Hiroyoshi Hiratsuka

Research Fellow, Institute of Education Research and Service (IERS), International Christian University (ICU), Japan.

Special Researcher, Institute of Global Studies, School of Global Studies and Collaboration (GSC), Aoyama Gakuin University (AGU), Japan.

hhiratsuka@gsc.aoyama.ac.jp

Abstract

The Japan Self Defense Force (SDF)'s lack of deployment experience to the overseas missions has hindered the Japanese government and SDF from preparing the mission participants to be effective in unfamiliar operational environments overseas. The author selected Canada for cross-case analysis for this study because the country's PKO history, expertise, and contribution. Designed as a cross-case synthesis, this study examined a cultural awareness component of the current pre-deployment training by the two countries. The both cases identified the cultural awareness component as an important subject in their pre-deployment training to prepare the participants for their overseas missions; However, the training could be improved by integrating affective and behavioral components through experiential approaches.

Hiroyoshi Hiratsuka is a Rotary Peace Fellow at the International Christian University in Japan, and obtained MA in Peace Studies, and held faculty positions at U.S. and Japanese universities from 2008 to 2016. Currently, he is a doctoral student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. His research focuses on cultural dynamics, organizational conflict resolution, and post-secondary education.

A CROSS-CASE SYNTHESIS OF PRE-DEPLOYMENT TRAINING IN JAPAN AND
CANADA: ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL AWARENESS TRAINING OF PKO
MISSION PARTICIPANTS

INTRODUCTION

One of my colleagues in the Japanese government asked me about possible options

for developing the Japan Self Defense Force (JSDF) personnel in cultural awareness for their

overseas missions. My colleague was at a Japanese government unit which is responsible for

JSDF's United Nations Peacekeeping Operation (UNPKO) pre-deployment training. Cultural

awareness training was increasingly becoming an important consideration of UNPKO pre-

deployment preparation[1] when the rapidly changing operational dynamics and environment

required the UNPKO missions and the member countries to engage in more cross-national

cooperation. The challenge is no exception to JSDF when it had begun to make their

contribution to the missions, but the government unit had any expertise in cultural awareness

training at the time. After speaking with my colleague, I questioned the current status of

cultural awareness training in the PKO sector. Why did my colleague face challenges finding

appropriate professionals to assist in designing and delivering the training? The defense

sector was one of the original contributors to the field of intercultural education and training;

there should be more than enough resources and practitioners inside and outside of Japan.

After my initial literature review, I determined that Stewart's theory was best suited

for this study because of his combat experience, relevant military behavioral research and

development involvement, and major contribution to the field of Intercultural Education and

Training.[2] Based on his relevant U.S. defense experience and studies, Stewart defined culture

as "an organization of diversity."[3] I determined that Stewart's theory was best suited for this

study to provide a conceptual foundation to contrast the two groups in order to frame this

study in the context of a comparative study of the PKO pre-deployment training between

Japan and Canada. Moreover, my review identified that cultural awareness is a component of

one Canadian conceptual framework, that of the interculturally effective person.[4] In fact, *American Cultural Patterns*[5] and *A Profile of the Interculturally Effective Person*[6] are conceptually similar. Furthermore, Japan and Canada share their commitment to peacebuilding, and have experienced their own opportunities and challenges contributing to the UNPKO Missions.[7] A cross-case analysis of Japan and Canada could contribute to a cultural awareness component of the pre-deployment training in a new way.

The purpose of this study is to examine the current design of the PKO pre-deployment training in Japan and Canada. The following research question guided my inquiry and design: in what ways do the Japanese and Canadian PKO pre-deployment training prepare for their participants for cultural challenges during their overseas missions? The study looked at the training design including instructional contents and approaches, and participants' needs. Designed as a cross-case synthesis,[8] the study employed in-person interviews to collect and analyze qualitative data from the participants of the Japanese Self-Defense Force (JSDF) and the Canadian Armed Force (CAF). The study's rationale for focusing specifically on the UNPKO personnel is practical: the Japanese constitution prohibits JSDF from engaging in any international conflicts and wars. Focusing on the PKO missions only allowed this study to examine the JSDF and CDF cases. After reviewing the existing literature on an intersection between the field of Intercultural Education and Training and UNPKO, the study presented results and analysis, discussion and the conclusions. The study's goals aimed at 1) synthesizing the existing literature on cultural awareness training in the PKO sector 2) examining the current cultural awareness component of the pre-deployment training design in Japan and Canada. Re-examining the significance of cultural awareness training from the PKO sector benefits today's increasingly diversified operational PKO missions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cultural Awareness Training: The Origin, in Japan, and in Canada

Several professional sectors contributed the establishment and expansion of the field of Intercultural Education and Training, including Business, Defense, Education, Foreign Services, Health Care, International Development, Religious Institutions, and Migration and Refugee Agencies. Geographical diversity also contributed to the field's progression.[9] The U.S. seems to have the most accumulation of knowledge and practice, going back to 1930s but having developed mainly in the 1960s.[10] The field expanded to Japan after the 1950s through academic and educational sectors from the U.S. as a part of the post-conflict reconstruction by the U.S. involvement.[11] Canada took its own path in the field of intercultural education and training through its history, heritage, and social justice approaches in the public and the diplomatic sectors in the 1960s.[12] Although the sectoral and geographic contexts differentiated the field inception and expansion among these countries, one of the original overarching themes across the countries and sectors was preparing individuals to work effectively with counterparts from a culture different from their own in overseas missions. Today, the geographic and disciplinary research and teaching activities are converging and several common existing challenges such as training effectiveness and competency development are emerging. For example, one meta-analysis on training effectiveness concluded that the training "...seems to be effective in enhancing knowledge and trainee satisfaction but seems to be much less effective in changing behavior and attitudes and in improving adjustment and performance."[13] The same meta-analysis also explained, "More than half of all treatment groups received training that was mainly didactic (56%), compared with experiential (26%) or a combination of the two (21%)."[14] Another relevant issue in the field also involves integrating cultural skills and cross-cultural competencies as an urgent need for academic and professional development programs in the diplomacy and peacebuilding sectors.[15]

The field of Intercultural Education and Training owes its inception partially to the U.S. foreign service training and defense behavioral research and development projects. Edward Hall's research and training activities at the US Foreign Service Institute often received credits for its inceptions.[16] During the same period, another set of studies was considered as one of the first research and development projects of cultural awareness training. The study involved a failure of a U.S. overseas mission in the Southeast Asia. The White Star team was one of the first U.S. groups deployed to Laos as the technical advisors to engage in their missions with the local defense personnel in the 1960s. Stewart and others surveyed the existing techniques and interviewed the White Star team members to identify their challenges on their overseas missions. The review concluded that the least attention was paid to interpersonal communication issues; they analyzed that a miscommunication became a major problem between the U.S. Americans and the Lao members because of the U.S. Americans' wrong attribution toward the Lao counterparts. They concluded no proper training materials existed, and no adequate teaching approaches were available to improving intercultural relations between the U.S. and local members.[17] Remedying the training gaps, Stewart and others formulated an intervention, Contrast Culture Method (CCM, or originally called Contrast American Method) which would raise assignees' awareness of their own cultures, so that they could bridge cultural differences between themselves and the local personnel.[18] In CCM, Culture involved at least four theoretical categories: reference culture, target culture, contrast culture, and cultural differences,[19] and cultural awareness is achieved when an individual becomes aware of one's own culture as "...is understood from inside out as a procedure for how things get done."[20] In Stewart's theory, the interpersonal level is the analytical focus; he argued that culture organizes individual thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors. Cultural differences refer to organizational variations between two groups. The challenge of any cultural awareness training is improving individuals' performance by reducing

unconscious negative stereotypes and ethnocentrism because they are often outside of one's own consciousness.[21]

While more theories and interventions came out of the U.S. defense sector, and newer training approaches for cultural awareness are available in the field today, CCM remains one of the most effective and valuable approaches.[22] The U.S. case was an illustration of the defense sector's relevance and its suitability for cultural awareness training. At the same time, the literature review indicated that this training tradition seems to have disappeared from the defense sector even though the sector in the U.S. had been intimately involved in providing materials and approaches in the early stages of the field.[23] Why did the U.S. defense involvement in the field's research and development and its use of cultural awareness training decline, while sector experts continue to confirm the need for it today?

The development of the Intercultural Education and Training field in Japan focused more on the academic and educational sectors transferred from the U.S. to Japan under the post-war national reconstruction. The Japanese higher education sector institutionalized intercultural education and training subjects in Japanese universities through the U.S. efforts in education reconstruction. Japan's business sector, particularly large companies, later began to include cultural awareness training to prepare their managers for overseas business operations under Japan's global economic influence.[24] Only recently has the Japanese defense sector recognized a need for improving cultural awareness, when the Japanese government decided to contribute to the UNPKO missions in 1992.[25] Their challenges came from their lack of overseas field mission experience; and as a result, no organized pre-deployment training existed prior to 2005.[26] The question remains; in what ways does the Japanese government build its own research and development capacity of pre-deployment training, including a cultural awareness component for the JSDF personnel?

Canada's Intercultural Education and Training research and development evolved out of a unique national history. Canada has a history of managing a diverse society with a bilingual heritage and indigenous communities. The constitutional commitment to its linguistic and cultural diversity is integral to Canadian cultural values,[27] and the Canadian government's recent Truth and Reconciliation Commission reflected its first step toward social justice commitment to the indigenous cultures.[28] Canadian researchers have responded to Canada's cultural diversity challenges by contributing to developing such concepts as acculturation strategies and interpersonal competencies in the social, diplomatic and international development sectors.[29] Canada is also one of the original places of peacekeeping as a modern diplomatic option, has enjoyed the excellent profile of the PKO training,[30] and has shared its experience of the UNPKO mission successes and failures.[31] It appears that Canada's commitment to managing diversity and to furthering the cause of social justice, and its reputation for providing quality PKO training, could all contribute to answering the existing challenges related to the cultural awareness component of the UNPKO pre-deployment training. However, Canada has experienced a decline in participation and preparation capacity for UNPKO missions in the last ten years; the decline depleted Canada's knowledge and participation were the lowest level on record.[32] In fact, after surveying the current PKO training available (academic and non-academic courses) in Canada, the same study cited that Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC) in Canada only included a minimal training which primarily focused on language training.[33] Identifying Canada's current available resources, accumulated approaches, and challenges to preparing their personnel for the UNPKO mission would possibly benefit other countries by providing insights into its successful pre-deployment training although reassembling the resources and institutional knowledge of Canadian PKOs will be one of their major challenges for this study.

The Current Design of the Cultural Awareness Component in Pre-Deployment Training in the UNPKO Context

Today, more than ever, the PKO missions require participants to engage in new responsibilities and more cross-national cooperation.[34] The UN developed a standardized and unified pre-deployment training for the civilians, the ground units and the staff officers, which would include professional/technical, personal and psychological, mission-specific, and socio-cultural stress management training as a part of human resource management strategies for UNPKO missions.[35] Cultural awareness training is considered an important component in the pre-deployment training.[36] Both the UN and regional organizations, such as NATO and the African Union, included cultural awareness training.[37] In fact, for example, NATO examined the role of cultural differences in their PKO multinational mission operations, and concluded that a greater integration of cultural awareness in the pre-deployment preparation for all NATO member countries' defense personnel in the all levels was possible.[38] In part, this seemed to be a response to the modern PKO missions' confronting challenges: for example, their increasing involvements in intra-state civil wars, ethnic conflicts, and terrorism.[39] As a result, the PKO mission personnel also have to shift their roles of traditional combat, defense functions to non-combat, peacekeeping functions[40] including intelligence gathering, mediation, and protecting civilian and aid workers.[41]

Giving cultural awareness training requires more delicate approaches than just providing the training to a group of trainees. It requires assess, plan, deliver, and evaluate the trainees based on their preparedness, needs, and certain mission security and safety realities. Kimmel explained the cultural awareness training for the UNPKO missions focuses on "mak[ing] more tangible the idea of cultural differences, with an emphasis on the relativity of some of their own values and assumptions."[42] As Stewart and others originally explained, the primary training goal of a defense officer focuses on "increas[ing] his awareness of the possible limitations of his own cultural frame of reference and of the possibility of alternative ways of perceiving a situation."[43] Improving personnel's cultural awareness contributes to

analyzing the situational dynamics of communal-cultural conflict.[44] Staff officers would

apply the concept to the managerial tasks in the forms of coordination and collaboration

within the multinational mission operations in the mission headquarters.[45] Ground units

would apply the concept into their engagements with the local civil and non-state members in

the forms of negotiation, mediation, communication, and intelligence gathering. However,

increasing individuals' cultural awareness requires their readiness to accept the existence of

cultural differences by reflecting on their own experience[46] and the pre-deployment training

must identify the most appropriate approaches and contents depending on participants'

experience levels.[47] Most importantly, when a security situation decline, mission officers

would be required to shift their priority from putting efforts on cultural awareness to

improving mission security and safety. Cultural awareness might not be their first priority

depending on the mission security level.

  Cultural awareness training is included in both the ground unit and the officer-level

training, although different terminologies are used to describe the concept: cultural

awareness, cultural sensitivity, and managing cultural diversity. For example, an online

course, United Nations Staff Officers Course (UNSOC), includes cultural awareness as one

of required lessons for the officer candidates.[48] The UNDPKO also has a standardized

guidebook for the member states to utilize during their own pre-deployment training for the

participating ground units,[49] but individual contributing countries are responsible for

implementing the training. The studies from Australia[50], Canada[51], Finland[52], Ghana[53], the

United States[54] and South Africa,[55] identified a cultural awareness component in the pre-

deployment training is crucial for the mission preparation. In the Japanese case, Maekawa in

2007 argued the importance of cultural awareness preparation of JSDF personnel in the future

as Japan would become an active participant in the PKO missions.[56] Most recently the UN

Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department for Field Support reported the gaps

between the current training objectives and the participants' needs; the reports stressed the importance of improving cultural awareness at the staff officer level, as it is currently lacking.[57] Another third-party report even went further, and critically evaluated the quality of cultural awareness training available for the UNPKO mission personnel:

> Existing training materials appear to add fuel to the racist attitudes that can contribute to higher rates of exploitation of local women. More generally, better cultural awareness training materials will explicitly address problems of racism and dehumanization among peacekeepers.[58]

The current design in some cases defeated the cultural awareness training purposes and goals by actually worsening participants' attitudes and behaviors instead of improving them on the missions.[59] Improving cultural awareness of the UNPKO mission personnel as a part of pre-deployment training continuous to be one of urgent priorities. What is striking is that the defense sector, which could have accumulated a wealth of knowledge on the cultural awareness research and development, seems to have discontinued this line of research over time:

> Almost every sector eventually circles back and reinvents what existed earlier because the institutional memory of past work has been lost. To some degree, this has hobbled the development of the field as a whole and caused it to deal with the same issues over and over again. Although the constant reinvention does bring a certain eclectic creativity to the field, it could be argued that it hinders in-depth or new research on conceptual constructs and training techniques.[60]

Training outcomes are inconsistent at the best across the providers; however, some individual member countries like Germany, Canada, and the U.S. have received recognitions for the quality PKO pre-deployment training.[61] What really is needed in this study is to review the existing training of one of the high-quality providers among the PKO contributing countries, like Canada, and to contrast the training design with another country which needs capacity building, like Japan, to further investigate the existing issues and challenges and to generate possible solutions to the design gaps in the cultural awareness training.

METHODOLOGY

This qualitative study uses the Case Study strategy[62] as the main methodological framework: Type 3 design.[63] Throughout the study, I made my best attempt to keep my flexibility and check my pre-existing assumptions and bias, which shaped my methodological and theoretical orientations as I engaged in this cross-cultural study in Canada and Japan. While the Case Study strategy has several advantages when data availability is a challenge, the strategy also comes with some methodological limitations. In order to keep my assumptions and bias in check and improve internal and external validity and reliability, I utilized the strategies of data triangulation and peer debriefing.[64] I focused on the Canadian Defense Force and the Japanese Self-Defense Force as the cases within the context of member countries' contribution to the UN peacekeeping operation. The study looked at their PKO pre-deployment training as the analytical unit. I incorporated two different sets of data collection methods to build the cross-case synthesis: in-person interviews and document analysis.

I had to take some methodological considerations for data collection and analysis in Japan and Canada: Study's geographic coverage, resource and time availability. I decided to use different data collection methods in Japan and In Canada in order to collect data successfully. My data collection in Japan was more concentrated in one location: Tokyo. While the Japanese PKO is under the national jurisdiction, the key Japanese PKO agencies and facilities are centralized in Tokyo and the surrounding areas. This institutional concentration allowed much more financial and time resource flexibility for me to collect data in Japan. The only challenge was the informants' schedule availability: I was only able to meet with the informants on one day at one location in Tokyo. The Department of National Defense (DND) and the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF), that are responsible for the Canadian PKO operations, also fall under the federal jurisdiction; however, Canada is a large country, and the defense agencies including the bases and training centers are located

throughout the country. In addition, my time and financial resource availability limited my

visit to Canada over no more than one month in the summer of 2012. Therefore, I

concentrated my research visits on federal agencies and offices located in Ottawa and

Kingston, Ontario. The above considerations dictated my decision to approach the actual

data collection slightly differently between Japan and Canada.

The study's data collection method applied a snowball sampling to identify and

contact possible participants once referral was made and clearance was given.[65] As a first

point of contact, my colleagues in the Japanese government responsible for the PKO pre-

deployment training forwarded my study and contact information sheets to their contact in

the Canadian Defense Force. In addition, I made informational contact with other individuals

in the Canadian federal agencies involved in the PKO pre-deployment training. The same

individuals in the Japanese government also forwarded my information to the Japanese Self-

Defense Force contacts. Upon receiving participants' agreement and Canadian and Japanese

government clearance, I was invited to meet four participants in Canada in 2012 and in Japan

in 2016.

The participants all received the study cover letter, a question list, and the consent

form in advance via email. At the time of meeting, they also received my verbal explanation

about the study, and the consent forms were signed before the data collection. I had to use

different data collection methods in two countries. In Japan, I used group, face-to-face

interviews for the data collection when the participants were only available to meet one day

at one location of their choice in Tokyo. Due to the data collection procedures and the

limitations of time and resources in Canada, I used individual, face-to-face interviews. I

recognized that both data collection methods have their strengths and weaknesses. The

individual interview would allow more in-depth reflection of the interviewers while the group

interview allows the participants to reflect on others' statements. The challenges are that the

individual interviews do not have collective data generation, while the group interview does not necessarily protect the individuals' privacy. My interview in Japan was conducted in Japanese; I interviewed the Canadian participants in English. In addition, I gathered printed materials for their pre-deployment training available in Canada and in Japan to supplement my data sources.

My data analysis framework in the Case Study strategy included the cross-case synthesis technique.[66] Once the data collection generated data sources in two cases, I first transcribed the interviews, then organized the transcribed data into a set of major themes across the cases by contrasting the data sets to generate the generalizable themes. The interviews and my transcription were done in the respective languages, but I translated Japanese to English for the analysis. Specific identifications (P) were given to the participants to maintain their anonymity during the analysis phase. The result generated the analysis summary in the table in the next section (Table 1).

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 1. Analysis Summary

	Participants' Recognition: Experiencing Cultural Differences during the PKO Missions	Cultural Awareness Instructional Contents	Cultural Awareness Instructional Approaches
Japan	Time and scheduling (P1, P5) A sense of security and safety (P3) Understanding of multilateral mission cooperation: planning and process (P2)	Appraising one's reference culture while looking down on other cultures on the mission (P1) A set of information about a mission destination in the digital or print materials (P5) Regional specific information from the experts' experience (P6)	Lectures (P1) In-field mission rehearsal (P2) Training for trainers (P5)
Canada	Alcohol consumption	Contents of cultural	Participatory field

and shared cups (P4)	awareness as a skill set (P1)	instruction on the target countries (P1)
Gender roles and information/intelligence gathering (P1)	A set of information about a mission destination (P4)	Stand-and-point, powerpoint presentations (P4)
	A prescriptive set of knowledge and actions (P4)	Specific task-focused field exercises such as cooking in austere environments (P4)
	The past participants' individual reports on specific missions and particular missions' digital and print materials (P4)	

Participants' Recognition: Experiencing Cultural Differences on the PKO Missions

The interview participants both at the ground unit and officer levels recognized the existence of cultural differences between themselves and the other UNPKO members from different countries. Both the Japanese and Canadian ground unit members and officers expressed retrospectively that the cultural differences caused them a unique form of stress by causing different degrees of miscommunication, dysfunction and/or collaboration breakdown during their missions. Moreover, two Canadian participants in the interview confirmed that the cultural differences could challenge the PKO mission participants. Experiencing cultural differences during the UNPKO missions became a common source of frustration among the ground unit members and officers from Japan and Canada.

The Japanese and Canadian participants suggested the higher the rank of UNPKO officers, the greater the functional challenge caused by cultural differences (Japanese P2, P6; Canadian P3, P4). The participants who were deployed at the headquarters expressed the need for adjustment and flexibility in order to work with other officer colleagues and supervisors from different member countries and the great stress this caused. The data analysis also suggested that staff officers from Japan recognized cultural differences to be a

major stressor in their work. They emphasized the critical need for more effective cultural

awareness training than currently available in order to prepare them for working with other

officers in the mission headquarters. Their cultural difference challenges included team

dysfunction, miscommunication, and a lack of effective project planning. The risk of

mismanaging group diversity and cultural differences might be greater for command-level

officers who, due to lack of training, could only imagine how to manage cultural differences.

It is not clear whether this is a result of Japan's lack of experience in the PKO missions

overseas. In any case, the participants indicated that they felt a lack of ability to manage

cultural differences and diversity could be one factor that contributed to their job

performance on the UNPKO missions.

PKO Cultural Awareness Training: Instructional Contents and Approaches

Analyzing cultural awareness content illustrated the inconsistency of contents and

approaches in the pre-deployment training across Canada and Japan. The participants

described, as instructors and students, a variety of contents and instructions that existed

across the federal/national PKO centers and across levels, and the analysis did not indicate

any uniform instructional contents and approaches for cultural awareness preparation. These

training contents and approaches appeared to focus on knowledge about the destination

countries. The training described in the data did not include approaches that would engage

the participants' attitudinal and behavioral dimensions. On the other hand, some participants

promoted more dynamic approaches such as a mission-specific case study (Canadian P2) and

theory-based facilitation (Canadian P3). As one participant critiqued, the existing

instructional approach to cultural awareness needed to change and to be more reflective of

the mission's reality (Japanese P1). Another participant provided constructive feedback by

saying that the existing content needed to focus on the relativity of worldviews rather than

emphasizing the appraisal of one's ways of doing things (Japanese P1). As one participant

explained, beyond the UN Standard Guideline, the sending member countries are responsible

for the contents of pre-deployment training (Japanese P6); as a result, content inconsistency

seemed unavoidable unless training experts on cultural awareness (Canadian P2) and

mission-specific experts (Canadian P3) became involved in the pre-deployment preparation

training more collaboratively.

The current contents and approaches of cultural awareness training seemed to

inadequately or inappropriately prepare the PKO participants. The data indicated that the

available instructional contents emphasized more knowledge of a target culture instead of

changing attitudes and/or behaviors of the participants. The data also indicated that the

instructional approaches of cultural awareness training lacks an experiential component as

indicated by the participants. The past experts[67] advocated for an experiential approach to

improve affective and behavioral dimensions to be available to the technical advisors, but the

result is an affirmation of the PKO sector's remaining challenge of applying the cultural

awareness contents and instructional approaches. A need for institutionalizing quality

cultural awareness training is recognized by a few participants from Japan and Canada.

DISCUSSION

The importance of cultural awareness as originally argued by the experts[68] remains

relevant in PKO pre-deployment training. The analysis confirmed that Stewart's original

theoretical framework of cultural differences applied to the challenge of PKO participants

today.[69] The result identified that the study participants retrospectively recognized the

existence of cultural differences, which became a source of their stress and challenged their

cooperation with the other member countries. The participants' accounts also highlighted the

critical role of cultural awareness training for ground unit and officer levels, but the existing

content and instructional approaches seemed inadequate or inappropriate for preparing the

participants to perform their multilateral duties across the two cases. As this result was in

line with the past[70] and contemporary[71] studies, this discovery is particularly unfortunate when the original attempt of the defense research and development was to invent innovative training contents and approaches that focused on participants' affective change to improve their cultural awareness. Whether Japan's experience scarcity or Canada's capacity decline, one training challenge seems to be a lack of an experiential approach to articulate the affective and behavioral dimensions of cultural awareness training as examined by the past experts.[72] At the same time, the participants suggested that cross-national cooperation and instructor/participant mobility would address the cultural awareness training availability.

Due to the study's limitations, future studies will require a reconsideration of methodology. Designed as a qualitative case study, this study only aimed at surveying the current challenges and possible improvements of the cultural awareness component in the UNPKO pre-deployment training in Japan and Canada. Should I design the future qualitative studies, I would include more data collection methods such as participatory observation to watch the actual pre-deployment preparation, time and security clearance permitting. In addition, some more interesting data were left out of the analysis because they were outside this study's scope. First, some participants emphasized the possibility of more time devoted to language preparation. Second, the Japanese and the Canadian data contained rich information about the cultural awareness training specific to their contexts; synthesizing the data as individual cases instead of a cross-case synthesis would allow clarification of their individual countries' needs for a cultural awareness component in future pre-deployment training.

The study affirmed the current challenges of cultural awareness component in the PKO pre-deployment training in Japan and Canada. The significance of this study's results is twofold. First, the study uncovered this practice mismatch between the PKO participants and the training providers in Japan and Canada. The result articulated that the cultural awareness

component in the PKO pre-deployment training remains one of the critical importance in the PKO pre-deployment training claimed by the Japanese and Canadian PKO participants even though the existing training does not prepare them adequately and appropriately perform their duties on the PKO missions overseas. Some participants recognized the inadequacy and/or inappropriateness of the training they received, and suggested the need for better training, including training for trainers, which would improve the instructional quality. Second, the training providers does not have integrated effective instructional contents and approaches into the current design in order to effectively improve the participants' affective and behavioral dimensions. A lack of training for participants' affective and behavioral improvement in the current PKO pre-deployment training suggested that the past training approaches like the Contrast Culture Method (CCM) remain relevant today. The existing instructional contents and approaches need reconsideration by integrating such approaches as CCM into the future training design for the Japanese and the Canadian PKO pre-deployment training. Articulating a need for participants' affective and behavioral preparation continues as a challenge for the Japanese and Canadian training providers. Based on the study result, future projects could involve 1) a joint training program for staff officers and mission leaders regarding more experiential approaches to cultural awareness 2) research and development of new cultural awareness training design, management, and evaluation.

CONCLUSION

A professional conversation with my Japanese colleague about a cultural awareness challenge of the Japanese PKO pre-deployment training prompted me to embark on this study. This cross-case synthesis examined the current challenges of two countries, Japan and Canada, regarding cultural awareness components in their training to prepare their participants for PKO missions overseas. The literature review illustrated the discontinuation of the research and development tradition in the field, although preparing for managing

cultural differences remained one of the critical challenges identified in the literature. The UNDPKO and regional organizations also recognize that cultural awareness training plays an important role in PKO pre-deployment training when these missions involve complex multilateral and multinational operations. At the same time, the existing cultural awareness component in the PKO pre-deployment training today prepares the participants inadequately and inappropriately, and only produced mixed results for the participants. The result indicated the current training contributed to compromising the participants' job performance and the achievements of the PKO mission goals. Based on this qualitative study, the analysis identified the common realities and challenges, the existing instructional contents and approaches, and possible capacity building options through cross-national cooperation of the PKO centers. The study contributed to building a synthesis of the literature. Although the study came with research limitations, it identified possible pathways for future research of the PKO pre-deployment training for the two countries.

What was most important, however, is to integrate knowledge and practice in the field of Intercultural Education and Training and Peace and Conflict Studies into today's PKO training design. This study was my attempt to apply Stewart's theoretical framework to the current PKO context. A US World War II veteran and one of the founding members of intercultural communication, Stewart inspired my research and practice by sharing his reflective thoughts from his scholarship, his experience on the battlefield, and his concerns for contemporary cultural issues. One of my questions, since my first correspondence with Dr. Stewart, had been to articulate ways to bridge a disciplinary gap between the field of Intercultural Education and Peace and Conflict Studies because I often thought an insufficient amount of studies in the Intercultural Education field extended their knowledge and practice into the Peace and Conflict Resolution field. The study provided me an opportunity to

address issues related to culture and conflict and its possible contribution to the field of Peace

and Conflict Resolution in the current UNPKO contexts.

ENDNOTES

[1] Paul R. Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," in *The Psychology of Peacekeeping*, ed. Harvey Langholtz (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998), 63–64; Harvey Langholtz J., "The Psychology of Peacekeeping: Genesis, Ethos, and Application," *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 4, no. 3 (1998): 232–33; United Nations, "Operational Readiness Preparation for Troop Contributing Countries in Peacekeeping Missions" (Department of Peacekeeping Operations & Department for Field Support, 2016): 12.

[2] Jacqueline Howell Wasilewski and Holly Siebert Kawakami, "Edward C. Stewart: Cultural Dynamics Pioneer," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36, no. 6 (November 2012): 874–76.

[3] Edward C Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," in *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-Cultural Training Methods.*, ed. M.G. Folwer and M.G. Mumford, vol. 1 (Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc., 1995), 56.

[4] Thomas Vulpe, Daniel Kealey, David Protheore, and Doug MacDonald, "A Profile of the Interculturally Effective Person" (Ottawa, Canada: Center for Intercultural Learning / Canadian Foreign Service Institute, 2000), 15.

[5] Edward C. Stewart, *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc, 1972), 5-6.

[6] Vulpe et al., "A Profile of the Interculturally Effective Person."

[7] A.W. Dorn, "Canadian & Japanese Contributions to UN Peacekeeping: More than 'Boots on the Ground'" (Tokyo, Japan, 2012), 32-41.

[8] Robert K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 5th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc, 2014), 50.

[9] Margaret D Pusch, "Intercultural Training in Historical Perspective," in *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, ed. Dan Landis, Janet M. Bennett, and Milton J. Bennett, 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc., 2004), 25-26; Colleen Ward, Stephen Bochner, and Adrian Furnham, *Psychology of Culture Shock*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2001), 19-46.

[10] Pusch, "Intercultural Training in Historical Perspective," 15.

[11] Holly Siebert Kawakami, "A History and Development of the Intercultural Communication Field in Japan (1950-Present)" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 2009), X-9; Pusch, *Intercultural Training in Historical Perspective,* 3-36.

[12] Global Affairs Canada, "Evaluation of the Canadian Foreign Service Institute (Final Report)," Evaluation Report (Ottawa, Canada: Evaluation Division, Office of the Inspector General, Global Affairs Canada, 2016), 49.

[13] Mendenhall et al., "Evaluation Studies of Cross-Cultural Training Programs: A Review of the Literature from 1988 to 2000," in *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, ed. Dan Landis, Janet M. Bennett, and Milton J. Bennett, 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2003), 138.

[14] Mendenhall et al., "Evaluation Studies of Cross-Cultural Training Programs: A Review of the Literature from 1988 to 2000," 133.

[15] Maria P Carland and Candace Faber, eds., *Careers in International Affairs*, 8th ed. (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2008), 5; Nike Carstarphen et al.,

"Graduate Education and Professional Practice in International Peace and Conflict" (Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 2010), 1-3.

[16] Edward T. Hall, *The Silent Language* (New York, NY: Anchor Books, 1990).

[17] Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 47-48

[18] Hiroyoshi Hiratsuka, Hanako Suzuki, and Alexis Pusina, "Explaining the Effectiveness of the Contrast Culture Method," *Journal of International Students* 6, no. 1 (2016): 77.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 48.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Hiratsuka, Suzuki, and Pusina, "Explaining the Effectiveness of the Contrast Culture Method," 78-79.

[23] Allison Abbe and Melissa Gouge, "Cultural Training for Military Personnel: Revisiting the Vietnam Era," *Military Review*, 2012, 9; Pusch, *Intercultural Training in Historical Perspective,* 13-36.

[24] Kawakami, "A History and Development of the Intercultural Communication Field in Japan (1950-Present)," 8; Pusch, "Intercultural Training in Historical Perspective," 25-26.

[25] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, "Japan's Contribution to UN Peacekeeping Operations (PKO)" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Japan (MOFA), 2017), http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pko/index.html; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, "Outline of Japan's International Peace Cooperation" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Japan (MOFA), 2015), http://www.mofa.go.jp/fp/ipc/page22e_000683.html.

[26] Cabinet Office of Japan, "Heiwa E No Mich [a Path to Peace]" (Tokyo, Japan: Secretariat, International Peacekeeping Cooperation Center, Cabinet Office of Japan, n.d.).

[27] Joan Small, "Multiculturalism, Equality, and Canadian Constitutionalism: Cohesion and Difference," in *Multiculturalism and the Canadian Constitution*, ed. Stephen Tierney (Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press, 2007), 196.

[28] Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, "Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada" (Manitoba, Canada: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015), 1-22.

[29] Donald M Taylor and Roxane de La Sablonniere, *Towards Constructive Change in Aboriginal Communities: A Social Psychology Perspective* (Montreal and Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014), 3-10; John Berry, "Fundamental Psychological Processes in Intercultural Relations," in *Handbook of Intercultural Training.*, 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2004), 166–84; Frank Hawes and Daniel J. Kealey, "An Empirical Study of Canadian Technical Assistance: Adaptation and Effectiveness on Overseas Assignment," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 5, no. 3 (1981): 239–58.

[30] Walter Dorn, "Canadian Peacekeeping: A Proud Tradition," *Peace Magazine*, July 2006, 15; Angela Febbraro, Brian McKee, and Sharon L. Riedel, "Multinational Military Operations and Intercultural Factors (Les Operations Militaire Multinationaleset Les Facteurs Interculturels)," RTO Technical Report (Cedex, France: NATO, 2008), ES-1.

[31] Lloyd Axworthy, "Forward," in *Canada and Mission for Peace: Lessons from Nicaragua, Cambodia, & Somalia*, ed. Gregory Wirick and Robert Miller (Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre, 1998), ix-xi; Glen Milne, "Canada: Objectives, Decision-Making, and Lesson Learned," in *Capacity Building for Peacekeeping: The Case of Haiti*, ed. John T. Fishel and Andres Saenz (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc./National Defense University Press, 2007), 52-65.

[32] Dorn and Libben, "Unprepared for Peace?: The Decline of Canadian Peacekeeping Training (and What to Do about It)," 9.

[33] Dorn and Libben, "Unprepared for Peace?: The Decline of Canadian Peacekeeping Training (and What to Do about It)," 23.

[34] Donald C.F. Daniel, Paul D. Williams, and Adam C Smith, "Deploying Combined Teams: Lesson Learned from Operational Partnerships in UN Peacekeeping," *Providing for Peacekeeping* No. 12 (New York, NY: International Peace Institute, 2015), 23.

[35] Brian Kidwell and Harvey J. Langholtz, "Personal Selection, Preparation, and Training for U.N. Peacekeeping Missions," in *The Psychology of Peacekeeping*, ed. Harvey J. Langholtz (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 89–100.

[36] Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," 57-74; United Nations, "Operational Readiness Preparation for Troop Contributing Countries in Peacekeeping Missions," 62-64.

[37] Febbraro, McKee, and Riedel, "Multinational Military Operations and Intercultural Factors (Les Operations Militaire Multinationaleset Les Facteurs Interculturels)," ES-1; Festus B. Aboagye, "Revised Harmonized Standards for Civilian Peacekeepers Foundation & Police Pre-Deployment Training," Training Manual (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Peace and Security Department, African Union Commission, 2014), 59; United Nations, "United Nations Infantry Battalion Manual Volume 1," Instructional Manual (New York, NY: Department of Peacekeeping Operations & Department for Field Support, 2012), 30.

[38] Febbraro, McKee, and Riedel, "Multinational Military Operations and Intercultural Factors (Les opérations militaires multinationales et les facteurs interculturels)," ES-1.

[39] Ervin Staub, "Building a Peaceful Society: Origins, Prevention, and Reconciliation after Genocide and Other Group Violence," *American Psychologist* 68, no. 7 (2013): 576–89.

[40] Langholtz, "The Psychology of Peacekeeping: Genesis, Ethos, and Application," 219-228.

[41] Dorn and Libben, "Unprepared for Peace?: The Decline of Canadian Peacekeeping Training (and What to Do about It)," Mario Novelli, "The New Geopolitics of Educational Aid: From Cold Wars to Holy Wars?," *International Journal of Educational Development* 30 (2010): 453–59.

[42] Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," 63.

[43] Edward C Stewart, Jack Danielian, and Robert J Foster, "Simulating Intercultural Communication through Role-Playing" (Alexandria, VA: George Washington University, Human Resources Research Office, 1969), 44.

[44] Tom Woodhouse, "Peacekeeping and the Psychology of Conflict Resolution," in *The Psychology of Peacekeeping*, ed. Harvey J. Langholtz (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998), 153–66.

[45] Johan Galtung, "Military Peace Missions and Cultural Awareness," CITpax Seminar (Madrid, Spain: European Commission, 2009), 3; Robert A Rubinstein, Diana M Keller, and Michael E Scherger, "Culture and Interoperability in Integrated Missions," *International Peacekeeping* 15, no. 4 (2008): 540–55; Robert A Rubinstein, "Intervention and Culture: An Anthropological Approach to Peace Operations," *Security Dialogue* 36, no. 4 (2005): 527–44; Robert A Rubinstein, "Cross-Cultural Considerations in Complex Peace Operations," *Negotiation Journal* 19, no. 1 (2003): 29–49.

[46] Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," 63; Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 56.

[47] Kidwell and Langholtz, "Personal Selection, Preparation, and Training for U.N. Peacekeeping Missions," 89-100.

[48] United Nations, "Operational Readiness Preparation for Troop Contributing Countries in Peacekeeping Missions," 12.

[49] United Nations, "United Nations Infantry Battalion Manual Volume 1," 30.

[50] Vandra Harris and Andrew Goldsmith, eds., *Security, Development and Nation-Building in Timor-Leste: A Cross-Sectoral Assessment* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2011), 166.

[51] Neil MacDonald, "Lessons Learned - Culture and War," Consultant's Report (Kingston, Canada: Lesson Learned Division, Directorate of Learning and Innovation, Canadian Defense Academy, 2009), 32-36.

[52] Susanne Adahl, "Varying Cultures in Modern Crisis Management," FINCENT Publication Series 1 (Tuusula, Finland: Finnish Defense Forces International Centre, 2009), 1-21.

[53] Nana Odoi, "Cultural Diversity in Peace Operations: Training Challenges," KAIPTC Paper No. 4 (Accra, Ghana: Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping and Training Centre (KAIPTC), 2005), 1-20.

[54] William Wunderle, *Through the Lens of Cultural Awareness: A Primer for US Armed Forces Deploying to Arab and Middle Eastern Countries* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2006), 1-153.

[55] A.J. de Vos, "Cultural Intelligence as a Fundamental Enabler in the SA Army's Peacekeeping Repertoire" (Gezina, South Africa: Defense Intelligence Division: Directorate Intelligence for Operations, 2012), 1-21.

[56] Kiyoshi Maekawa, "Ibunka Kyoiku to Tai-Tero Anzen Hosho: Iraku Fukkoushien Oyobi Goran Kokuren PKO No Kyokun Wo Chushin Ni [Intercultural Education and Anti-Terrorism Security Studies: Iraq Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Golan Heights PKO Lesson Learned], 97-106" *Musashino Gakuin University Japan Research Institute Journal* 4 (2007): 92–109.

[57] United Nations, "Training: Strategic Investment in UN Peacekeeping" (New York, NY: Department of Peacekeeping Operations & Department for Field Support, United Nations, 2012), 21; United Nations, "Report on the Strategic Peacekeeping Training Needs Assessment," Evaluation Report (New York, NY: Department of Peacekeeping Operation & Department for Field Support, United Nations, 2008), 10.

[58] Catherine Lutz, Matthew Gutmann, and Keith Brown, "Conduct and Discipline in UN Peacekeeping Operations: Culture, Political Economy and Gender" (Providence, RI: Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University, 2009), 19.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Pusch, "Intercultural Training in Historical Perspective," 30.

[61] Febbraro, McKee, and Riedel, "Multinational Military Operations and Intercultural Factors (Les opérations militaires multinationales et les facteurs interculturels)," 19.

[62] John W. Creswell, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 4th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc, 2014), 14;

[63] Yin, *Case Study Research*, 50.

[64] Creswell, *Research Design*, 201-203

[65] Zina O'Leary, *Researching Real-World Problems: A Guide to Methods of Inquiry* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2005), 94.

[66] Yin, *Case Study Research*, 50.

[67] Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," 62-64; Langholtz, "The Psychology of Peacekeeping: Genesis, Ethos, and Application," 232-33; Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 56.

[68] Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," 62-64; Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 56.

[69] Hiratsuka, Suzuki, and Pusina, "Explaining the Effectiveness of the Contrast Culture Method," 77; Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 47-56.

[70] Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," 62-64; Langholtz, "The Psychology of Peacekeeping: Genesis, Ethos, and Application," 232-33; Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 47-56.

[71] Dorn and Libben, "Unprepared for Peace?: The Decline of Canadian Peacekeeping Training (and What to Do about It)," 15-33; Mendenhall et al., "Evaluation Studies of Cross-Cultural Training Programs: A Review of the Literature from 1988 to 2000"; Mendenhall et al., "Evaluation Studies of Cross-Cultural Training Programs: A Review of the Literature from 1988 to 2000," 133.

[72] Kimmel, "Cultural and Ethnic Issues of Conflict and Peacekeeping," 62-64; Stewart, "Contrast Culture Training," 47-48.