emerging theories of human communication* (pp. 1-24), Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Carbaugh, D., & Hastings, S. O. (1992). A role for communication theory in ethnography and cultural analysis. *Communication Theory*, 2 (1992), 156-165.
- Carbaugh, D., & Hastings, S. O. (1995). A role for communication theory in ethnographic studies of interpersonal communication. In W. LeEds-Hurwitz (ed.), *Social Approaches to Communication* (pp. 171-187), Guilford, 1995.
- Carbaugh, D., & Rudnick, L. (2006). Which place, what story? Cultural discourses at the border of the Blackfeet Reservation and Glacier National Park. *Great Plains Quarterly*, 26, 167-184.
- Carbaugh, D., & Wolf, K. (1999). Situating Rhetoric in cultural discourses. *International and Intercultural Communication*, 22, 19-30.
- Chen, G. M., & Ma, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Chinese conflict management and resolutions*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Needham Height, MA: Allyn & Bacon
- Chen, G-M., & Starosta, W. J. (Eds.). (2000). *Communication and globalization*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Chen, G-M., & Starosta, W. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Dialogue among diversities*. Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association
- Condon, J. C., & Yousef, F. (1975). *An introduction to intercultural communication*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merill.
- Dodd, C. H. (1982/1987/1991). *Dynamics of intercultural communication*. Dubuques, IA: Brown.
- Dodd, C. H. (2008, November). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Donahue, R.T. (2002). *Exploring Japaneseness: On Japanese enactments of culture and consciousness*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Donahue, R. T. & Prosser, M. H. (1997). *Diplomatic discourse: International conflict at the UN: Addresses and analysis*. Westport, CN: Ablex.
- Eribo, F. (2001). *In search of greatness: Russia's communications with Africa and the world*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Ferguson, S. D. & Shade, L.R. (2002). *Civic discourse and cultural politics in Canada: A cacophony of voices*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Fischer, H-D., & Merrill, J. C. (Eds.). (1976). *International and intercultural communication*. New York: Hastings House.
- Gher, L. & Amin, H.Y. (2000). *Civic discourse and digital age communications in the Middle East*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Gostin, L. (2007). The journey of an intercultural/international scholar: An interview with Dr. Michael Prosser. *China Media Reports*.
- Guan, S. J. (2007). Foreword. In S. J. Kulich & M. H. Prosser (Eds.), *Intercultural perspectives on Chinese Communication*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. (pp. i-xvi)
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1983). *Intercultural communication theory: Current perspectives*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1985). Intercultural communication: Current status and proposed directions. B. Dervin & M. J. Voigt (Eds.), *Progress in Communication Sciences*, 6 (pp. 1-46). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Gudykunst, W. B. (Ed.). (2003). *Cross-cultural and intercultural communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (Ed.). (2005). *Theorizing about intercultural communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). *Methods for intercultural communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Mody, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of international and intercultural communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Harms, L. S. (1973). *Intercultural Communication*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Heisey, D. R. (2000). *Chinese perspectives in rhetoric and communication*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Heisey, D. R. (2008). Interview with D. Ray Heisey. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 1(2), 131-137.
- Heisey, D. R. (2008, November). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Heisey, D. R. & Gong, W. (Eds.) (1998). *Communication and Culture: China and the world entering the 21st century*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holt, R. (2004). *Dialogue on the internet: Language, civic Identity, and computer-mediated communication*. Westport: CT: 2004.
- Hu, W. Z. (Ed.). (1990). *Selected readings in intercultural communication*.
Changsha: Hu'nan Education Press.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of civilizations and the remaking of the world order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Jain, N.C., Prosser, M.H. & Miller, M. H. (Eds.) (1974). *Intercultural communication: Proceedings of the Speech Communication Association summer conference X*. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Jia, W. S. (1999). *The remaking of the Chinese character and identity in the 21st century*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

- Jia, W. S. (2008, December). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Kim, Y. Y., & Gudykunst, W. B. (Eds.). (1988). *Theories in intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2008, November). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Kluver, R. & Powers, J. H. (Eds.). (1999). *Civic discourse, civil societies, and Chinese communities*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
- Kohls, L. R. (1979). *Survival kit for overseas living*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Kulich, S. J. (2008). Toward an Extensive List of Core Books Abroad. In the document of his SISU Intercultural Communication Program – Intercultural Communications Research: History and Status.
- Kulich, S. J. (2009, January). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Kulich, S. J., & Prosser, M. H. (Eds.).(2007). *Intercultural perspectives on Chinese communication*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Kulich, S. J. & Prosser, M.H. (Eds.) (Forthcoming). *Values at the theoretical crossroads of culture; Intercultural Research Volume 2*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Kulich, S. J.& Prosser, M.H.. (Eds.) (Forthcoming) *Values: Dynamics and dimensions across cultures: Intercultural Research Volume 3*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Lengel, L. (2000). *Culture and technology in the new Europe: Civic discourse in the transformation of post-Communist Europe*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Lengel, L. (2004). *Intercultural communication and creative practice: Music, dance, and women's virtual identity*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Martin, J., & Nakayama, T. K. (2003). *Intercultural Communication in Contexts* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Moriarty, T. (2003). *Finding the words: A rhetorical history of South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Miller, J. M., Prosser, M. H., & Benson, T. W. (Eds.). (1973). *Readings in medieval rhetoric*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Over, W. (1999). *Human rights in the international public sphere: Civic discourse*

- for the 21st century*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
- Over, W. (2001). *Social justice in world cinema and theatre*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Over, W. (2004). *World peace, mass culture and national policies*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Pedersen, P. B. (2008, November). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Prosser, M. H. (Ed.). (1969). *An ethic for survival: Adlai Stevenson speaks on international affairs, 1936-1965*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Prosser, M. H. (Ed.). (1970). *Sow the wind, reap the whirlwind: Heads of state address the United Nations*, 2 volumes (deluxe, numbered, boxed, limited edition). New York: William Morrow.
- Prosser, M. H. (Ed.). (1973). *Intercommunication among nations and peoples*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Prosser, M.H. (1973). *Major books on intercultural communication*. Washington, SIETAR International.
- Prosser, M.H. (1974, 1975) Syllabi in intercultural communication. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.
- Prosser, M.H. (1975). Teaching intercultural communication: An illustrative syllabus and bibliography. *Speech Teacher*. XXIV. 3. pp. 242-250.
- Prosser, H.H. (1977). Communication media and attitudinal and social change. In M.B. Casata and M.K. Asante. *Social Uses of Mass Communication*: Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Prosser, M.H. (Ed.). (1977). *USIA intercultural communication course: 1977 proceedings*: Washington, DC: USIA.
- Prosser, M. H. (1978/1985/1989). *The cultural dialogue: An introduction to intercultural communication*. Washington, DC: SIETAR International.
- Prosser, M.H. (1978). Intercultural communication: Major constructs: An overview. In B.Rubin, Ed. *Communication Yearbook II*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Prosser, M.H. (2003-09). Website: Intercultural Communication.
- Prosser, M. H. (2007). One world, one dream: Harmonizing society through intercultural communication: A prelude to China intercultural communication studies. In S. J. Kulich & M. H. Prosser (Eds.). (2007). *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (pp. 22-91). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Prosser, M.H. (2007). China: Selected Books in English. [Online] *Review of Books in Communication*.

- Prosser, M.H. (2008-09). Frequent interviews and correspondence with the author Peter Zhang Long.
- Prosser, M.H. (April, 2008). The Palestine issue in the eyes of Jimmy Carter: A book review. *Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies (in Asia)*. Vol. 2. Number 1,
- Prosser, M.H. (2009). Classical rhetoric. *Encyclopedia of Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Prosser, M.H. (2009). Cross-cultural communication. *Encyclopedia of Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Prosser, M.H. (2009) Media diplomacy. *Encyclopedia of Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Prosser, M.H.. (forthcoming). Universal rights as universal values. In S. J. Kulich and M.H. Prosser, Eds. *Values at the theoretical crossroads of culture*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Prosser, M. H., & Sitaram, K. S. (Eds.). (1999). *Civic discourse: Intercultural, international, and global media* (vol. 2). Westport, CN: Ablex.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (Eds.). (1972). *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E., Stefani, L. A. (1998). *Communication between Cultures* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Simons, H. (2008, November). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Sitaram, K.S. (1995). *Communication and culture: A world view*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sitaram, K. S., & Cogdell, R. T. (1976). *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Columbus, OH: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Sitaram, K. S., & Prosser, M. H. (Eds.). (1998). *Civic discourse: Multiculturalism, cultural diversity, and global communication* (vol. 1). Westport, CN: Ablex.
- Smith, A. G. (Ed.). (1966). *Communication and culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Smith, A. L. (1973). *Transracial communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Starosta, W. J. (1984). Intercultural rhetoric. In W. B. Gudykunst, Y. Y. Kim (Eds.), *Methods for intercultural communication* (pp. 229-238). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Starosta, W. J. (2008, November). Correspondence with Peter Zhang Long, on Michael H. Prosser's contributions to the IC Field.
- Steinfatt, T.M. (2002). *Working at the bar: Sex work and health communication in*

- Thailand*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Ting-Toomey, S & Oetzel, J. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Varis, T. (1998). Foreword. In K. S. Sitaram & M. H. Prosser (Eds.), *Civic discourse: Multiculturalism, cultural diversity, and global communication*. Westport, CN: Ablex.
- Varis, T. (1999). Values and the limits of the global media in the age of cyberspace. In M. H. Prosser & K. S. Sitaram (Eds.), *Civic discourse: intercultural, international, and global media* (pp. 5-18). Westport, CN: Ablex.
- Weaver, G. (1978). *Crossing cultural barriers*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Wenk, E. (1999). *The double helix: Technology and democracy in the American Future*. Stamford, CT: Ablex
- Windes, R. R. (1975). Editor's foreword. In John C. Condon & Fathi Yousef, *An introduction to intercultural communication* (pp. v-x). Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merill.
- Xi, G. (2009). Michael H. Prosser in *Journalism and Communication Scholars Database* (www.jcscholar.com). Wuhan: Wuhan University.
- Yin, J. (2006). MA thesis entitled A glimpse into intercultural communication study in America: Evaluating 35 years' Samovar & Porter's *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Shanghai: SISU Intercultural Institute.
- Zhou, L. J., & Prosser, M. H. (Eds.). (2003). *Sino-American compositions on shared topics*. Zhengzhou, China: Henan People's Press.

Appendix A Academic Survey Questions & Answers:
Respondents: Donal Carbaugh, Carley H. Dodd, Ray T. Donahue, D. Ray Heisey, Wenshan Jia, Young Yum Kim, Paul B. Pederson, Herbert Simons, William J. Starosta,

Are there any contributions to the development of the intercultural communication field by Michael Prosser that you consider noteworthy?

C. Dodd: The long list that follows testifies to Dr. Prosser's amazing contributions. He initiated the field of Intercultural and International Communication to the National Communication Association (called Speech Communication Association or SCA earlier during that time). Most of all, he was extremely encouraging to many young scholars at the time such as me. Michael provided inspiration and encouragement to many, but I felt especially benefitted in his kind words and his written comments. When I was invited to the University of Shanghai, I was welcomed by Professor Enping Zhuang. However, I believe Michael Prosser must have contributed to why I and others were invited and why the conference was so successful as is the Chinese Intercultural Communication Association which he is involved in.

D. R. Heisey: His contributions were in two areas. First, personally he was a leader among his peers in taking the initiative in calling attention to the need for moving out in this area of the field of speech communication. He led in establishing the need for a division of intercultural and international communication within the field and in holding workshops and conferences at SCA and at RIT, his institution. Second, intellectually he was a leader in focusing on international and intercultural communication with an emphasis on the rhetorical implications and applications for this area of research. He came out of the classical rhetoric dimension of communication where many others came from the interpersonal and quantitative research areas. Thus his emphasis was unique. He focused on the important dimension of dialogue as the essence of intercultural communication.

H. Simons: My main impressions of Mike's contributions to intercultural

communication have come from his long and quite detailed e-mails to CRTNET and from my visits to his classes as BLCU.

Jia Wenshan:

- 1). Michael has continued and expanded Robert Oliver's tradition by writing, lecturing, editing and mentorship.
- 2). Michael is a visionary with a broad and inclusive and forward-looking intellectual vision on humanity and human communication across cultures. He lives his life, lecturing, researching and teaching by this vision. While a majority of communication scholars in the US are fearful of going to China due to the media's influence, Michael has already taught in China for 10 years.
- 3). Michael has mentored a new generation of leading intercultural scholars. Some of them are big names such as Bill Starosta, Guoming Chen, Laura Lengel, Tom Steinfatt and so on. My academic life has been significantly influenced by Michael's mentorship. The three English books which I wrote and co-edited on China are possible because of Michael's vision and boldness of action. All of these books have been on the "Outstanding Academic Book" list on Choice of American Library Association and are sold to hundreds of libraries in the world.
- 4). Michael has also played a central role in the development of IC in China in the past ten years by giving keynote speeches and mentorship of graduate students and other professors including Steve Kulich.

P. B. Pedersen: Michael's contribution has been especially strong in networking and developing a professional identity for intercultural communication in the field of communication.

Ray T. Donahue: The intercultural communication field (IC) can be viewed as having four historical threads:

- 1) Cultural anthropology (i.e., Edward T. Hall's work)
- 2) Communication studies, particularly interpersonal communication and rhetorical studies
- 3) IC training rooted in group counseling methods (e.g. the T-group method and role play) for intercultural and international relations
- 4) Academic coursework in intercultural/international communication.

The first three threads were almost simultaneous and together led to the fourth thread of academic coursework, largely in departments of communication or communication studies. Michael H. Prosser made important contributions to the later three threads.

Y. Y. Kim: When I entered the field of intercultural communication after completing my Ph.D. degree in 1976, Professor Prosser was one of the most prominent figures in the field.

W. J. Starosta: Dr. Prosser produced the first PhD in Intercultural Communication while at Indiana University. He held several conferences to exchange syllabi in intercultural communication. He was among the founders of the Intercultural divisions of SCA (now NCA), ICA, & SIETAR. He produced books on intercultural communication as early as 1973. He sent his graduate students to present at panels at SCA, ECA, and CSCA. (This is a brief introduction.)

As a scholar of classical rhetoric, he applied rhetorical analysis (or criticism) to international speech making at the United Nations in his doctoral dissertation (1964) and throughout his long career. He exercised his scholarship ability early in his career by his editorship of the journal *Today's Speech* and of a standard textbook on classical rhetoric, *Readings in Classical Rhetoric* (1969, Allyn and Bacon). He went on to almost single-handedly develop the field of UN diplomacy within communication studies with these publications:

(1969). *An Ethic for Survival: Adlai Stevenson Speaks on International Affairs, 1936-1965*, William Morrow.

(1970). *Sow the Wind, Reap the Whirlwind: Heads of State Address the United Nations*, William Morrow

(1973). *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples*. Harper and Row.

(1997). *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations*.

Addresses and Analysis. Ablex.

His major contribution was raising people's consciousness for international understanding and intercultural awareness, as well as documenting important diplomatic statements at the United Nations. His volumes of *Sow the Wind, Reap the Whirlwind: Heads of State Address the United Nations*, made important UN speeches easily accessible, in the pre-internet era, to scholars and students of communication studies, as well as those in political affairs. This was followed by *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations* but with greater analysis and inclusion of both the international and intercultural levels of communication.

So this was primarily at the level of international communication, an important foundation for intercultural communication studies. Also, Prosser was giving voice to international understanding, a great need felt in the turbulence during the Cold War and the Vietnam War era. As Americans increasingly recognized the need for intercultural training, Prosser filled an important leadership position by organizing the first national conference on intercultural communication (in 1973 at University of Virginia) and later founding or helping to found major professional organizations devoted to intercultural communication, such as Intercultural and International Division of the National Communication Association, the International Communication Association, and SIETAR (Society for International Education, Training and Research). He was one of the first to teach college-level courses on intercultural communication in the U.S. and in Canada. Additionally, he authored one of the early textbooks on intercultural communication, *Cultural Dialogue* (1978). Besides covering concepts and principles of intercultural communication, this book also documented an intercultural T-group or group learning experience, a rare documentation despite the T-group is a core intercultural training strategy. For such various reasons as these, Michael H. Prosser is considered a founding father of academic intercultural communication (AIC). Perhaps, in time that distinction may be deemed for the whole field of intercultural communication.

Prosser continued to contribute importantly to the field by organizing forums for original research through international conferences and publishing. As a Distinguished Professor (a position he has held at various institutions) at Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT), he joined with another founding father of AIC, K.S. Sitaram, in the mid-1990s to celebrate twenty-five years of AIC with a series of annual research conferences at RIT. These conferences gave rise to Prosser's book series titled *Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium* for Ablex and the Greenwood Publishing Group. His conception of the book series edited for Ablex titled *Civic Discourse* (from 1999) was almost prescient of the events of 9/11 for his sense of civic unrest in the world and his hope for increased cultural understanding. The depth and breath of topics covered in the *Civic Discourse* series, the awards that some of the books received, evince that he is a person of high scholarship and wisdom.

Prosser's professional leadership in the field of communication studies has been great and far ranging from scholarly writing and editing to the founding of academic associations and research conferences. He without doubt is one of the most important figures in communication studies today.

If you are familiar with his early books such as his edited *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (1973) and his authored book *The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication* (1978, reprinted in 1985, 1989), were there any specific contributions which these books or your own books made to the development of the intercultural communication field?

C. Dodd: The Cultural Dialogue made a huge impact on my early writing, where several articles in the book highly influenced aspects of 3 chapters in one of my textbooks. I cannot begin to tell you how grateful I am for this contribution, which helped the entire field develop and begin to grow.

D. R. Heisey: His *Intercommunication* book was a landmark in the field as it covered all the important areas of international communication. He covered all of the areas that

now have developed into their own fields of specialty and he did this by assembling some of the best scholars in the field. I have used this book repeatedly in my teaching and research. And his *Cultural Dialogue* book was an outstanding early textbook for those teachers and scholars in the intercultural area. His focus on the dialogue dimension of the field has continued and expanded for a proper understanding of intercultural communication whether at the interpersonal level or the rhetorical level or the political level.

Ray T. Donahue: As mentioned above *Cultural Dialogue* is important not just because it was an early textbook in the field, but it is one of the few, if not the only one, to document an intercultural T-group learning experience. The T-group is an important learning mechanism, which will likely to continue to be one.

Nations and Peoples (1973), as mentioned, helped communication studies take a broader view, a cultural one, especially at a time when cries for support of diversity in the U.S. were just starting to be heard.

Y. Y. Kim: Although Professor Prosser and I have not had opportunities to work closely, I did read his book, *The Cultural Dialogue*. I regard this book to be one of the first solid efforts to offer a conceptual grounding for the study of intercultural communication.

W. J. Starosta: My name appears in small print on the *Intercommunication* book, as assistant to the editor. I also worked on Prosser's books on *Sow the Wind and Reap the Whirlwind* (heads of state addressing the UN general assembly). The *Intercommunication* book was more interdisciplinary than almost any book of its day. It was early, it forced us to look closely at definitions, and it gave us a platform to see intercultural communication more rhetorically than is done today.

My & Chen's *Foundations of Intercultural Communication* is still the best book available for basing intercultural communication in a context broad enough to include Chinese philosophy, communication theory, intercultural listening, and theory-building in intercultural communication. The *Foundations* book has been reprinted once, and will be printed next year in China as well. Our three editions for NCA were very significant works, and were ahead of their time.

If you are familiar with his later books, his coauthored book with Ray T. Donahue

Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations (1997), and his coedited books with K.S. Sitaram: *Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Global Communication* (1998), and *Civic Discourse: Intercultural, International, and Global Media* (1999), and his coedited book with Steve J. Kulich, *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (2007). Are there any contributions by Michael Prosser or his books which you consider relevant to the study of intercultural communication?

D. R. Heisey: I am familiar with all of these books and find them to be most valuable for the area of teaching and research that I have been involved in for about fifty years. My area of political and rhetorical communication in the intercultural field has benefitted most significantly from his published works in the diplomatic and civic discourse field. His work on combining rhetorical, media, diplomatic, and now Chinese communication has been at the forefront of research. His civic discourse model for intercultural communication grew naturally out of his emphasis on dialogue and diplomacy in international communication.

Ray T. Donahue: I will confine my remarks to DD (*Diplomatic Discourse*), for I am its co-author and by that perspective may offer special insight. DD intends to merge discourse analysis with rhetorical analysis (criticism), while at the same time merge the international and intercultural levels where feasible. For example, statesmen when addressing the UN are not just voices for entire nations (usually) but also are individual people, who often enter a social or intercultural situation on the podium vs. a vs. their political counterparts and their immediate audience before them in the hall. The related social and cultural relationships can be seen mirrored in their style and organization of the speech. Through this medium of the UN speech, it is hoped that the communication process can be viewed in action while highlighting related international and intercultural aspects. An important point is that international diplomacy is in itself intercultural (often when diplomats interact interpersonally), an aspect often overlooked. Besides this intercultural training, DD provides further development of the field of international diplomacy especially through analytical tools.

Michael was the chair of the first three conferences in North America to establish the

field of intercultural communication: 1971 Indiana University: Brown County, Indiana consultation, 1973 University of Virginia Syllabus Building Conference, 1974 Chicago Speech Communication Association, International Communication Association, and SIETAR SCA Summer Conference. Can you comment on any of these conferences and their contributions or yours in these conferences to the study of intercultural communication?

C. Dodd: I attended the 1974 SCA summer conference. It was life changing and career-altering. I was exposed to new ideas and techniques for teaching that have made my work so much better.

D. R. Heisey: I was involved personally in some of these early conferences which helped immensely in my own growth and maturation in the field of intercultural communication. I still have those outlines that were developed then and can attest to their relevance in giving guidance and direction to the young field of intercultural communication. I can remember how excited I was as a young scholar moving into the intercultural field to be invited to these conferences and workshops to help build this new field. They helped me in establishing at my own university here at Kent State a new course in intercultural communication. My university, of course, still has an emphasis in intercultural communication.

Y. Y. Kim: I got to know him through SCA and ICA conferences where he was very active--as you noted in #4. All of us are truly indebted to Professor Prosser and his colleagues, whose visionary efforts laid the intellectual and organizational foundation for the field of intercultural communication.

W. J. Starosta: These were the early days of the field. The conferences put me into contact with Ed Stewart, David Hoopes, KS Sitaram, Ed Glenn, WS Howell, Nobleza Asuncion-Lande, and many other persons, who shaped my definitions of the field and influenced my perceptions of where the field might go in future years. Prosser had the insight to see that networking at this early day would be foundational for subsequent developments in the field.

Michael chaired the International and Intercultural Communication Commission (later Division) of the Speech Communication Association from 1971-1973; was

the third Chair of the Intercultural Division of the International Communication Association, 1974 or 1975-1977, and a founding Governing Council member, 1973-1977, and later President of SIETAR International, 1984-1986. Can you comment on any contributions that Michael or you made to these organizations during these periods or later?

C. Dodd: Thanks to Michael, I was appointed Vice-President of SIETAR and chair of the program committee for the San Antonio SIETAR conference. This role led to a co-authored edited book with Frank F. Montalvo (Our Lady of the Lake University) published by SIETAR in 1987. Again, Michael's influence and encouragement led to this entire set of events that would not have happened without him. Moreover, his SIETAR leadership carried the organization into a world recognized level.

D. R. Heisey: As I mentioned before, Michael was the leader in the professional organizations for establishing international and intercultural communication in SCA and in SIETAR. I was very active in both of these organizations, attending their conferences and doing research and presenting papers at their meetings. His leadership in these professional organizations helped to ground me in my own development. Following his leadership, I eventually was elected myself to become vice-chair first and then chair of the Division of International and Intercultural Communication of NCA in 2001-2002. I also became active for a while, before my retirement, in the World Communication Association and presented papers and published in their journal.

Michael and K.S. Sitaram co-chaired six Rochester Intercultural Conferences from 1995-2001: 1995 – the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Intercultural Division of ICA by K.S. Sitaram; 1996 – Intercultural, International, and Global Media; 1997 – Communication, Technology, and Cultural Values; (no conference in 1998); 1999 – Social Justice and Human Rights; 2000-War and Peace; and 2001-Computer Mediated Communication. Can you comment on any contributions that Michael or you made to these conferences?

P. B. Pedersen: Michael made a great contribution through SIETAR in taking intercultural communication across disciplines.

W. J. Starosta: Michael was a Founding Father, and I was a Founding Bastard Son, to

these fields. I later came to hold some of these same posts, and was in on the discussions these early years. We insinuated intercultural communication into the offerings of existing societies. Today, most divisions do something (inter)cultural, but in those days, it was a distinct area of study, and we wrestled with whether domestic and international cultural communication worked by the same premises.

P. B. Pedersen: I did not attend any of these conferences.

W. J. Starosta: I never found the money to attend these gatherings. I would be wiser if I had!

D. R. Heisey: These were very important conferences in my professional life as a scholar in intercultural communication. I attended I believe every one of them and was awarded an outstanding scholar award at one of the last conferences and was one of the keynote speakers at one of them. Michael gave me the opportunity to reflect on and present some of my views and experiences in intercultural communication. Michael was personally aware of my many overseas teaching and research opportunities over the years and I was very appreciative of his support. One of the things I was proud of at these conferences was the way I involved some of my Chinese students from China. I submitted some of the best papers they had researched for me while I was teaching in Beijing and added introductions or conclusions to them so that I could be a co-author and present their papers for them since they could not be in attendance. These conferences gave me an opportunity to share my students' research with the American community. Michael was very supportive of my efforts to involve my Chinese students in his conferences.

Ray T. Donahue: Several points about these conferences, some of which might be overlooked by others:

1) Prosser evinced both internationalism, cooperation, and collaboration by greatly encouraging contributions from abroad and more significantly insisting that he and co-organizer K.S. Sitaram take turns in being the "first" conference coordinator or book editor, despite that the conferences were really Prosser's own, coming from his endowed chair at RIT and sole support by his institution.

2) Prosser organized expert readers (faculty at RIT) to evaluate conference submissions prior to the conferences, not solely by abstract, a usual practice, but by the

whole paper.

3) Prosser gave enthusiastic encouragement to young researchers (including students) and to people of color for their participation.

From 1998-2004, Michael's (Ablex, Praeger, Greenwood Publishing Group) "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium" series published about 17 or 18 books. Can you comment on any contributions that Michael made in this context as the series editor or your own contributions to the study of intercultural and international communication during this period?

D. R. Heisey: I think these publications by Michael and his associates during this period were very important in the development and extension of the research in international and intercultural communication because of the focus he gave to the field. It was phenomenal in the way that he continued to publish extensively in year after year thus giving great opportunity to other authors and editors to be involved in the publishing of intercultural research. I can speak from my own experience because Michael personally was responsible for my becoming editor of the Ablex Series, "Advances in Communication and Culture." I can still remember the NCA conference where he introduced me to the Ablex editor where we discussed the launching of my new series, which eventually produced five volumes, the first one by me, *Chinese Perspectives in Rhetoric and Communication*, and then four others by outstanding Chinese scholars. These volumes were entitled, *Chinese Conflict Management and Resolution*, edited by Guo-Ming Chen and Ringo Ma, *Chinese Communication Studies*, edited by Xing Lu, Wenshan Jia, and D. Ray Heisey, *Chinese Communication Theory and Research*, edited by Wenshan Jia, Xing Lu, and D. Ray Heisey, and *In Search of Boundaries: Communication, Nation-States, and Cultural Identities*, edited by Robert McIntyre and Joseph Chan. All of these excellent volumes by important Chinese scholars have to be credited to the efforts of Michael Prosser who gave me the opportunity to produce and edit them which helped to extend the research and publication of Chinese scholarship.

P. B. Pedersen: I have not seen any of these books.

W. J. Starosta: Again, I made little use of these books. I had launched my own

research, and started my own journal (The Howard Journal of Communications), so that my time was consumed in tasks that were closer to home.

Ray T. Donahue: As I mentioned, this series was almost prescient of the events of 9/11 for his sense of civic unrest in the world and his hope for increased cultural understanding. He wanted to give scope and voice about various regions of the world in an effort to increase our global understanding of the world, for he was well aware of international conflicts, a topic that he explored from his earliest days of scholarship of speech communication at the UN.

During Michael's years of teaching in China, 2001-2008, he often posted "China Continuing" comments to CRTNET. Many of them have been posted also on his website: www.michaelprosser.com Can you comment on any contributions which Michael made to the study of intercultural communication through these comments or essays?

P. B. Pedersen: I am not familiar with the website.

W. J. Starosta: I didn't read many of these postings, though people mentioned them to me. I was just too busy to do much Internet surfing.

H. Simons: The CRTNET posts also provide abundant evidence of Prosser's scholarly and pedagogical contributions to intercultural communication in China. I know of no one in my field who has done more in that general area.

D. R. Heisey: These excellent contributions from Michael in the field where he was teaching and guiding Chinese scholars were outstanding glimpses into what was happening in communication studies in China. As a newly emerging field in that country, he was instrumental in helping to develop the departments at several universities by his presence and his teaching. We in this country would not have known what was happening over there were it not for his extensive and specific sharing of information of the communication field in China. Having taught at Peking University for two different semesters in 1996 and again in 2000, I was especially pleased that he wrote to the scholars in the U.S. through these columns to let them know about these developments. I knew from my own experience that the Americans did not know about China and Michael's stories and citing of important information

about communication departments and their students on China's campuses were most valuable to a better international understanding. I can remember reading his entries and then saying to myself, "Right on, Michael. That is great that you are taking the time to write so much interesting detail about our Chinese colleagues." He also shared with CRTNET such informative items as the abstracts of his and Steve Kulich's M.A. students so we could know what their students were researching. This was a very valuable service that he performed.

Ray T. Donahue: From the ones that I read, I felt that he took the middle-ground well in viewing China, a country that after all has been a relative mystery for Westerners, for it had been closed to the view by outsiders for most of the second half of the 20th century and somewhat still.

Are there other contributions which Michael or you have made to intercultural communication at large which you think are worthy of note?

C. Dodd: His speeches and many papers presented to the SCA, now NCA, called increasing attention to a young and growing field during the 1970s and 80s. Because of his amazing presence, comments during business meetings, and numerous papers and critiques, we have grown to one of the largest divisions without NCA and stand on the brink of greatness. Thanks, Michael.

D. R. Heisey: I would like to comment on a quality that I feel Michael and I share. I was encouraged by his example which helped me to model my behavior in similar ways. I refer to the interest in and commitment to the invitation to our students and colleagues to submit their scholarly work for publication consideration. He has always done this throughout his career as I have also. My first major publication in the intercultural field was my article in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* on "The Rhetoric of the Arab-Israeli Conflict" in 1970. I can still remember how excited I was as a young scholar to receive his invitation to submit my journal article to his forthcoming book as a chapter in *Intercommunication*. He has invited many authors and editors to submit their work. I have always tried to encourage my students to submit their papers for conference presentation and publication consideration. When I taught those two times in China, I always tried to invite my students to submit their work at NCA,

Michael's RIT conferences, the conferences of the International Academy for Intercultural Research in which I am a Fellow and other places. One of my superior Beijing students I encouraged by inviting him to submit a chapter in my book, *Chinese Perspectives in Rhetoric and Communication*, on the rhetoric of Deng Xiaoping. I also presented a jointly-authored paper by him at the NCA 1997 conference on "Serendipity Dialogue in Intercultural Communication" by this same student. He went on to get his Ph.D. in communication at USC and is now a professor of communication at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and he is one of the editors of the newly established *Chinese Journal of Communication* which was published for the first time in 2008. He invited me to engage in a dialogue with him about my international experiences and intercultural views that he published in the October issue of the journal. His name is Jack Linchuan Qiu. This is an example of what can be the consequence of the commitment to encouraging one's students to submit and publish. I followed Michael's example in inviting Chinese colleagues, some of them very early in their careers, to submit chapters in my "Advances in Communication and Culture" Series with Ablex. Even after the series was ended, I continued to receive requests from Chinese colleagues, wondering whether I could help them publish their work. Since my thesis will be also a comparative study of contemporaries of Michael's contributions to the study of intercultural communication, please comment, including book titles, on your own major contributions to the study of intercultural communication.

H. Simons: The e-mails were wonderful and I'm glad that they've been collected on his website. I also much enjoyed my visits to BLCU and was especially impressed by Mike's warm relationship with students on campus, nearly all of whom seemed to know Mike. What's even more impressive is how many of them he knew personally and could greet by name and with reference to their studies. On these occasions Mike ENACTED his knowledge of intercultural communication, serving as a model of sorts for me.

P. B. Pedersen: I am sorry to make such a poor contribution to your study. My work has been largely limited to psychology and counseling.

W. J. Starosta: Everything we did was worthy of note. Or not. Maybe Dr. Prosser

will tell you about his cigar store figurine in Chicago.

We were at the dawn of a discipline. I was the first PhD, Prosser was the first PhD mentor, in intercultural. We were definitional. I started a journal that was one of the few publication outlets for many years in intercultural. We networked everywhere. All roads to intercultural started from Indiana or Minnesota. I have spent 37 years at the graduate level between UVA and Howard University. Prosser has been active longer than that.

We should learn how to finally quit, and to leave the field in the hands of MA students writing a thesis in Shanghai.

Y. Y. Kim: As for my own contributions, it is difficult for me to say. So, I am attaching an abridged curriculum vitae. If you are interested, you can find in this vitae the information on my publications, the leadership roles I have played in SCA, ICA, and other intercultural organizations, and my work on journal editorial boards. I consider these activities to be my primary contributions to the field.

P. B. Pedersen: See my website (<http://soeweb.syr.edu/chs/pedersen/>).

W. J. Starosta: The *Howard Journal of Communications* was my primary contribution to the field. It stands on its own as a unique achievement.

Besides that, there were books:

2007

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998, 2005, 2007). *Foundations of Intercultural Communication*. Reprinted in the People's Republic of China.

2005

Starosta, W. J. & Chen, G-m. Taking Stock in Intercultural Communication: Where to Now? Vol. 28, *NCA Intercultural and international communication Annual*.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2005). *Foundations of Intercultural Communication*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America (reissued).

2004

Chen, G-m & Starosta, W.J. (Eds.). Dialogue on diversity. Vol. 27, *NCA Intercultural and international communication Annual*.

2003

Starosta, W. J. & Chen, G-m. Ferment in the Intercultural Field: Axiology/ Value/

Praxis (Eds.) (two chapters authored). Vol. 26, *NCA Intercultural and international communication Annual*. Five Oaks: Sage.

2000

Communication and Global Society, (Ed.) (two chapters authored) with G-m Chen. Peter Lang Press, Berlin, Boston.

1998

Foundations of Intercultural Communication, second author with Guo-ming Chen. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

1973

Assistant to Editor, M. Prosser (Ed.), *Intercommunication among Nations and Peoples* (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1973).

And I have served on or read for some 20 international communication journals.

D. Carbaugh: My research in Intercultural Communication has been focused on the ethnographic study of actual instances of intercultural contact between people who use different cultures. This approach was introduced in my edited book below, and other publications. It has also been developed in my 2007 article, below, as well as in several other publications which I will list for your information.

The approach is included as an entry in the recent International Encyclopedia of Communication (Carbaugh, D., 2008).

I have published some books on Intercultural Communication that have received awards and may be of interest to you in your review of the field. The two most central are (Carbaugh, D., 1990; Carbaugh, D., 2005).

Both were designated Outstanding Book of the Year by the National Communication Association, the former in 1991, the latter in 2006.

An article I wrote was also similarly designated. It is (Carbaugh D., 1993A).

The most recent detailed statement of the approach is (Carbaugh, 2007).

Earlier formulations of the approach are in (Carbaugh, D. & Hastings, S. O., 1992; Carbaugh, 1990; Carbaugh, D., & Hastings, S. O., 1995; Carbaugh, D., Gibson, T., & Milburn, T., 1997; Carbaugh, D., 1983).

A recent co-authored book is (Carbaugh, D. et al., 2008).

Several Studies have focused on Blackfeet communication and culture, and intercultural encounters among Native Americans (i.e., Blackfeet) and largely "white" Americans (Carbaugh, D. & Rudnick, L., 2006; Carbaugh, D., & Wolf, K., 1999; Carbaugh, D., 1999A; Carbaugh, D., 1993B; Carbaugh, D. & Boromisza-Habashi, D., in press; Carbaugh D., Boromisza-Habashi, D., & Ge, Xin-mei, 2006; Carbaugh, D., 2002; Carbaugh, D., 2001; Carbaugh, D., 1999B; Carbaugh, D., 1995A).

Others have focused on Intercultural Encounters between Finns and US Americans (Carbaugh, D., Berry, M., & Nurmikair-Berry, M., 2006; Carbaugh, D., Berry, M., & Nurmikari-Berry., M., 2006; Carbaugh, D., Berry, M., 2004; Carbaugh, D. & Berry, M., 2001; Carbaugh, D., 1995B).

C. Dodd: I have 11 books and over 100 papers and articles mostly about intercultural communication and other related topics. Dr. Prosser was a big influence in the early development of these projects, mostly by his encouragement and inspiration. Carley H. Dodd, *Dynamics of Intercultural Communication* (1982/1987/1991) was highly influenced by Michael's intercultural text.

D. R. Heisey: I have already mentioned the five books I edited in the Ablex series, but I could comment on the involvement I have had in the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies. I served as president of the organization from 2001-2003 and gave the presidential address at its conference in Hong Kong in 2001 and then was presented with a Festschrift in my honor consisting of a journal of the *Intercultural Communication Studies* by my former students and colleagues. This was presented to me in the conference in Tapei in 2005. I have published widely in that journal and now serve on the Board of Directors. One of our former Kent State

University Ph.D. students and one of the leaders in intercultural communication is now the executive director of the IAICS. He is Guo-Ming Chen of the University of Rhode Island. He was one of my editors of my Ablex book series.

I might add one further piece of information that relates to impact. After I retired from Kent State University in 1996 where I had taught for 30 years with some leaves of absence to teach overseas in Belgium, Iran, Sweden, Estonia, and then China, I was awarded the President's Medal by the Board of Trustees of the University for my accomplishments in teaching and research and administration. One of the specifics mentioned was the establishment of exchange programs between Kent State and other institutions, such as in China, which encouraged intercultural communication. These included exchange programs with the Guangming Daily newspaper, with Peking University, with Renmin University in Beijing, and with Lund University in Lund, Sweden.

A final point to be mentioned here is the fact that I was offered the position of Distinguished Visiting Professor of Global Rhetoric at Hiram College in Ohio for the fall semester 2008. I am teaching a course in the Rhetoric of World Cultures and World Leaders, and a course in Chinese Perspectives in Rhetoric and Communication. The department chair said she invited me to this position "because of [Heisey's] international reputation as a leading scholar in the area of intercultural and international communication."

R. T. Donahue: Here I will direct comments about my own contributions, as they may be pertinent for highlighting my own qualifications as an evaluator of Prosser. I am a fellow of the International Academy for Intercultural Research (presently based in the Dept. of Psychology, University of Hawaii) and have been involved in the field of intercultural communication since its beginnings, first in interracial relations (a minorities counselor and trainer in the U.S.) in the early 1970s and later as a college teacher of intercultural communication in Japan and elsewhere. Presently I am a full professor at a Japanese university. My book *Japanese Culture and Communication* (1998, University Press of America) won a book excellence award from the National Communication Association. This book contributes (hopefully) to the field by developing critical thought about cultural imaging especially of the Japanese, a people

and culture long held to be widely different from Westerners. This book also follows up my book, *Japanese Nonlinear Discourse Style* (1990, Applied Linguistics Research, New York), in taking a necessary look at the methodology of contrastive rhetoric as a cultural product itself and how we might better understand communications across cultures. With this background, I endeavored to gain deeper understanding of Japanese culture still, by my edited book, *Exploring Japaneseness* (2002, Ablex), a look at Japan at the recent turn of the century. On a broader international scale, I co-authored with Michael H. Prosser, *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations*. In sum, my major contributions have been with applications of discourse analysis or sociolinguistics to intercultural/international issues, so that realistic and fair images of other cultures will be the result.

Appendix B Survey of IC Majors at SISU

Demographics: Male Female Current IC major Former IC major

Advisee Non-advisee

Your thesis advisor?

Not your advisor, but a reader and commentator on your thesis?

Names of courses taken from Michael Prosser:

Registered student in class Auditor

1. If you have been a student or auditor in Michael Prosser's classes, such as 'Global Media and Culture', Steve Kulich's and his 'History of Intercultural Communication', Steve Kulich's and his 'Readings in Intercultural Communication' for communication majors, or his 'Model UN Security Council', please comment on any contributions which Michael has made in your study of intercultural communication through these classes.

2. In general, how would you rate Michael's PowerPoint presentations in any of these classes:

Excellent Strong No opinion Weak Very weak

3. Are there one or two topics in his power point presentations which you found especially interesting or relevant to your study of intercultural communication?

4. If Michael has been your thesis advisor or has reviewed and commented on your intercultural communication thesis, are there contributions which he made to it which strengthened it?

5. If you have read part or all of Steve Kulich's and Michael's coedited book, *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication*,

How would you rate it as a source book in your study of intercultural communication?

Excellent Strong No opinion Weak Very weak

6. If you have read Michael's essay in Steve Kulich's and Michael's coedited book, 'One World, One Dream: Harmonizing Society through Intercultural Communication', how do you rate it as a history of intercultural communication in North America and China?

Excellent Strong No opinion Weak Very weak

7. If you have read any of Michael's essays in his website, www.michaelprosser.com, in general, how would you assess the quality of his essays?

Excellent Strong No opinion Weak Very weak

8. If you have read any of Michael's essays in his website, are there two or three that you found especially helpful in your understanding of intercultural communication?

9. Has Michael had other characteristics or contributions which have helped you in your understanding of intercultural communication?

10. Do you choose to be identified by name? Or do you wish to remain anonymous?

APPENDIX C: The Journey of an Intercultural/International Communication Scholar: Dr. Michael Prosser. China Media Reports.

[2007-12-06 12:27:03 | Author: michael]

The Journey of an Intercultural/International Communication Scholar:

An Interview with Dr. Michael Prosser

Laura Gostin, University of Rhode Island

Abstract: This interview was conducted via email over a period of several weeks during the summer of 2007. Dr. Michael Prosser is a renowned Intercultural Communication scholar and one of the co-founders of the academic field of Intercultural Communication. During the interview, Dr. Prosser shared some of his personal experiences as an Intercultural scholar and offered his valuable insights regarding the discipline of communication in general and the field of Intercultural Communication in particular.

Keywords: Scholar interview, Intercultural Communication, founder, China.

1. Would you please briefly introduce yourself and describe one of your typical workdays?

Growing up more or less monoculturally, something in my high school boarding school sparked my intercultural and international interest, now a guiding principle throughout my life. The western zodiac has me as an Aries, pioneer or warrior; my namesake, St. Michael, was a legendary heavenly warrior archangel. The Chinese zodiac has me as a rat, which jumped to the head of the 12 zodiac animals. I have been used to the role of leadership throughout my life. Following my university graduation, I traveled for two months in Europe, and in the following summer, I was among the first 15,000 Americans to visit Russia.

During my professional career, I have been among the founders of the field of intercultural communication; chair of the first three North American conferences to found the field; the founding chair for what is now the International and Intercultural Division of the [US] National Communication Association; a founding Governing Council member and later President of the International Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research; the first teacher for communication majors as a Fulbright Professor at the University of Swaziland; founder of six Rochester Intercultural Conferences (1995-2001); and for a period of time in the late 1990's I was

called the "father of the South Sudan Community" in Rochester, New York. As the father of three children, with nine grandchildren, potentially I will leave a considerably large group of descendants behind me like those following the rat in the Chinese zodiac.

Writing my doctoral dissertation on the United Nations speeches by US Ambassador Adlai Stevenson led both to my editing a 1969 collection of his international speeches over his lifetime and a 1970 two volume collection of addresses by heads of state and government at the United Nations. My book *The Cultural Dialogue* (1978) was among the first texts on intercultural communication. Still later, my co-authored *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations* (1997) illustrates how both rhetorical and discourse analysis can be used effectively to understand international messages in the UN. Recently, I have co-edited *Civic Discourse: Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, and Global Communication* (1998); *Civic Discourse: Intercultural, International, and Global Media* (1999); *Sino-American Compositions of Shared Topics* (2003); and *Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication* (2007). From 1998 to 2004, eighteen books were published in my series, *Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium* (Ablex/Praeger).

Jointly retiring in 2001 from the University of Virginia and the Rochester Institute of Technology, I have since taught 1800 Chinese university students in three Chinese universities. Presently as Distinguished Professor at the Shanghai International Studies University, the SISU Intercultural Institute Executive Director, Steve Kulich and I co-edit an "Intercultural Research" series with our next two volumes on intercultural value studies in progress.

On every typical Monday for the last two years, I have taught five classes for undergraduates at the SISU undergraduate campus. This year in the autumn semester, I taught five classes of sophomore oral English for English majors and during the spring semester, five classes of freshmen oral English.

2. What are the most challenging issues you are faced with in your teaching and research career?

My long-term teaching positions have included: junior high school Latin, 1960-63; communication in several American universities, 1963-2001; and English in three Chinese universities, 2001-present. I have now taught more than 10,000 students in my 47 years of teaching, including 1800 in China. In introducing new communication courses like classical/modern rhetorical theory at SUNY-Buffalo and intercultural communication later, I found the development of the broad communication field always moving faster than I could keep up with it. I had to decide my main teaching and research focus: a classical- contemporary rhetorician; an expert on public address and discourse; or political or intercultural communication. Once, I introduced a seminar on

Communist rhetoric, quickly discovering that one undergraduate knew far more than I. Later as a founder of the field of intercultural communication in North America, first, I had never taken courses in anthropology, sociology, or psychology. Although I required intercultural field studies in most of my intercultural communication courses in the American universities, I had no statistical background, nor the contemporary social science programs for empirical analysis.

As the field matured in the 1980's until more recently, many teachers and researchers developed far more sophisticated theories and constructs than I was aware of. For example, though I knew generally about Geert Hofstede's multi societal surveys, it was more than a decade later when I introduced his findings into my own teaching. In a similar way, before teaching at the Shanghai International Studies University, I had no knowledge of significant researchers such as Robert Inglehart, Michael Bond or Shalom Schwartz and their seminal value studies. Fortunately, Steve Kulich and Zhang Rui gave me a broad understanding of these scholars' contributions. I can claim far more editorial competence than as an author. Among my books, edited or co-edited books leave only two authored ones, *The Cultural Dialogue* (1978) and my co-authored book with Ray Donahue, *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations* (1997). My edited and authored books are rather eclectic, with two on classical/medieval rhetoric; two on international public discourse, two dealing with communication at the United Nations, and six involving my strongest interest, intercultural and international communication and media. However, these books all demonstrate my wide cultural and international interest, with the latest two books specifically on Chinese communication.

I am pleased with my intercultural co-editing collaboration with K.S. Sitaram. Preferring to work directly with book-length manuscripts, my scholarly journal articles represent a very short list. Because of my propensity for moving quickly toward a new project, unfortunately, several book ideas or books in progress have languished, sometimes leaving other contributing authors with their own committed but unpublished articles. Without any serious personal statistical or empirical background, I have not conducted any cutting edge research that the intercultural field demands. While pleased at the number of my books that did get published, I regret those intended or committed but never published, especially for the authors whose chapters were not published. Steve Kulich, Zhang Hongling and I have more books in progress.

3. Considering the impact of globalization, where do you see the discipline heading in the future?

"Globalism", like communication, is "the broad concept", while "globalization", like communications, is "the process", both positive and negative. We have not suddenly awakened to a globalizing society. The pre-Christian

Greeks and Romans began the process for the West, where Aristotelian logic has formed a framework for modern deductive and inductive reasoning and Confucius, whose Analects is still a major life force in East Asian cultures such as China, Japan, and Korea, as well as Siddhartha, the founder of Buddhism, and Hindu sacred writings that developed Eastern polytheocracies .

The Catholic Church, the oldest NGO (Non governmental organization) with the Orthodox and Protestant churches deeply influences 1/3 of the world's population. The sixth century creation of Islam is now the fastest growing religion with 1/6 of humanity. The probable visit of Marco Polo to Asia and China provided us with the first, though highly exaggerated, history of the world. Although the Chinese and Koreans perfected the printing press a thousand years before, the Renaissance and Reformation between 1400 to 1650 reopened the West to the wisdom, art, and globalizing influence of ancient Greece and Rome. At the same time, "the man of the second millennium," Johannes Gutenberg, opened up the West through the printing press, encouraging Europeans to become literate, to develop a middle class as well as great literature, art, and music and also scientific methodologies, and to conduct major geographical explorations.

The eighteenth century gave us the American and French revolutions. The British, French, Portuguese, and Spanish colonization periods expanded globalization exponentially while placing Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans under their negative influence. The nineteenth century brought us early modern communication discoveries like the telegraph, trains, photography, telephone, light bulb, moving pictures, the bicycle, and the automobile. Marxism provided a counterbalance to the Western development of capitalism.

The twentieth century developed such positive major communication contributions as the radio, television, computer-mediated communication, and wireless technology. Negative impacts from World Wars I, and II, and in the latter case the horrors of the Holocaust led to the development of the modern field of communication. The United Nations and later WTO further globalized the world. Genocides in Rwanda and Bosnia and other crimes against humanity negatively followed the "cold war." In the midst of nuclear tensions between the US and the Soviet Union, China began opening up to the world, first in 1972, later with the 1978 and 1985 "opening up" by Deng Xiaoping in 1978 and 1985, followed economically by later Chinese leaders, Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao. Perhaps we are now in a post-cold war "cold war" with new verbal skirmishes between Russia and the US, as President Putin reminds us that a new US missile system in Poland and the Czech Republic may reignite the "cold war." Other communication breakdowns as well include the devastating problems in the fifth year of the aftermath of the Iraq war, the resurgence of the Taliban in Afghanistan, other conflicts in the Middle East, plus nuclear technology and weaponry in Iran and North Korea, the spread of HIV/AIDS and malaria, and Terrorism, which continues to be a menacing global threat and the source of major communication breakdowns.

The serious study, critique and practice of positive versus negative communication scholars and media, organizational, intercultural and international communication have never been so important a global issue as it is today. Communication scholars and practitioners have the most critical responsibility to make the public in all sectors of society aware both of positive global communication and the negative communication breakdowns. It is a very special opportunity for us to recognize that while globalization is irreversible, our goal must always be to promote and analyze both positive communication and communication breakdowns. We owe a very special debt to Western communication innovators such as Johannes Gutenberg and Eastern leaders who continue to open up their countries to the world and the world to them.

4. Many scholars believe that their role is solely to produce knowledge while others believe that scholars have an obligation to bring about social change. What do you consider to be the primary role of a researcher?

In my opinion, scholars have a vital double role, both to produce knowledge and to advocate social change, though not necessarily at the same time. Perhaps scholars who only produce knowledge but are removed from the real world as advocates are like cloistered monks or nuns. They have an important but limited function. We need thinkers and philosophers, but also “public thinkers” whose knowledge moves others toward one or another sort of positive action. The famous cloistered Trappist monk Thomas Merton's books moved millions of people world-wide toward a greater spirituality. He prayed several times daily with his fellow monks and taught the young monks theology, but he was clearly an advocate for spirituality. Pope John Paul II had a doctorate in sacred theology, and wrote many books and papal encyclicals. He wrote and spoke eloquently for social change about religious and social issues, with addresses to more than 60 million people in his live audiences in nearly 90 countries. He was extremely powerful as one of the most significant world moral forces during the 25 years of his papacy. Some scholars credit him as one of the major influences both in a religious revival and in causing the collapse of communism in central and eastern Europe through his advocacy.

When we advise graduate students for their theses, we encourage them to leave their call for social change out of their literature reviews, methodologies, and discussion of results. However, we may also encourage them to call for social change in clearly delineated sections of the thesis such as recommendations in the conclusion. For example, a thesis, dissertation or book on educational reform first identifies the nature of the problem, offers various options to solve the problem, and typically advocates specific educational reforms that the writer believes should be introduced. Sometimes at different times in our lives we produce knowledge at one point,

and advocate social change at another stage. In this way, we have a significant double influence on society.

We speak of the need for objectivity instead of personal subjectivity in our scholarship. The field of communication has many topics that specifically call for action, for example in public speaking, intercultural, organizational or mass communication. We provide our readers the information and then detail how to use the information to make them better speakers (or writers), better interculturalists, better organizational members or leaders, or better active users or producers of the mass media. After all, we are interested in a particular topic first because of our personal subjective passion, and no matter how much we try or how objective the empirical research appears, our own biases and goals still remain a significant aspect of the research. In my view, this double perspective, as knowledge producers and as advocates of social change moves us out of the isolated "ivory tower" and makes us vital societal leaders through our advocacy for social change. Both should be complementary.

5. You have been living in China since 2001 and have had extensive intercultural experience prior to your relocation. How, if at all, has this affected your personal and professional worldview?

In the late 1960's and the 1970's, I was an active founder establishing the intercultural communication field in North America. I led the first three North American foundational conferences to establish the field and participated actively in German-American communication conferences and the 1974 bicultural research conference in Japan. My own long and short-term teaching opportunities, including two in Canada, offered some of the first IC courses in the US and Canada. I actively developed professional divisions and organizations dedicated to intercultural and international communication (National Communication Association, International Communication Association, and the International Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research, for which I served as chair of the 1980 international congress and later as President from 1984-86). In 1977, I was also a professor for mid-level executives and co-chaired Scholar-Diplomat seminars at the United States Information Agency working with L. Robert Kohls, one of the field's most outstanding interculturalists. Most of my edited and authored books have dealt with intercultural/international communication and media and the UN. In the 1980's, I hosted international high school students each for several months from Sweden, Belgium, France, Brazil, Spain, South Africa, and Swaziland. Being an intercultural host father also thrust my own children into various positive or negative intercultural situations. I taught about 8500 university students such courses as intercultural communication, communication and social change, international media and the Model United Nations Security Council. I created ten high school Global Awareness Days at the University of Virginia from

1983 to 1990. During 1990-1991, as a Fulbright Professor at the University of Swaziland, I initiated their first courses for the new communication major. Additionally, I got caught up in the military invasion of the campus on November 14, 1990, where two to four students were killed and 300-400 were injured. I actively assisted eleven students to seek safety outside the campus.

In 1994, I declined a Fulbright professorship in Bulgaria to assume a distinguished professorship in communication at the Rochester Institute of Technology. There I had funds for creative activities such as hosting 33 public lectures on intercultural and international issues, and presenting eleven of them. I hosted four high school Model UN Security Councils for 800 Rochester-area students; and was the faculty advisor for RIT students at five Model United Nations in Toronto and Montreal.

With K.S. Sitaram, I co-hosted six Rochester Intercultural Conferences, and co-authored or co-edited three books on intercultural and international communication. Overlapping the 1990s and early 2000s, I was series editor for 18 books in my series "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium," two of which were on Chinese communication. Finally, I became "the host father" in the South Sudan Community of Rochester, New York, including having young Sudanese adults living in my home over several years. I was a member of the growing welcoming committee for about half of the seventy-eight "Lost Boys of Sudan" who resettled in Rochester just before I went to China in 2001.

In a sense then, I blended my professional interests in developing the intercultural communication field and lived an intercultural life as well. Host father for various international high school students, host for many Swazi students in my University of Swaziland home and advocate for them because of the military campus invasion, finally I became a host leader for the South Sudan community in Rochester, New York. These personal intercultural activities have vastly enriched my life and have put into real practice the more theoretical constructs which I have taught and written about. It has been a pleasing intercultural life experience.

6. You have been one of the founders of the academic field of Intercultural Communication as well as the founding chair of the International and Intercultural Communication Division of the National Communication Association. Do you believe the field has changed since its inception? If so, how?

As I have noted earlier, I was among the founders of the field of intercultural communication in North America, chairing the first three foundational North American conferences (1971, 73, 74). The 1974 summer NCA, ICA, and SIETAR International Chicago conference had 200 participants studying Edward C. Stewart's Outline of

Intercultural Communication. NCA's proceedings were co-edited by Nemi Jain, Melvin Miller and me. At my speech on China at George Mason University in February, 2007, one senior faculty member reminded me that he was there, which began his life-long interest in teaching intercultural communication. I was the third chair of the ICA Division of Intercultural and International Division founded by K.S. Sitaram and others in 1970. I was responsible for 13 intercultural and international communication programs at the 1977 ICA Berlin conference. As a founding Governing Council member of SIETAR International, I was its President from 1984-86.

In my essay, "One world, one dream: Harmonizing society through intercultural communication: A prelude to China intercultural communication studies" in Steve J. Kulich's and my co-edited book, *Intercultural perspectives on Chinese communication* (2007: Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, pp. 22-91), I have included the following main sections: "The significance of values to the study of intercultural communication"; "Early intercultural communication development in the US: 1959-1979"; "Intercultural communication: A mature field: 1980-2006"; "Practical applications: Cross-cultural training: 1950s to 2005"; "China's contributions to 'one world, one dream'—Harmonizing society interculturally"; and 12 pages of "References."

In my discussion on IC as a mature field since 1980, I highlight Geert Hofstede, Michael Harris Bond, William B. Gudykunst, Stella Ting-Toomey, Young Yum Kim, my "Civic discourse for the third millennium" series, D. Ray Heisey's series on Chinese communication, selected books, and our IC program at Shanghai International Studies University, and others. In my section on practical application in cross-cultural training, 1950s to 2005, I stress the US AID Communication Seminars and the Portland SIIC Summer Institute (now in its 31st year). In the essay, I have not discussed IC developments in European, Latin American, Middle Eastern or African countries, or Asian countries besides China, intercultural business communication, interpretation and translation, comparative literature, social linguistics, cross-cultural psychology or intercultural mass media studies and my references miss reporting on several recent important books in IC, with much more historical work needing more careful consideration.

Thus, in my own review of the field, I have left out a lot of the important history, though some other essays in our book highlight sociolinguistics, for example by Steve Kulich and Yuxin Jia and Xuerui Jia, or cross-cultural psychology, for example by Michael Harris Bond, and the indigenous cross-cultural psychologist, Kwang-Kuo Hwang. Gudykunst's last edited book, *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (2005, Sage) provides a very strong identification of IC today as a mature field. Samovar and Porter's *Intercultural communication: A reader* (1972-2005, Wadsworth) has now been a significant student anthology for the last thirty-six years. Cultural competence and cultural identification are now major topics in IC studies.

The major point that can be made is that since 1980 as the field began to mature, IC has become a very

important concept not only in North America, but in many other regions of the world. A remarkable contribution in China is seen in the IC development, especially since 1994. In the last year, I have attended conferences in Russia, Peru, Germany, and seven communication conferences in China, including the most recent June, 2007 Intercultural Communication conference in Harbin. All of them have had at least an intercultural communication component, with several having IC as the major feature. The changes are very significant in theory, practice, and case studies since our nascent beginnings, and suggest that more and more theories, including an increasing number of indigenous ones, will push the field into greater maturity. In China, IC leaders are beginning to consider requesting that the Ministry of Education designate IC as a principal field in Chinese universities, with a national roundtable on creating IC as a discipline under planning stages at Shanghai International Studies University.

7. In his presidential column from the June/July 2006 issue of Spectra, Dan O'Hair calls attention to NCA's failure to provide an "opportunity for interaction and collaboration with international colleagues", a concern which you yourself mirrored in your essay entitled "The Communication Field Reaching Out to International Scholars." What effect, if any, do you believe the opportunity to exchange ideas and scholarship with our international colleagues could have on the field in general and on the individual cultures in particular?

William Howell, President of NCA (then SCA) in 1971, earlier recommended that SCA should demonstrate its commitment to internationalization by holding its 1970 convention in Hong Kong, then still a Crown Colony of the UK. The small SCA Committee for Cooperation with Foreign Universities of which I was a member enthusiastically supported this proposal, but the Legislative Council reacted in shock with the idea that the organization was more than an American-based one, and that such a convention would be impossible for most American members to attend because of the transportation costs. At that time, our Committee had already successfully co-sponsored the first German-American communication conference in Heidelberg, Germany, in 1968, and was going to co-sponsor the first Japan-US communication conference in Tokyo in 1969. These, however, were only footnotes in the history of the organization. When the Legislative Council turned down the Hong Kong convention idea and selected New Orleans for the 1970 convention, Howell and our Committee recommended that our keynote speaker should be Angie Brooks of Liberia, then the UN General Assembly President. Racial sensitivities on the part of our colleagues in the SCA leadership and local potential sponsors in New Orleans also found this idea to be unacceptable.

Nonetheless, under the leadership of K.S. Sitaram, the fifth division in ICA, Intercultural and International Division, was formed in 1970, and ICA may have held its first conference outside of the US with the 1973 Montreal site. SCA and the Canadian Communication Association held its first foundational meeting in 1971 for what later became our International and Intercultural Division under my leadership at Indiana University. In 1995, Sitaram and I co-chaired the first of six Rochester Intercultural Conferences, entitled "Intercultural Communication at Twenty-five: The Present and the Future" to celebrate what we identified as the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the intercultural field in 1970 under Sitaram's leadership for ICA and 1971 for SCA under my leadership.

Today, the Fulbright Program, NCA, ICA, the American Communication Association, the World Communication Association, the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, the American Broadcast Association, the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies, the Chinese communication associations in North America, the Korean Communication Association, the Japan-America Communication Association, the African Association for Communication Education, SIETAR in various regions, the Asia-Pacific Business Communication Association, the Asian International Mass Communication Association, the International Academy of Intercultural Researchers, the China Association for Intercultural Communication Association, and many other communication organizations in Latin America, Asia, Europe, Africa, and the Middle East all are recognizing the critical importance of academic scholarly and practical exchanges in the field of communication.

I was pleased to serve as a co-keynoter with former NCA president, Dan O'Hair, at the May 31-June 2, 2007 Chendu, China, "Globalization and Western China conference, where we exchanged useful views about the importance of the internationalization of the communication field. Later I was one of six co-keynoters at the June 22-24, 2007 Harbin, Seventh International China Intercultural Communication Symposium, co-sponsored by the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies, with more than 500 participants, including 30 from Russia, on the theme "Harmony, Diversity and Intercultural Communication."

Naturally, I have been convinced for most of my professional and cultural life that internationalization of the communication discipline and exchanges among communication scholars, practitioners, and students is every more critical. Middle Eastern scholars, for example, recommend that instead of a view toward Samuel Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations," we should instead be having a "Dialogue of Civilizations" as a way to better understanding between cultural groups throughout the world. As the internet used to be called the "information superhighway," for me personally, it now allows me frequent exchanges with faculty, professionals, and students in several countries. A few thousand people have viewed my website, www.michaelprosser.com and some

remind me regularly to update my essays there.

Ongoing contacts through being interviewed earlier 12 times on China Central TV International and more recently regularly on China Radio International; at the ten international communication conferences which I have attended in the last year; and engaging with hundreds of students annually in my teaching or lectures in China all enrich my communicative world. I hope that those who encounter me in these ways have their world enriched as well. Our goal should always be to move from communication breakdown to international communication competence, and from misunderstanding to understanding in the words of I.A. Richards many years ago in *Ideas Have Consequences*.

8. Could you tell us some of the experiences you have had that are important to learning the ropes as a new student and scholar in the discipline?

With BA and MA English degrees (and communication and Latin minors), I first joined the University of Illinois Ph.D. program in English, but I switched to communication, making English my minor. Thankfully, significant reforms in MA and Ph.D. education have occurred since I was a student. In English for example, though I had already taken the history of English as an MA student, I was required to take it again. As English majors we were required to take a semester of *Beowulf* in the original early English, but my intended major concentration was American literature. We also had to memorize hundreds of English authors, their works, and first lines, for an early departmental exam. As a Ph.D. student, I requested Latin as one of my two foreign languages, but was turned down because it was considered irrelevant to my study. Afterwards, I was a serious student of classical rhetoric, where both Greek and Latin were highly relevant. My year-long post graduate courses in French and German, only to translate 3 pages in 3 hours with a dictionary, meant that I learned these languages superficially, and with zero use as a scholar. The first communication comprehensive exams dealt not with what we had learned as post graduates, but drama, phonetics, speech science, and debate, all learned as a college sophomore or junior.

Fortunately, my Ph.D. advisor, Hal Gulley, had me audit communication theory for some background outside of rhetoric. He wisely challenged my early dissertation topics, but encouraged me to concentrate rhetorically on the addresses of Adlai Stevenson at the UN. He got me a \$1000 grant to collect information there. This very valuable research led to 3 books, one, *Readings in Classical Rhetoric*, a second, a collection of Stevenson's speeches on international topics, and another, a two-volume collection of addresses by heads of state and government at the UN. I did not have the reasonable time to study anthropology, despite the University of Illinois having

outstanding cultural anthropologists such as Oscar Lewis which would have informed my later serious involvement in intercultural communication.

Hopefully, North American MA and Ph.D. programs now concentrate on what is really important for one's development as a scholar. Thus, an important recommendation is to remember that the ultimate educational goal develops in the thesis or dissertation, for which one needs to be passionate. All possible efforts should be directed toward that end, eliminating as much irrelevant material as possible. The right open-minded advisor is as critical as is the best choice of a thesis or dissertation. Post graduates should remember that very important future possible research topics may originate in their early research. Additionally, post-graduate students should remember that they may forever be linked to their thesis or dissertation, so they should choose their topic wisely. As an MA student, Tom Bruneau got deeply involved in silence studies. He read everything possible on the subject, and today much of his reputation as a scholar is linked to that topic (silence, silences, and silencing). Later, intrigued with the brain, he researched every possible aspect of brain study, and made it one of his recognized areas of expertise. In a similar way, one of my chief teaching and research topics today remains the United Nations, generated by my dissertation enthusiasm.

9. Could you describe some of your most memorable experiences since your move to China?

Coming to China in 2001 began perhaps in the late summer of 1989 when I became a volunteer community host for a new physics Ph.D. student at the University of Virginia from Peking University. The dean of English in a Guangzhou university invited me to teach in Guangzhou in 1992-93. It was then impossible. In November 2000, at the Seattle NCA Convention, Kluver and Powers' 1999 book, *Civic Discourse, Civil Society, and Chinese Communities* in my Ablex "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium" series won an outstanding book award. Chinese colleagues asked me about teaching in China after retiring from UVA and the Rochester Institute of Technology in 2001. My response was "Why not?" Shuming Lu organized my joining the Yangzhou University English Department in 2001. Wenshan Jia organized for me to be a keynoter in the 2001 Xi'an China Intercultural Communication Association Forum. Beijing Language and Culture University's vice president invited me to come to teach there. Steve Kulich at Shanghai International Studies University encouraged me to join his intercultural communication program in 2005. I found myself teaching in English departments or colleges at these three universities. In Yangzhou, my teaching included mass media for juniors; intensive reading for seniors; intercultural communication, rhetoric and public discourse, and American literature for post graduates; and oral English for young instructors of various subjects whose English was limited. AT BLCU, where there are

7,000 international students and 4,000 Chinese students, I taught primarily Western civilization for all of the English major seniors, debate and advanced writing for juniors. At SISU, I have taught freshman and sophomore oral English, my model UN Security Council for juniors and English and international relations postgraduates, public speaking, intercultural communication, and global media and culture.

Numerically, I taught 1800 Chinese university students, plus many primary and secondary Saturday and winter English camp pupils. I have given public lectures to more than 6,000 secondary and university students in China, India, and Russia. I was interviewed 12 times on China Central TV International's "Dialogue" Program. I have visited many Chinese cities, plus Cambodia, El Salvador, Greece, India, Peru, South Korea, Russia, nine countries in Europe, and Viet Nam during my time in China. I have attended 15 Chinese communication conferences as keynoter for about eight. I have reviewed 32 books about China for the online journal Review of Communication. I am known beyond China for my many CRTNET posts on China. I have co-edited two books related to China. I have read 24 MA theses in intercultural communication.

Intellectually, and more importantly, I have vastly expanded my own knowledge base both in the field of English as it complements communication studies, and in intercultural communication, but particularly in values and Chinese communication studies, where some of our post graduates have had a much broader background. Now, I have more or less caught up with the latest research trends in intercultural communication and am eager to continue to contribute to Chinese communication conferences and scholarly editing and writing, as exemplified by Steve Kulich's and my co-edited Intercultural Perspectives on Chinese Communication (2007), and the values studies book that he, Zhang Hongling, and I are co-editing for the Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press as a special mandate for SISU's new Intercultural Institute.

10. As our interview comes to an end, we would like to thank you for your participation and ask that you make a final conclusion and share with us any final words of wisdom that you may have.

My two-month solo European travel at 22, again to Europe, including Russia, at 23 gave me a strong intercultural/international interest. Early attendance at conferences in Canada, Germany, Japan, Mexico, and the UK and teaching in Canada enhanced it. My Ph.D. advisor, Hal Gulley's openness, for my Ph.D. dissertation relating to addresses at the United Nations and collecting materials for six weeks there were very informative. Distant mentors like Fred Casmir, John Condon, Edward Hall, Ray Heisey, David Hoopes, Robert Oliver, Beulah Rohrlach, K.S. Sitaram, Edward Stewart, Lynn Tyler, and William Howell and having outstanding intellectually curious postgraduate students further developed my enthusiasm. Serving as chair of the first three North

American foundational conferences to develop intercultural communication, publishing early books and my intercultural leadership in NCA, ICA, and SIETAR International all strengthened my intercultural/ international background.

In the 1980's as the field began to mature theoretically, I became very active experientially as an annual host father for several international high school students and organized annual Global Awareness Days for 2200, including 500 international high school students. In this way, I began to live an intercultural life as well as being professionally dedicated to IC. I lived an intercultural life more fully as a Fulbright Professor at the University of Swaziland in 1990-91. There, we faced significant cultural and intercultural conflict when the military invaded the campus on November 14, 1990, killing 2-4 students and injuring 300-400. On that single day, as we protected five women students and helped Canadian friends get 11 frightened students to safety outside the beleaguered campus, we and other expatriates thought we might surely die. Subsequently, we and our students lived through two months of university closure and later a national judicial inquiry. This extended event became for me one of my worst days and one of my best—seeing the yin and yang of evil and goodness.

In the 1990's at the Rochester Institute of Technology, I had the opportunity for significant intercultural creativity: as an advisor for university and high school model UNs in Rochester and Canada, hosting 33 lectures while delivering 11 on intercultural and international topics, publishing 3 books, serving as series editor for 18 books in the Ablex "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium" series, and with K.S. Sitaram, hosting six Rochester Intercultural Conferences, in joint intercultural endeavors at the beginning and ending of our professional North American careers.

My 2001-07 Chinese teaching experience has brought me to a full circle for intercultural communication, both theoretically and experientially. Besides teaching China's youth, China's future, I have lived the most comprehensive intercultural life possible, including traveling and living with young Chinese. I have moved from being Eurocentric to Africentric to Asiatic. I have traveled in and outside China extensively, opening up both my world and that of Chinese friends.

As intercultural teachers and scholars, we have the opportunity to expand the field of intercultural communication exponentially in many cultural and national settings. Ideally of course, we are not just developing our now mature field theoretically, but practically through case studies and applications, and our own lived experiences. My favorite secular quote is that of Socrates: "I am neither a citizen of Athens, nor of Greece, but of the world." Our goal as interculturalists is becoming world citizens.

Appendix D: Michael H. Prosser's "Civic Discourse for the Third Millennium" series books (Prepared by Michael H. Prosser)

This series was initiated for Ablex, and later Praeger and Greenwood Publishing Group, by Michael H. Prosser, then the William A. Kern and Distinguished Professor of Communication at the Rochester Institute of Technology. The goal of the series was to explore the concept of civic or public discourse and media, particularly in the intercultural or international setting, both geographically and topically.

Kluver and Powers's 1999 book and Over's 1999 book on human rights received the International and Intercultural Division of the [US] National Communication Association award for the best books in 2000. Jia's book was nationally recognized by *Choice Magazine*. Thirty books were contracted.

With the sale of Ablex in 2000 to Greenwood Publishing Group, three books which had been completed and submitted to Ablex were not accepted by Greenwood Publishing Group without eliminating one third of each book for length and unfortunately these revisions never got made: Sitaram, K.S. & Prosser, M.H. (Eds.). *Civic discourse: Communication, technology, and values*; Prosser, M.H. & Sitaram, K.S. (Eds.) *Civic discourse and human rights*; and Prosser, M.H. (Ed.) *Civic discourse and African communication*.

Other contracted books in the series did not get completed because the authors were unable to complete their manuscripts by the dates required by Greenwood Publishing Group (including two books relating to Latin America, one to African media, one to civic discourse in South East Asia, two to Indian communication, one to "hate" speech on the internet, and one on the United Nations). One contracted highly creative book manuscript and one proposed book on Latin American communication were rejected by the Greenwood Publishing Group.

Donahue, R.T. (2002). *Exploring Japaneseness: On Japanese enactments of culture and consciousness*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Donahue, R.T. & Prosser, M.H. (Eds.) (1997). *Diplomatic discourse:*

International conflict at the United Nations. Stamford, CT: Ablex. [This was the

book which led to the creation of the series, but is not listed by Ablex as a part of the series.]

Eribo, F. (2001). *In search of greatness: Russia's communications with Africa and the world*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Ferguson, S. D. & Shade, L.R. (2002). *Civic discourse and cultural politics in Canada: A cacophony of voices*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Gher, L. & Amin, H.Y. (2000). *Civic discourse and digital age communications in the Middle East*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Holt, R. (2004). *Dialogue on the internet: Language, civic Identity, and computer-mediated communication*. Westport: CT: 2004.

Jia, W. (2001). *The remaking of the Chinese character and identity in the 21st century: The Chinese face practices*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Kluver, R. & Powers, J.H. (1999). *Civic discourse, civil society and Chinese communities*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Lengel, L. (2000). *Culture and technology in the new Europe: Civic discourse in the transformation of post-Communist Europe*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Lengel, L. (2004). *Intercultural communication and creative practice: Music, dance, and women's virtual identity*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Moriarty, T. (2003). *Finding the words: A rhetorical history of South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Over, W. (1999). *Human rights in the international public sphere: Civic discourse for the 21st century*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Over, W. (2001). *Social justice in world cinema and theatre*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Over, W. (2004). *World peace, mass culture and national policies*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Prosser, M.H. & Sitaram, K.S. (Eds.) (1999). *Civic discourse: Intercultural, international, and global media*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Sitaram, K.S. & Prosser, M.H. (1998). *Civic discourse: Multiculturalism, cultural diversity, and global communication*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Steinfatt, T.M. (2002). *Working at the bar: Sex work and health communication in Thailand*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Wenk, E. (1999). *The double helix: Technology and democracy in the American Future*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.