

博雅
教育

全国英语专业博雅系列教材

总主编 丁建新

跨文化交际： 经典阅读

秦 勇 刘悦怡 齐环玉 主 编

LIBERAL EDUCATION



中山大學出版社
SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

全国英语专业博雅系列教材/总主编 丁建新

跨文化交际：经典阅读

主 编：秦 勇 刘悦怡 齐环玉
副主编：沈文静 王意颖



中山大學出版社
SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

版权所有 翻印必究

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

跨文化交际: 经典阅读/秦勇, 刘悦怡, 齐环玉主编. —广州: 中山大学出版社, 2014. 7

(全国英语专业博雅系列教材/总主编 丁建新)

ISBN 978 - 7 - 306 - 04958 - 2

I. ①跨… II. ①秦… ②刘… ③齐… III. ①英语—阅读教学—高等学校—教材 IV. ①H319.4

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2014) 第 158629 号

出版人: 徐 劲

策划编辑: 熊锡源

责任编辑: 熊锡源

封面设计: 曾 斌

责任校对: 刘学谦

责任技编: 何雅涛

出版发行: 中山大学出版社

电 话: 编辑部 020 - 84111996, 84113349, 84111997, 84110779

发行部 020 - 84111998, 84111981, 84111160

地 址: 广州市新港西路 135 号

邮 编: 510275 传 真: 020 - 84036565

网 址: <http://www.zsup.com.cn> E-mail: zdcbs@mail.sysu.edu.cn

印 刷 者: 广州中大印刷有限公司

规 格: 787mm × 960mm 1/16 11.5 印张 258 千字

版次印次: 2014 年 7 月第 1 版 2014 年 7 月第 1 次印刷

印 数: 1 ~ 4000 册 定 价: 28.00 元

如发现本书因印装质量影响阅读, 请与出版社发行部联系调换

全国英语专业博雅系列教材编委会

总主编 丁建新 (中山大学)

编 委 会

李洪儒 (黑龙江大学)
司显柱 (北京交通大学)
赵彦春 (天津外国语大学)
田海龙 (天津外国语大学)
夏慧言 (天津科技大学)
李会民 (河南科技学院)
刘承宇 (西南大学)
施 旭 (浙江大学)
辛 斌 (南京师范大学)
杨信彰 (厦门大学)
徐畅贤 (湖南城市学院)
李玉英 (江西师范大学)
李发根 (江西师范大学)
肖坤学 (广州大学)
官 齐 (暨南大学)
张广奎 (广东财经大学)
温宾利 (广东外语外贸大学)
杜金榜 (广东外语外贸大学)
阮 炜 (深圳大学)
张晓红 (深圳大学)

博雅之辩（代序）

大学精神陷入前所未有的危机，许多人在寻找出路。

我们的坚持是，提倡博雅教育（Liberal Education）。因为大凡提倡什么，关键在于审视问题的症结何在，对症下药。而当下之困局，根源在于功利，在于忘掉了教育之根本。

博雅教育之理念，可以追溯至古罗马人提倡的“七艺”：文法、修辞、辩证法、音乐、算术、几何、天文学。其目的在于培养人格完美的自由思考者。在中国教育史上，博雅的思想，古已有之。中国儒家教育的传统，强调以培养学生人格为核心。儒家“六艺”，礼、乐、射、御、书、数，体现的正是我们所讲的博雅理念。“学识广博，生活高雅”，在这一点上，中国与西方，现代与传统，并无二致。

在古罗马，博雅教育在于培育自由的人格与社会精英。在启蒙时代，博雅教育意指解放思想，破除成见。“什么都知道一点，有些事情知道得多一点”，这是19世纪英国的思想家约翰·斯图亚特·密尔（John Stuart Mill）对博雅的诠释。同一时期，另外一位思想家，曾任都柏林大学校长的约翰·亨利·纽曼（John Henry Newman）在《大学理念》一书中，也曾这样表述博雅的培养目标：“如果必须给大学课程一个实际目标，那么，我说它就是训练社会的良好成员。它的艺术是社会生活的艺术，它的目的是对世界的适应……大学训练旨在提高社会的精神格调，培养公众的智慧，纯洁一个民族的趣味”。

博雅教育包括科学与人文，目标在于培养人的自由和理性的精神，而不是迎合市场与风俗。教育的目标在于让学生学会尊重人类生活固有的内在价值：生命的价值、尊严的价值、求知的价值、爱的价值、相互尊重的价值、自我超越的价值、创新的价值。提倡博雅教育，就是要担当这些价值守护者的角色。博雅教育对于我们来说，是一种素质教育、人文教育。人文教育关心人类的终极目标，不是以“有用”为标准。它不是“万金油”，也无关乎“风花雪月”。

在美国，专注于博雅教育的大学称为“文理学院”，拒绝职业性的教育。在中国香港，以博雅教育为宗旨的就有岭南大学，提倡“全人教育”；在台湾大学，博雅教育是大学教育的基础，课程涉及文学与艺术、历史思维、世界文明、

道德与哲学、公民意识与社会分析、量化分析与数学素养、物质科学、生命科学等八大领域。在欧洲，博雅教育历史中的七大范畴被分为“三道”（初级）与“四道”（高级）。前者包括语法、修辞与辩证法，后者包括算术、几何、天文与音乐。在中国大陆的中山大学，许多有识之士也提倡博雅之理念，让最好的教授开设通识课程，涉及现代学科之环境、生物、地理等各门。同时设立“博雅学院”，学拉丁，读古典，开风气之先。

外语作为一门人文性很强的学科，尤其有必要落实博雅之理念。对于我们来说，最好的“应用型”教育在于博雅。早在20世纪20~40年代，在水木清华的外文系，吴宓先生提倡“语”“文”并重，“中”“西”兼修，教学上提倡自主学习与互动研究。在《西洋文学系学程总则》中，吴宓明确了“博雅之士”的培养目标：

本系课程编写的目的为使学生：（甲）成为博雅之士；（乙）了解西洋文明之精神；（丙）熟读西方文学之名著、谙悉西方思想之潮流，因而在国内教授英、德、法各国语言文字及文学，足以胜任愉快；（丁）创造今日之中国文学；（戊）汇通东西方之精神而互为介绍传布。

博雅之于我们，不仅仅是理念，更重要的是课程体系，是教材，是教法，是实践，是反应试教育，是将通识与专业熔于一炉。基于这样的理念，我们编写了这套丛书。希望通过这样的教育，让我们的学生知道人之为人是有他内在的生活意义，告诉我们的学生去求知，去阅读，去思考，去创造，去理解世界，去适应社会，去爱，去相互尊重，去审美，去找回精神的家园。

无需辩驳，也不怕非议。这是我们的坚守。

中山大学外国语学院 教授、博士生导师

中山大学语言研究所 所长

丁建新

2013年春天

前 言

博雅教育的目的之一是培养国际化的创新性人才。这就要求“博雅之士”应当具有全球化的视野和观念,了解世界发展历史与趋势,能够分析当今时代问题,富有创新精神和思辨能力,能理解和尊重不同的文化,具备一定的跨文化交际能力。

看似易,做则难。跨文化交际是多维度的,既有知识性、体验性,也有思维性、实践性。自上世纪80年代初以来,《跨文化交际》教材的编写虽说已硕果累累,但问题也层出不穷。胡文仲老先生就指出,多数教材偏重语言教学,无实证性讨论,领域不够宽,视野不够广,学科参与也比较单一。有鉴于此,本教材的编写力在改善这一困境,这也是本书的特点。具体来讲,我们希望学生在学习本教材的过程中,熟读西方跨文化交际的经典之作,谙习跨文化交际的思想潮流。从课文的选材上,我们致力扩大覆盖的内容,使其全面化、跨学科化。本书主要包括文化与跨文化交际,人与社会,文化的多样性和冲突,个体与身份认同,宗教与权力,语言与非语言交流,空间和时间,以及交际技巧的具体应用等内容。

本书各章都包括理论和实践两部分,分成六个小节,分别为 Discussion, Text, Exercises, Case Illustrations, Communication Activities, Further Reading。

理论部分:跨文化交际源于语用,也源于哲学。在 Discussion 这一部分,我们引用了各位学者的名言,引发学生进行相关主题的思考,并通过 Key words 指出本章的知识要点。接下来是两篇名家经典的阅读,每篇的 Notes 都对课文中出现的背景知识给以介绍,另外 Language Points 解决语言难点。

实践部分:我们希望学生通过练习将前面学到的理论和概念转化为实践。各种题型的、有趣的课后练习,旨在增强学生的积极性。充分、新鲜的案例分析,可以进一步巩固学到的理论知识,活跃学生的思维。交际活动环节分为二人活动和小组活动,旨在培养学生的应变能力,使学生脱离困境、成功交际。每章后为学生提供了相关的阅读书目,供拓展学习之用。

全书是集体智慧的结晶,共九章,秦勇(第一章、第三章)、刘悦怡(第四章、第八章)、齐环玉(第六章、第九章)、沈文静(第五章)、王意颖(第二章、第七章)参加了编写。中山大学出版社不辞辛劳地对整本书进行了细致的审阅和修改,在此表示感谢。另外,在整个编写过程中,本系列教材的总主编、博士生导师丁建新教授给予了宝贵意见和大力支持,在此深表谢意。

编者

2014 年夏天

Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Text A	What Is Culture?	<i>Edward T. Hall</i> 2
Text B	Culture Is Communication	<i>Edward T. Hall</i> 9
Chapter 2	Human and Society	21
Text A	Human and Society (I)	<i>Larry A. Samovar et al.</i> 22
Text B	Human and Society (II)	<i>Larry A. Samovar et al.</i> 29
Chapter 3	Diversity and Conflict	40
Text A	Culture and Conflict	<i>Harry C. Triandis</i> 41
Text B	Different Languages, Different Worlds	<i>Richard D. Lewis</i> 47
Chapter 4	Individuals, Identity and Values	58
Text A	I, We, and They	<i>Geert Hofstede</i> 59
Text B	The Importance of Identity	<i>Larry A. Samovar, Richard E. Porter, Edwin R. McDaniel</i> 67
Chapter 5	History, Power and Intercultural Communication	77
Text A	History and Intercultural Communication	<i>Judith N. Martin, Thomas K. Nakayama</i> 78
Text B	Power and Intercultural Communication	<i>Larry A. Samovar, Richard E. Porter</i> 83
Chapter 6	The Voice of Culture	91
Text A	Language, Race and Culture	<i>Edward Sapir</i> 92

2 跨文化交际：经典阅读

Text B	Paradoxes of Translating	<i>Eugene A. Nida</i>	98
Chapter 7	Nonverbal Interactions		107
Text A	Nonverbal Communication	<i>Zhang Ailin</i>	109
Text B	Top 10 Nonverbal Communication Tips	<i>Kendra Van Wagner</i>	117
Chapter 8	Time, Space and Distance		126
Text A	Distances in Man	<i>Edward T. Hall</i>	127
Text B	Types of Nonverbal Communication; Space and Time	<i>Everett M. Rogers, Thomas M. Steinfatt</i>	138
Chapter 9	From Knowledge to Skills; Practical Approaches to Intercultural Communications		148
Text A	Managing Differences Abroad	<i>Susan C. Schneider, Jean-Louis Barsoux</i>	149
Text B	Managing in Asia; Cross-cultural Dimensions	<i>Rosalie L. Tung</i>	156
References		168
Key to the Exercises		170

Chapter 1 Introduction

“Culture is those deep, common, unstated experiences which members of a given culture share, which they communicate without knowing, and which form the backdrop against which all other events are judged.”

Edward T. Hall

This chapter deals with the interface of two fundamental concepts, culture and communication. Intercultural communication is the exchange of information between individuals who are unlike culturally. This broad definition implies that two or more individuals may be unlike in their national culture, ethnicity, age, gender, or in other ways that affect their interaction. Their dissimilarity means that effective communication between them is particularly difficult.

Key words

1. Culture
2. Communication
3. Intercultural communication
4. Dimensions of cultural variability
5. Flexible strategies for different patterns of thought

Discussion

1. What values do all cultures in the world share?
2. Is there any clear boundary between intercultural and intra-cultural communication?
3. What forms does intercultural communication often take?
4. What problems may arise when we come across with a new culture?
5. Why do we say intercultural study is a multi-dimensional approach that covers a variety of disciplines?
6. Which principles should we follow in the study?

Text A

What Is Culture?

Edward T. Hall



①Culture is a word that has so many meanings already that one more can do it no harm. Before this book is finished I will redefine it again—in such a way, I hope, as to clarify what has become a very muddled concept. For anthropologists culture has long stood for the way of life of a people, for the sum of their learned behavior patterns, attitudes, and material things. Though they subscribe to this general view, most anthropologists tend to disagree however, on what the precise substance of culture is. In practice their work often leads some of them to a fascination with a single category of events among the many which make up human life, and they tend to think of this as the essence of all culture. Others, looking for a point of stability in the flux of society, often become preoccupied with identifying a common

particle or element which can be found in every aspect of culture. In sum, though the concept of culture was first defined in print in 1871 by E. B. Tylor, after all these years it still lacks the rigorous specificity which characterizes many less revolutionary and useful ideas.

②Even more unfortunate is the slowness with which the concept of culture has percolated through the public consciousness. Compared to such notions as the unconscious or repression, to use two examples from psychology, the idea of culture is a strange one even to the informed citizen. The reasons for this are well worth noting, for they suggest some of the difficulties which are inherent in the culture concept itself.

③From the beginning, culture has been the special province of the anthropologist, who usually gained a firsthand experience of its pervasive power in the field during the internship which follows the prescribed period of classroom training. As fledgling anthropologists moved deeper and deeper into the life of the people they were studying they inevitably acquired the conviction that culture was real and not just something dreamed up by the theoretician. Moreover, as they slowly mastered the complexities of a given culture they were apt to feel that these complexities could be understood in no

other way than by prolonged experience; and that it was almost impossible to communicate this understanding to anyone who had not lived through the same experience.

④ This frame of mind alone would have been enough to isolate the growing skills of the anthropologists from the everyday society about them which might have well used their special insights and knowledge. But there were other reasons too. What technical training the anthropologists had was rather lengthy and detailed. It concerned subjects which seemed to have little relevance to the problems of the layman engrossed in his/her own society. Moreover, until the last war few Americans had even heard of the places the anthropologists frequented or the people they studied, who were generally small isolated populations with little place in the power politics of the modern world. There seemed to be no "practical" value attached to either what the anthropologist did or what they made of their discoveries. Except for a certain curiosity or nostalgia which might be satisfied, what point was there in studying the American Indian, who was usually viewed as the romantic red man, a remnant of the days long gone, or as an embarrassing reminder that there had been a time when Americans were ruthless with those who stood in the way of progress? Despite an occasional flurry of popular interest, anthropology (and the culture concept which is at its heart) was long associated in people's minds with subject matter and individuals who are far removed from the realities of the everyday world of business and politics. Though it still persists in some quarters, this viewpoint was at its strongest up until the time of the early 1930s.



⑤ The depression changed many things. It led to the peaceful introduction of many ideas which had been considered revolutionary. One was the application of social science theory and techniques to the mundane problems of the nation's domestic economy. Anthropologists, for example, were suddenly called from their academic refuge and put to work trying to relieve some of the more pressing burdens of the nation's minority groups.

⑥ Among this long-suffering population were the Indians, living miserably depressed lives on reservations as wards of the government. Most of these Indians had neither the dignity of their old ways nor the advantages of the now dominant society that surrounded them. Up to this point it had been the government's policy to treat all the different tribes alike, as if they were ignorant and somewhat stubborn children—a mistake which is yet to be really rectified. A body of custom had grown up in the government's Indian Service as to how to "handle" Indians and Indian problems. Like

the State Department's Foreign Service, the Indian Service transferred its employees from post to post so often that they could put in a lifetime of service without learning anything about the people they were administering. The bureaucracy that grew up was more oriented toward the problems of the employees than those of the Indians. Under such conditions it was almost impossible to introduce the disturbing anthropological idea that the Indians were deeply and significantly different from European-Americans, for that would have threatened to upset the bureaucratic applecart. Though the treatment of the Indians by the government still leaves much to be desired, it has been vastly improved during the years in which trained anthropologists have worked on the reservations.

⑦In World War II many anthropologists such as myself were not only put to work on various projects having to do with the natives of the Southwest Pacific but were even asked to deal with the Japanese. Under the pressure of war some of the advice we gave was heeded—though, like many wartime innovations, much that was done was forgotten in the peace that followed.

⑧However, the field work which anthropologists did as pure research, plus the applied projects on which we worked, was not entirely wasted. If this rich experience taught us one thing it was that culture is more than mere custom that can be shed or changed like a suit of clothes. The people we were advising kept bumping their heads against an invisible barrier, but they did not know what it was. We knew that what they were up against was a completely different way of organizing life, of thinking, and of conceiving the underlying assumptions about the family and the state, the economic system, and even of mankind. The big problem was how to communicate this brute fact. When we tried to point it out our explanations didn't make sense. Most of our attempts were anecdotal and very little was specific.

⑨Apart from having problems with laymen who often did not really care about a definition of culture, we had certain methodological difficulties in the field itself. The most pressing one was consistency of basic information. Field workers would record their interpretations of what informants told them, but if someone else visited the same group and interviewed a different set of informants or even the same informants (a practice frowned upon by anthropologists) the second man would usually come back with a different set of interpretations. There was no way to gather data that could be legitimately checked, no way to reproduce field procedures, no way to equate an event in culture A with culture B except to try to describe each and they say that they were different. It was difficult, if not impossible, to say in precise terms what it was that made one culture really different from another, except to point out that there were people who raised sheep and others who gathered food; that there were those who hunted and those who cultivated plants; that people worshiped different gods and organized their societies in varying ways. The anthropologist knew that there were even

more profound differences, but his readers and often the very officials he was advising preferred to ignore them. Without being quite aware of it these well-meaning gentlemen assumed a naively evolutionary view which classified most foreigners as "underdeveloped Americans."

⑩ Even now, when the populations of the so-called "underdeveloped" areas balk at the introduction of new techniques of health and agriculture by the Americans, they are thought to be backward and stubborn, or thought to be led by greedy leaders who have no concern for their people's welfare. Leaders were usually blamed and sometimes even accused of coercing their people to resist innovation because it would break their strangle hold on the economy.

⑪ Unfortunately some of these things are true, and they offer a convenient excuse for this country's failures abroad on the technical assistance, military aid, and diplomatic fronts. Most of our difficulties stem from our own ignorance. Honest and sincere people in the field continue to fail to grasp the true significance of the fact that culture controls behavior in deep and persisting ways, many of which are outside of awareness and therefore beyond conscious control of the individual. When anthropologists stress this point they are usually ignored, for they are challenging the deepest popular American beliefs about ourselves as well as foreigners. They lead people to see things they might not want to see.

⑫ Moreover, as I have pointed out, the solemn strictures of the anthropologist to the layman who might make use of these insights lack the necessary concreteness. There is no way to teach culture in the same way that language is taught. Until recently no one had defined any basic units of culture. There was no generally agreed upon underlying theory of culture — no way of being specification way for B to get to the field and check A's results. Even today a volume examining the various concepts and theories of culture, written by the nation's two most distinguished anthropologists, A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, calls for such qualities as "empathy" in the investigator. The authors also state that no constant elemental units of culture have as yet been satisfactorily established.

⑬ This state of affairs had been a source of irritation for a number of years, and it drove me to work toward an integrated theory of culture which would overcome the shortcomings I have just sketched. In 1951, when I came to Washington to train Point Four technicians, I had a very practical reason for pressing this work toward a tangible conclusion. Prior to this time I had been teaching at a university and a small college. College students are content to take subjects for their general interest. Point Four technicians and Foreign Service officers, on the other hand, are expected to go overseas and get results, and they have to be well prepared. In general I found that they are not too interested in the anthropologist's preoccupation with "what culture is" and tend to become impatient unless they have been abroad previously and have had some actual

experience. Foreign Service officers in particular used to take great delight in saying that what the anthropologists told them about working with the Navajo didn't do them much good, for we didn't have an embassy on the Navajo reservation. Unfortunately the theory we were able to bring to bear at the time I began working in Washington simply had no perceived relevance to the operator in the field. Their defenses were too well entrenched and we could show them no compelling reasons to change. Additional harassment came from the government administrators who failed to grasp the fact that there was something really different about overseas operation, that what was needed was something bold and new, not just more of the same old history, economics, and politics.

⑭Those Foreign Service officers and other trainees who did take seriously what they heard and managed to make something out of it came up against another problem. They would say, "Yes, I can see that you have something there. Now I'm going to Damascus. Where can I read something that will help me to do business with the Arabs?" We were stumped! If they were going to Japan we could tell them to read Ruth Benedict's excellent book, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, with the caution that it was for background only and they shouldn't expect to find conditions exactly like those that Benedict described. Of course the remarkable thing about Benedict's book was that, while she had never been to Japan and could only work with Japanese who were in the United States (the book was written during the war), it showed extraordinary insight into the psychological processes of the Japanese. It is one of the best pieces of evidence that the anthropologist has something crucial and practical to say if it can only be systematized.

⑮Just about this time George L. Trager and I began our collaboration to develop a method for the analysis of culture. Our ultimate objectives included five basic steps.

1. To identify the building blocks of culture—what we later came to call the isolates of culture, akin to the notes in a musical score.

2. To tie these isolates into a biological base so that they could be compared among cultures. We also stipulated that this comparison be done in such a way that the conditions be repeatable at will. Without this, anthropology can lay no claim to being a science.

3. To build up a body of data and a methodology that would enable us to conduct research and teach each cultural situation in much the same way that language is taught without having to depend upon such qualities as "empathy" in the researcher.

4. To build a unified theory of culture that would lead us to further research.

5. Finally, to find a way to make our discipline tangibly useful to the non-specialist.

⑯Trager and I felt that much of the preoccupation of anthropologists with statistics was having a stultifying effect on our discipline and that the methodologies and theories

borrowed from sociology, psychology, and other biological and physical sciences had been ineptly used. In many instances social scientists, under pressure from physical scientists, have been virtually panicked into adopting prematurely the rigors of formal mathematics and the “scientific method.” Our view was that it was necessary for anthropology to develop its own methodology adapted to its own subject matter.

(*The Silent Language*, 1959)

Notes

1. **Edward T. Hall:** Edward Twitchell Hall, Jr. (May 16, 1914 – July 20, 2009) was an American anthropologist and cross-cultural researcher. He is remembered for developing the concept of Proxemics, a description of how people behave and react in different types of culturally defined personal space. Throughout his career, Hall introduced a number of new concepts, including proxemics, polychronic and monochronic time, and high and low context culture. In his second book, *The Hidden Dimension*, he describes the culturally specific temporal and spatial dimensions that surround each of us, such as the physical distances people maintain in different contexts. In *The Silent Language*, Hall coined the term polychronic to describe the ability to attend to multiple events simultaneously, as opposed to “monochronic” individuals and cultures who tend to handle events sequentially. His third book, *Beyond Culture*, is notable for having developed the idea of extension transference.
2. **E. B. Tylor:** Edward Burnett Tylor (October 2, 1832 – January 2, 1917), was an English anthropologist and representative of cultural evolutionism. In his works *Primitive Culture and Anthropology*, he defined the context of the scientific study of anthropology, based on the evolutionary theories of Charles Lyell. He believed that there was a functional basis for the development of society and religion, which he determined was universal. Tylor is considered by many to be a founding figure of the science of social anthropology, and his scholarly works helped to build the discipline of anthropology in the nineteenth century. Tylor reintroduced the term animism into common use.
3. **The State Department’s Foreign Service:** The State Department’s Foreign Service, also called Diplomatic Service, the field force of a foreign office, comprises diplomatic and consular personnel engaged in representing the home government’s interests abroad and provides the necessary information on which foreign policy is based. There is a marked similarity in the Foreign Service organizations of most countries. Diplomatic and consular functions are generally performed by a single service, which is expected to serve at home or abroad, enabling interchangeability of

- consular and diplomatic officers. In the United States, despite the absence of an aristocracy or governing class, wealth and political connections were once important prerequisites because of low salaries and meagre representation (entertainment) allowances.
4. **The Indian Service:** The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is agency of the U. S. Department of the Interior that serves as the principal link between federally recognized American Indian and Alaska Native populations and the U. S. government. It is responsible for administering about 66 million acres (27 million hectares) of land held in trust. It also provides various economic development, educational, and natural-resource management services to help promote Native American and Alaska Native self-determination and well-being.
5. **Ruth Benedict:** Ruth Benedict, née Ruth Fulton (June 5, 1887 – September. 17, 1948), American anthropologist whose theories had a profound influence on cultural anthropology, especially in the area of culture and personality. Her long-standing interest in Japanese culture bore fruit in her famous book *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*.
6. **A. L. Kroeber:** A. L. Kroeber, Alfred Louis Kroeber (June 11, 1876 – October. 5, 1960) in full, was an influential American anthropologist of the first half of the 20th century, whose primary concern was to understand the nature of culture and its processes. His interest and competence ranged over the whole of anthropology, and he made valuable contributions to American Indian ethnology and to the study of linguistics. His career nearly coincided with the emergence of academic, professionalized anthropology in the United States and contributed significantly to its development.
7. **Clyde Kluckhohn:** Clyde K. M. Kluckhohn, Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn (January 11, 1905 – July 29, 1960) in full, was an American professor of anthropology at Harvard University, who contributed to anthropology in a number of ways: by his ethnographic studies of the Navajo; by his theories of culture, partial-value systems, and cultural patterns; by his intellectual leadership and stimulation of a large number of students; and by his representation of anthropology in government circles and his work on government projects.

Language points

1. Culture is a word that has so many meanings already that one more can do it no harm. (Para 1)
2. Even more unfortunate is the slowness with which the concept of culture has percolated through the public consciousness. (Para 2)
3. As fledgling anthropologists moved deeper and deeper into the life of the people they