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This paper reports on a study relevant to the psychology literature on pan-cultural self-enhancement; namely, what are some strategies by which people from non-western cultures raise their self-worth? I conducted an experiment to test hypotheses regarding culturally acceptable means of communicating positive feedback and its effect on changes in self-esteem. Japanese were expected to report elevated feelings of self-worth after receiving positive feedback from a friend, whereas Americans were expected to report higher feelings of self-worth after announcing their own positive feedback (given by an experimenter in front of a friend). One hundred and fifty-seven pairs of friends participated in an experiment in which one friend in each pair was the target of positive feedback from a simulated creativity test (delivered by self or friend). Analyses revealed that culture and source of feedback affected the global self-esteem of the test takers and appearance self-esteem of both the test taker and the friend. Relative to each culture, US Americans’ self-esteem increased after self-delivered feedback, whereas the self-esteem of Japanese increased after feedback announced by a friend. The results highlight appropriate feedback situations leading to positive self-evaluation for Japanese and Americans. Implications for intercultural education are discussed.
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It seems obvious that everyone has a need to feel good about his or her self, especially if one considers a cultural system whose members encourage positive self-feelings and are devoted to the pursuit of happiness. However, how about a very different cultural system where group harmony, encouragement, and effort are highly valued? In such a cultural system, would it be important for people to feel good about their selves? If so, in what situations and under what conditions would it be appropriate? The present experimental study was designed to provide some possible answers to these questions. It examines changes in positive self-regard in the context of close relationships in two countries: Japan and the United States.

The Pan-Cultural Self-Enhancement Debate

In a review paper on positive self-regard, Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama
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(1999) report the results of a number of cross-cultural studies, especially with Japanese and North American (US and Canadian) samples. They provide anthropological, sociological, and cultural explanations for reasons why Japanese, in particular, may not have a need for positive self-regard. One reason, for example, is that because traditional Japanese culture values group membership and duty over individual rights, Japanese are motivated not to stand out of a group. Thus, because self-enhancement would involve highlighting one’s positive features, often in comparison to others, this motive should not be found in Japanese culture.

Along the lines of the same argument, other researchers have found evidence to suggest that Japanese are motivated to self-improve or self-criticize, rather than to self-enhance (e.g., Heine et al., 2001; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997). This evidence suggests that self-criticism or self-improvement would benefit the particular in-group of Japanese and that this behavior is rewarded and encouraged in Japan. Similar to the ideas of self-improvement or self-criticism is the prevention dimension of prevention/promotion self-regulatory focus (Higgins, 1996). For example, research has revealed that hurting the group by failing is a concern for East Asians who tend to focus on prevention rather than promotion, whereas North Americans tend to focus on promoting themselves as individuals rather than preventing failure in a group context (Ip & Chiu, 2002).

On the other side of the debate, in the mainstream social psychology literature (primarily based on Western samples), the notion of self-enhancement has been considered to be a universal human motive (e.g., Greenwald, 1980; Sedikides & Strube, 1997; Taylor & Brown, 1988). Data from cross-cultural studies have also supported this idea. For example, in one series of studies, Japanese were found to self-enhance on culturally important traits (Brown & Kobayashi, 2002; 2003) and these findings were replicated and extended in another series of studies where Japanese were found to self-enhance on collectivistic traits, but not on individualistic traits (Sedikides, Gaertner, & Toguchi, 2003). For a summary, including meta-analyses, of evidence for both sides of the debate on universal self-enhancement see Heine (2005), Heine & Hamamura (2007) and Heine, Kitayama, & Hamamura (2007) and Sedikides, Gaertner, & Vevea (2005).

Cross-Cultural Self-Evaluation Research in a Relationship Context

Much of the work summarized above involves research designs where participants completed surveys or engaged in experimental tasks alone. Other studies, however, have examined self-esteem or self-enhancement from a relational approach. For example, in a laboratory experiment involving pairs of friends, both Japanese and Americans demonstrated implicit positive self-evaluations and explicit negative self-evaluations when making comparisons between self and a close friend of the same gender (Kitayama & Uchida, 2003; Kobayashi & Greenwald, 2003), but the role of positive feedback from others in self-esteem maintenance remains to be demonstrated (in the present study).

Other relationship-oriented self-evaluation research has found Japanese to provide external attributions for their successes (e.g., “I did well on the test because I was lucky.”), while expecting others to make internal attributions for their successes (e.g., “My friend
would say ‘you must have studied hard’ or ‘you are a smart person.’” (Muramoto, 2003; Muramoto & Yamaguchi, 1997). However, no cross-cultural experiments have been designed to directly test for the effects of communicating success with friends on self-esteem change in relationships. From the work cited above, Japanese as well as Americans would be expected to show an increase in self-esteem in a non-competitive situation involving a friend, depending on the way feedback was delivered: in the form of self-presentation (feedback from the experimenter announced by the self in front of a friend) or from friend to self. The study described below was designed to test this idea.

**Overview and Predictions of the Present Study**

The present study builds on previous work that has considered self-evaluation in a relational context (Dalsky, Gohm, Noguchi, & Shiomura, 2008; Kitayama & Uchida, 2003; Kobayashi & Greenwald, 2003; Muramoto, 2003; Muramoto & Yamaguchi, 1997). It involves a cross-cultural experiment in which two friends were not engaged in competition to test for cultural differences in the effects of positive feedback on self-esteem. In the United States, it is expected to be more appropriate to announce one’s own achievements (in front of a friend), whereas in Japan it is expected to be more appropriate for one’s achievements to be announced by a friend. Hence, an experiment was designed to test the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis:** Japanese are expected to report an increase in self-esteem after receiving positive feedback from a friend, whereas Americans are expected to report an increase in self-esteem after delivering positive feedback about their own performance (in front of a friend). Moreover, as would be suggested by collective self-esteem theory (see Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1991; 1992), the friends who are participating in the experiment with the target of the creativity test are expected to show changes in self-esteem in the same direction as the creativity test takers.

**Method**

**Participants**

Undergraduates at a university in the United States and a university in Japan volunteered to participate in the experiment with a close friend of the same gender. The universities were each located in rural regions, were mid-sized, and had about the same academic reputation level within each country. American participants were 40 male and 114 female undergraduate volunteers with a mean age of 21 (115 European Americans, 39 African Americans). Analyses to test for the effect of ethnicity were carried out and did not reveal any significant effects on the outcome measure, so data for both ethnic groups remained in the study for the US Americans (some gender effects are mentioned in the discussion). However, data from 4 of 154 participants were dropped due to procedural issues early on in the experimental sessions. Japanese participants were 62 male and 98 female undergraduates with a mean age of 20.5. American participants received experimental research credit or entered a $50 gift certificate drawing if they were not enrolled in a psychology class. Japanese participants received a snack in exchange for participation.

**Measures**

*Rosenberg State Self-Esteem Scale (RSES).* Essentially, self-esteem involves positive evaluations of one’s self (Rosenberg, 1965) and it is traditionally measured with (explicit) self-report surveys. Self-esteem
may be classified as trait self-esteem and state self-esteem. The former refers to a person’s chronic level of self-esteem, whereas the latter refers to a person’s level of self-esteem for a short period of time. The Rosenberg State Self-Esteem Scale includes the same items as in the original Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), but the instructions ask respondents to consider self-evaluations “at this moment” and the Likert scale ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree).

Heatherton & Polivy State Self-Esteem Scale (HPSES). This is a 20-item measure of state self-esteem that asks respondents to consider the present moment when evaluating their self on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 9 (extremely). The scale has items that comprise three subscales: social state self-esteem (e.g., “I am worried about what other people think of me”—reverse scored), appearance state self-esteem (e.g., “I feel that others respect and admire me”), and performance state self-esteem (e.g., “I feel confident that I understand things”). Overall α was .92 (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991).

The Inclusion of the Other in Self Scale (IOS). This is a single-item measure that asks respondents to think of a specific other and to choose, from a number of overlapping circle pairs, the pair that best represents the degree of closeness in their relationship (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992) (α = .83). Participants in the present study were asked how close they were to their friend who was participating in the study with them.

Momentary mood assessment. To confirm that the manipulation in the experiment was changing self-esteem and not mood, participants were asked to “describe how you are feeling right now, at this moment”, using three separate Likert scales (1 = very unhappy to 7 = very happy, 1 = very unpleasant to 7 = very pleasant, and 1 = very negative to 7 = very positive).

Creativity Test. This was a modified version of a 32-item Detailed IQ Test (Test Cafe, 2002). The name was changed to “Creativity Test” in the experiment to reduce effects of a potentially anxiety-provoking “IQ Test”. The number of items was reduced to 24 so participants could complete the test in less than 10 minutes. It should be clear that in the present experiment this was not used as an IQ test, but rather, a (simulated) creativity test (Test Cafe, 2002).

Relationship Closeness Inventory (RCI). This scale measures three factors of relationship closeness with a specific other: frequency, diversity, and strength (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 1989). In the experiment, it was used as an unrelated task for one of the friends to complete while the other participant was taking the creativity test. Respondents were asked to consider their relationship with their friend participating in the study when completing the scale.

All the instruments were translated into Japanese, backtranslated, and checked for equivalence in English meaning.

Procedure

Upon entering a small room with two computers, the experimenter told each pair of participants the experiment was about personality and friendship, and participants signed informed consent statements. Participants completed demographic information and the following measures on PCs in the following order: (a) Rosenberg State Self-Esteem measure (5 out of 10 items); (b) Heatherton & Polivy State Self-Esteem measure (10 out of 20 items); (c) 3 questions to measure momentary mood.

The state self-esteem scales were split into two parts for the pre- and post-test. Rather than administering identical items pre- and post-, the former method was chosen as a precaution for the likely influence of demand characteristics. The concern was that if participants filled out scales with the identical items only 12-15 minutes apart, they would be more likely to guess the purpose of the manipulation and artificially report an increase in self-esteem. Descriptive statistics of items for the pre- and post- measures of the Rosenberg State Self-Esteem scale and Heatherton and Polivy scale were examined for possible outliers due to item differences. These analyses revealed two outliers that were that were removed from subsequent analyses.

After completing these measures, Participant 1 (P1) completed the simulated creativity test while Participant 2 (P2) completed the Relationship Closeness Inventory on paper. In each experimental session, the experimenter randomly determined the role of each participant (P1 or P2) with a coin toss in the United States and the drawing of a slip of paper in Japan (because tossing a coin is not common in Japan). The experimenter told participants they had 10 minutes to complete the test or survey. After 10 minutes, the experimenter collected the surveys and instructed participants to complete an Inclusion of the Other in the Self Scale while the experimenter was ostensibly scoring the creativity test. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two feedback conditions: the other-feedback condition or self-feedback condition.
In the other-feedback condition, the experimenter handed the results paper to P2, asking him or her to read the creativity test results aloud to P1, exactly as written: “The results of your creativity test indicate that you are above average in creativity and your score is in the 90th percentile”. In the self-feedback condition, the experimenter handed the results paper to P1, asking him or her to read the creativity test results aloud to P2: “The results of my creativity test indicate that I am above average in creativity and my score is in the 90th percentile”.

Several precautions were taken to ensure that participants would believe the feedback manipulation was authentic. First, the feedback paper was printed on university letterhead with the names of the researchers. Also, to simulate scoring of the creativity tests, the experimenter sat at a table with his or her back turned to the participants and used a red pen as if he or she was actually scoring the creativity tests. The experimenter filled in the feedback forms so that the words “above average” and 90th were written on every sheet. The participants were only shown the feedback sheet; not their actual creativity test. Follow-up questions after the experiment confirmed that nearly all of the participants believed the experimental manipulation to be authentic (96%).

Immediately following the creativity test feedback, participants were asked to complete the following measures on PCs: (a) Rosenberg State Self-Esteem Scale (5 out of 10 items); (b) Heatherton & Polivy State Self-Esteem Scale (10 out of 20 items); (c) three items to measure momentary mood; (d) follow up questions about the self-esteem manipulation; and (e) two other surveys as part of a separate survey study. At the conclusion of the experiment participants were debriefed, told that the creativity test feedback was false and only a part of the experiment, and thanked for their participation.

Analyses of Data

Before the data analyses to test the main hypothesis, several preliminary data analyses were conducted for this study including interpersonal closeness, to be sure that the participants were friends, and momentary mood, to be sure the manipulation changed feelings related to the self and not mood.

Interpersonal Closeness

Participants were asked to consider how close they felt to their partner in the study and to complete the Inclusion of Other in the Self (IOS) Scale. Confirming that the pairs of participants in the experiments were close friends, the modal response on the IOS scale for both Americans and Japanese was 3 on a 5-point scale. That is, most of the participants chose overlapping circles of self and other as the most accurate representation of their relationship with their friend (choices 1 and 2 on the scale were non-overlapping circles). The mean responses across cultures were not significantly different as Americans ($M = 3.1, SD = 1.1$) reported to be as close to their partner in the study as Japanese ($M = 2.9, SD = .85$), $t(312) = 1.91$, $p = .06$, $d = .20$ and the IOS scores did not differ across experimental conditions ($t(312) = 3.03$, $p = .13$).

Momentary Mood

Paired sample $t$ tests confirmed that in the American sample mood was not changed by the feedback manipulation for participants who took the creativity test, $t(75) = –.65$, $p = .10$, $d = .17$ ($M_{pre} = 5.1$ and $M_{post} = 5.3$, $SD_{pre} = 1.2$ and $SD_{post} = 1.1$) and their friends, $t(75) = .44$, $d = .10$ ($M_{pre} = 5.1$ and $M_{post} = 5.2$, $SD_{pre} = .92$ and $SD_{post} = 1.04$). Mood was also not changed for Japanese participants who took the creativity test, $t(79) = -.68$, $p = .50$, $d = 0$ ($M_{pre} = 4.4$ and $M_{post} = 4.4$, $SD_{pre} = 1.0$ and $SD_{post} = .96$) and their friends, $t(79) = 1.05$, $p = .30$, $d = .07$ ($M_{pre} = 5.2$ and $M_{post} = 5.1$, $SD_{pre} = 1.3$ and $SD_{post} = 1.6$).

Tests of Hypotheses

If the hypotheses are supported, Americans should show an increase between the pre- and post-test measures of self-esteem in the self-feedback condition, relative to the Japanese who should show an increase from the pre- and post-test measures of self-esteem in the other-feedback condition. A significant interaction effect with an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Culture by Feedback condition would confirm these hypotheses. Therefore, ANOVAs for both creativity test-takers and their friends in the experiment are presented below.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To test for the hypothesized interaction of Culture X Feedback on self-esteem change, 2 (feedback) X 2 (culture) X 2 (pre-/post-state self-esteem) mixed ANOVAs were conducted. The following results were the only significant effects in all analyses at $p < .05$.

**Global State Self-Esteem Change**

A mixed ANOVA revealed a significant interaction for global state self-esteem change for the participants in the pairs who completed the creativity test, $F(1,147) = 10.54, p = .001, \eta^2 = .06$. As expected, $t$ tests revealed that Americans reported a greater increase in global state self-esteem than Japanese in the self-feedback condition, $t(75) = 2.71, p = .008, d = .62 (SD_{Americans} = 1.05, SD_{Japanese} = 1.06)$, whereas Japanese reported a greater increase than Americans in global self-esteem change in the other-feedback condition, $t(76) = -1.92, p = .06, d = .43 (SD_{Americans} = 1.20, SD_{Japanese} = 1.09)$ (see Fig. 1 for mean differences). Thus, supporting the hypothesis, the global self-esteem American participants increased more when they announced their own positive results, whereas the global self-esteem of Japanese participants increased more when they received positive feedback from a friend.

For the friends of the participants, a mixed ANOVA did not reveal a significant interaction, but rather, a significant main effect for Culture emerged as the global state self-esteem of Americans’ friends increased more than their Japanese counterparts regardless of feedback condition ($M_{Americans} = .39, M_{Japanese} = -.12; SD_{Americans} = 1.06, SD_{Japanese} = .96), F(1,147) = 7.0, p = .002, \eta^2 = .06$.

**Appearance State Self-Esteem Change**

A mixed ANOVA on changes in appearance state self-esteem for participants who completed the creativity test revealed a significant interaction, $F(1,147) = 5.78, p = .02, \eta^2 = .04$. Americans reported a greater increase in appearance state self-esteem than Japanese in the self-feedback condition, $t(75) = 2.59, p = .01, d = .59 (SD_{Americans} = 1.59, SD_{Japanese} = 1.52)$. The cultural difference in the other-feedback condition was not significant, however, $t(76) = - .84, p = .40, d = .19$ (see Fig. 2 for mean differences).

For participants’ friends, a mixed ANOVA revealed a significant interaction for changes in appearance state self-esteem that replicated the pattern of results for Creativity Test takers, $F(1,147) = 4.58, p = .03, \eta^2 = .03$ (Fig. 3).

Again, the significant interaction effect for Feedback and Culture on changes in participants’ appearance self-esteem suggests that Americans feel better about themselves after delivering their own positive feedback, whereas Japanese feel better about themselves after delivering positive feedback to their friend.

**Social State Self-Esteem Change**

A mixed ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for Culture on social state self-esteem change as Americans who took the creativity test reported a larger increase than
Fig. 1. Global state self-esteem change for participants who completed the creativity test (in the self-feedback or other-feedback condition)

Fig. 2. Appearance state self-esteem change for participants who completed the creativity test (in the self-feedback or other-feedback condition)

Fig. 3. Appearance state self-esteem change for participants’ friends (in the self-feedback or other-feedback condition)
Japanese \((M_{\text{Americans}} = .32, M_{\text{Japanese}} = -.30; SD_{\text{Americans}} = 1.49, SD_{\text{Japanese}} = 1.12), F(1,147) = 8.69, p = .004, \eta^2 = .05.\) T-tests revealed that this cultural difference was only found in the self-feedback condition where the self-esteem of Americans increased more than their Japanese counterparts \((M_{\text{Americans}} = .53, M_{\text{Japanese}} = -.33; SD_{\text{Americans}} = 1.60, SD_{\text{Japanese}} = 1.22), t(75) = 2.70, p = .009, d = .60.\) No cultural difference was found in the other-feedback condition, \(t(76) = -1.39, p = .17, d = .11.\) For participants’ friends, mixed ANOVAs revealed no significant effects at \(p < .05.\)

**Summary of the Results**

Overall, the results of this study suggest that there are differences in appropriate social situations for positive self-evaluation in Japan and the United States. For two separate measures of state self-esteem (i.e., global and appearance) it was experimentally demonstrated that, relative to the other culture, a situation involving receiving positive feedback from a friend for Japanese leads to a greater increase in the target’s self-esteem, whereas for Americans, providing positive self-feedback leads to a greater increase in the target’s self-esteem. This significant pattern of results was also revealed for participants who were friends of the creativity test taker for changes in appearance self-esteem. That is, for Japanese, a situation involving positive feedback from a friend led to a greater increase in appearance self-esteem for the person delivering the praise, whereas in the United States, a situation involving positive self-feedback led to a greater change in appearance self-esteem for the friend (who was simply present in the room). It was also shown in the experiment that the manipulation affected only self-esteem and not mood, because the feedback was self-relevant.

Why does it appear that self-esteem decreased in the self-feedback condition for Japanese and the other-feedback condition for Americans? It could be that for the participants in Japan, saying good things about one’s self may lead to embarrassment and puts one in a socially awkward position, thus leading to a decrease in self-esteem compared to when one is receiving positive feedback from a friend. As for the American data, the results are not as easy to explain. Perhaps again, it is more socially acceptable in American culture to boast about the self and to receive positive feedback from a friend might be a socially awkward situation. Further research needs to be done to examine these possibilities.

**Future Directions**

Future investigations related to the present work may be directed towards examining strategies for indirect self-enhancement in Japan. To begin, it would be important to distinguish the behavior of complimenting one’s friend’s achievements from the behavior of boasting about one’s friend’s achievements (via basking in reflective glory: see Tesser 1988), as a strategy for indirect self-enhancement. The results of the current study suggest that, relative to each culture, for Japanese, delivering positive feedback to a friend leads to an increase in appearance self-esteem for both members of the pair and an increase in global self-esteem for the target.

Future work will isolate the effects of the experimenter’s presence and the behavior
of providing positive feedback to the target. Previous research has investigated how exchanging compliments may lead to indirect self-enhancement in Japan (Dalsky, Gohm, Noguchi, & Shiomura, 2008) and an extension of this work will consider how exchange of support in relationships leads to subjective well-being in Japan. In relationship-oriented collectivist cultures such as Japan and group-oriented collectivist cultures such as the United States (Yuki, 2003), exchanging compliments and support is expected to play a key role in enhancing the self-worth of a friend, partner, or team member who may be included in the self (Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991).

A Note on Gender Effects

In the current work, a variety of different subscales were used to measure self-esteem changes and global self-esteem was not only influenced by the manipulation, but also appearance self-esteem and social self-esteem. This is to be expected because the experimental design involved a social situation in which feedback was delivered in front of a friend and an experimenter. Though gender was not the focus of this study, additional analyses involving gender revealed some significant effects for only participants who completed the relationship survey: a) a main effect emerged for gender as appearance self-esteem of women increased more than that of men in both cultures; b) a post-hoc test clarified this main effect and revealed appearance self-esteem of Japanese women increased more than that of Japanese men, whereas there was no gender difference for Americans; c) social self-esteem of women increased more than men when their friend delivered her own positive feedback—there was no gender difference when positive feedback was delivered to friends. Investigations involving the effects of the exchange of compliments and support on subjective well-being with gender as a possible moderator may shed more light on these findings related to gender differences and gender by source of feedback interactions.

Limitations

With regards to internal validity, the experiment was not designed to test whether the effect of self-esteem change was due to the verbal announcement of the feedback or the positive feedback itself. Additional studies including conditions in which written feedback is given only to the test taker and another condition in which written feedback is given to both the test taker and friend could isolate the effects of the verbal announcement of the positive results. Moreover, it could be argued that the experimental design of this study does not in fact isolate the effects of the feedback source between the self and the friend because in the self-feedback condition, the participant is actually receiving the positive feedback from the experimenter. An additional study could examine the effects of the experimenter’s feedback with a condition in which the experimenter delivers feedback in front of the test taker and the friend. This would isolate the effects of the source of feedback and help to determine whether the announcement of positive feedback by the friend (not only the experimenter) leads to the boost in self-esteem. In the end, the goal of the current study was simply to suggest that given a particular communication situation, Japanese will show a different pattern of positive self-evaluation results than
Americans, and it is hoped that these findings may be applied to settings outside the laboratory (i.e., educational settings).

Questions may also be raised as to why both global and appearance self-esteem changed in the experiment when there were no specific theoretical predictions regarding changes in appearance self-esteem in particular. To address this issue, future studies may examine the possibility that appearance self-esteem may be an especially sensitive indicator for changes in state self-esteem in similar situations. As the appearance self-esteem subscale used in the present study includes items that mostly measure respondents’ self-evaluations towards physical appearance, the findings that emerged in this study provide some indication of the link between positive feedback in a social situation and how one perceives his or her physical appearance. These findings are included rather than omitted so that they may inspire future research.

Implications for Intercultural Education

It is hoped that the results of the present study will provide intercultural practitioners with useful information. In preparing a Western sojourner for success in Japan, for example, it may be misleading to emphasize stereotypes that could be simply derived from the social psychology literature such as Japanese collectivism and the importance of trying hard and preventing failure—rather than emphasizing rewards and praise—especially when empirical support for this notion is questionable (for a critique of this common view see Matsumoto, 1999; Takano & Osaka, 1999).

It is also hoped that the present experimental paradigm may not be so different from a classroom situation in which the results of test scores or performance reports may be delivered not in front of an entire class but rather by peers for classes in which peer-learning/teaching is encouraged. In such situations, the results of the current experiment imply appropriate classroom techniques for enhancing the self-worth of students: those students from cultural backgrounds in which it is appropriate to boast about the self may benefit from different social situations in the classroom than students from other cultural backgrounds. Educators who are sojourners may improve their practice by being aware and sensitive to the needs of the students in their host culture to become trusted and effective teachers.
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