

**Chapter 1 : Staff View: Culture in communication**

*This list is based on CrossRef data as of 15 october Please note that it may not be complete. Sources presented here have been supplied by the respective publishers.*

Mon, 20 May Di Luzio et al. Analyses of Intercultural situations. Book Announcement on Linguist: As clearly stated at the very beginning of the Introduction by the three editors, this collection of papers "is dedicated to questions arising in linguistic, sociological and anthropological analyses of intercultural encounters" vii. Consisting of three sections with a combination of both theoretical issues and empirical analyses, the methodological approach of which is "influenced by the phenomenological and hermeneutic tradition of the Sociology of Knowledge, Ethnography of Communication and Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis" vii , this volume has at least three objectives to achieve. First, it tries to explore new theoretical and methodological aspects of intercultural communication through elaborating topics less researched previously. Second, it aims to highlight the role of culture in intercultural communication. Third, it seeks to expound how ideology exerts an influence on participants of diverse cultural backgrounds in interactions cf. This volume has certainly opened new avenues of future research on intercultural communication. This volume is divided into three sections. Section 1 is devoted to "theoretical issues in intercultural communication". In "Communication, contexts and culture" , Hubert Knoblauch adopts a "communicative constructivist approach to intercultural communication". Accordingly, constructed by communicative actions, cultural contexts can be distinguished on three levels: In the last section, Knoblauch delves into the relationship among contexts, culture and intercultural communication, rightly arguing for a refined notion of communicative culture and a sophisticated rationale for the problem of intercultural communication necessary for a better understanding of the complexity and differentiation of modern intercultural communications. In "Contextualization and ideology in intercultural communication" , John J. Gumperz tries to expound the question of how culture, through language and interaction, exercises an influence on our way of thinking and communicating with other people of different backgrounds. Through a detailed but not lengthy presentation of a criminal law case involving intercultural communication brought against a member of an Indian minority culture in a North American town, Gumperz demonstrates that "only by considering ideology in relation to subconsciously internalized background knowledge and linguistic signaling processes can we account for the basic issues of hegemony or symbolic domination, that are so important in intercultural communication" As a pace-setter in intercultural communication research, Gumperz is always insightful in raising new research questions. The next paper, contributed by Susanne Guenther and Thomas Luckmann, is entitled "Asymmetries of knowledge in intercultural communication: The relevance of cultural repertoires of communicative genres" Starting with a small episode concerning table manners between the Chinese and the German, the authors show that social interaction and communication require a certain amount of shared knowledge and more importantly, "a minimum amount of what is significantly the same and what is significant different among the participants" 59 , the lack of which can account for, to a large extent, many an embarrassing problem in intercultural communication. The authors compellingly demonstrate that communicative genres are historically and culturally specific, fixed solutions to recurrent communicative problems and vary from culture to culture, and that knowledge of genres and of their proper use is central to the knowledge required for competent communicative interaction. Section 2 of this volume is devoted to case studies of intercultural encounters. In "Three ways of analyzing communication between East and West Germans as intercultural communication" , Peter Auer and Friederike Kern investigates the possibilities of applying the concepts of interculturality and intercultural communication to the situation in Germany after unification. The authors argue as follows. Issues for intercultural communication at work" explores how cultural variation becomes a part of the changing definitions of work enterprise and how this is made possible by the new computer production conditions of the late modern age. As this paper points out, there are several ways that service encounters enable service personnel and customers to perform this act for each other. First, the designed work environment provides an interactional situation channeling the action into certain paths;

first, the creation of a more or less tight script for many service exchange provides an interactional space for successful communication; and third, the idea of emotional labor evokes more than a mutual arrangement of damage control for self- image. All in all, this paper has shown that the apparent positive image and lack of conflict needs a great deal of work on the part of participants. The next paper, "The making of a witness: On the beheading of rabbits" , Macro Jacquemet, drawing on data from a controversial criminal trial taking place in Naples, Italy, between and , examines narrative performances in a cross- cultural, institutional environment. Jacquemet first discusses the nature and dynamics of the courtroom communication within the Italian legal system and the cross-cultural role played by government witnesses in its proceedings. This paper concludes with a discussion of the role explicit contextualization strategies play in constructing an authoritative discourse in a cross- cultural environment. In "Intercultural negotiation", the last paper of Section 2, Jochen Rehbein deals with verbal and non-verbal elements in business communication, "a type of cooperative opposition based on an institutional type of communication" After listing the characteristics of an auxiliary device , Rehbein presents an excerpt from discussions between a buyer and seller of two different nationalities: Rehbein shows, among others, that different languages employ different communicative apparatuses, both verbal and non-verbal; these apparatuses, different in character, may influence the intercultural interaction. In "Constructing misunderstanding as a cultural event" , Volker Hinnenkamp concentrates on the conflicting effects of miscommunication and misunderstandings. Hinnenkamp criticizes in this paper " the uncritical blending of misunderstanding and intercultural communication" in current relevant researches. For Hinnenkamp, a misunderstanding "may well be an interpretive accomplishment, but it may also be simply an unilateral interpretive matter and even just a felt matter" Drawing upon video analyses of several kinds of misunderstanding occurring in intercultural interactions, Hinnenkamp shows that "the bringing about of interculturality solely by virtue of connecting cultural different background of interlocutors with a misunderstanding cannot be taken for granted" In "Inter- and intra-cultural aspects of dialogue-interpreting" , Frank Ernst Mueller presents various types of lay interpretation in face-to-face interactions. For Mueller, interpreted dialogue can be conceived of as "conversation which is collaboratively designed for a specific mode of translatability" Dialogue- interpreting is an "activity sui generis" Linell Using transcribed interpreted conversation and interpretive findings from a small-scale empirical study dealing with interpreted dialogue of young French and German metal workers and apprentices, Mueller shows "the sub- culturally fine-tuned nature" of the dialogue interpreting and also points out that translatability and its cumbersome and costly machinery may have formalizing and fragmenting effects on the natural flow of conversation Adopting the perspective as advocated by Gumperz e. The last paper of this volume is "External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi-party conversations" written by Gabriele Pallotti. It is argued in this paper that external appropriations have played a vital part in helping this girl achieve the status of ratified participant in already open vectors of activity and that linguistic and sociocultural acquisition should be seen as a tightly intertwined process. One of the questions I would like to ask about this paper is: Would things be still the same if the subject under investigation were not a five-year-old Moroccan girl but a Chinese girl of the same age? Human beings are bestowed with more chances than ever to communicate with people coming from different cultural backgrounds, folkways and many other things. And one of the major and ultimate, in fact, objectives in research into intercultural communication should be how these people can come to mutual understanding without any friction. People have come to realize that cultural mistakes could be far more serious than language mistakes. This very view is also shared by the present volume under review. All the papers in this collection have been strung together by the core thread, which turns out to be the recurring theme throughout, that a comprehensive and convincing account of intercultural communication must take into consideration "actual dialogic contexts" viii. Dynamism should be counted as one of the underlying principles when it comes to explore online intercultural encounters. The volume offers a rich spectrum of intercultural communication research, from cultural differences in contextualization conventions to variable realization of communicative genres, from linguistic ideologies and hegemonial attitudes to "the contextualization of extralinguistic elements in the negotiation of meaning" xiii. All the contributions give a fair view of the state of the art in intercultural communication pursuit and more importantly touch upon new

questions for future research. Of course, some of the arguments presented in this volume need to be further evidenced and validated. And there is one tendency that we should guard against, that is, we human beings appear, if not seem, to regard conclusions drawn from some case studies as generalizations and use them as yardsticks to explain other intercultural encounters. By the way, it would be better if the spelling some authors use British spellings while others employ American spellings and references format could be consistent throughout the volume. To conclude, with both theoretical and empirical approaches going hand in hand, this is an innovative and in many ways thought-provoking collection of papers and would surely be embraced by scholars and students of anthropology, sociology, cultural psychology and, interpretative sociolinguistics. Her general research interests include discourse analysis, pragmatics and, intercultural communication.

**Chapter 2 : Culture in Communication: Analyses of Intercultural Situations - PDF Free Download**

*Intercultural interactants normally develop an awareness of the value mismatch that exists between their ingroups and the opposite party. As a response to the mismatch perceived, interactants.*

The turn to empirical fieldwork evolved with sociolinguist John Gumperz studying multilingual communities in India and inter-ethnic communication in the US. Gumperz grounded his research on tape recordings of multilingual talk, using mainly ethnomethodological, conversation-analytic and communicative-dialectological concepts for a qualitative analysis of the data. Now, with globalisation with its worldwide trade and commerce and the flux of capital, with streams of migration fosters mixing of languages and cultures, and so extends questions of intercultural communication to nearly all national and international domains of life, and hence to publications in all academic disciplines. Wierzbicka, an ethnomethodological, conversation-analytic approach including interactional stylistics and rapport theory. Thanks to these diverse approaches, intercultural communication has developed into a field which combines basic and applied research and in which conceptions about language, society, communicative structure, culture, and the role of mental processes are in contest and in argument. Let us look at an example from John Gumperz. A black female graduate student is sent out after an initial phone contact to interview a black housewife in a low-income quarter. The husband opens the door with a smile: I only came to get some information. The encounter proves that the black interviewer and the black interviewees belong to the same ethnic group but to two distinct social groups. Furthermore, the example shows that the communicative difference is due to the difference in the linguistic varieties of the social groups. Bremer et al. The authors demonstrate that understanding and misunderstanding are discourse-dependent phenomena. Straub et al. In short, groups are constituted by their common stock of presuppositions mostly tied to a common linguistic variety, and create, through common verbal and nonverbal forms, action systems. Thus, action presuppositions do not form a static repertoire of knowledge, but play an active standardizing role in individual action. Limits to communication and memberships are difficult to address due to their presuppositional character, of which the individual actors are barely aware, since presuppositions are givens which transcend the individual person. Not until cultural action comes into play is there any reflection on presuppositions, their range and limits. In analyzing IC, each sub-class of rapport needs to be made explicit. Misunderstandings arise, for instance, when actors introduce differing pattern-knowledge into the same constellation of the action in form of a presupposition. Apologies predominated among Europeans, directives among European men, commissives among South-east-Asian women, complaints among men. This applies to both spoken and written discourse. Communication in institutions is pre-structured as regards the sequences within the more comprehensive communicative units. The actors inside institutions can be divided into two main social groups, the representatives or agents, and the users or clients of the institutions. The particular forms in institutions assume are defined by differing social traditions in different parts of the world. This effects how institutional sequences are pre-structured in the knowledge of agents and clients from different cultural backgrounds, and necessitates cultural bridging particularly in institutional talk. Since in many countries trouble-free communication between agents and clients who speak a different language is in the public interest, interpreters and translators are often employed to bridge the gap in intercultural communication. The reason lies in the action systems discussed above, and also in the fact that, linguistically speaking, emotions originate from speech actions like threatening, refuting, insisting, insinuating etc. If the speaker is not acquainted with the societal background and the possible good will of a culturally diverse addressee. Clyne, this may distort even basic patterns of communication. Ekman, Friesen et al. Aijmer; the tinge field as well. An essential of intercultural communication, then, is that, because of difficulties in mutual understanding, the gap of the intercultural differences in the appraisal of emotion becomes sensitive - to one of the participants at least. Such reflexive procedures could help to downgrade destructive emotions in otherwise conflictory intra-societal rapports originated by whatever

kind of pre- 34 suppositions whether racial, ideological, denominational etc. Mediation of this kind 35 is probably easier in institutional settings, especially in sales talk, when the irritation 36 37 of clients unaccustomed to the commercial practices of the target country needs to ev 38 be appeased. This is best illustrated by the cultural impact of verbal politeness, 39 whose linguistic action patterns e. In contrast, they perceive it as the common 55 construction of new forms of understanding. Analyzing transcribed team discussions 56 57 of Dutch advisers with immigrant teachers of Surinamese, Moroccan, Turkish and 58 other backgrounds they found that the interactants developed new patterns and dis- 59 course forms. Intercultural bridging of an institutional type was observed in medical discourse in which German doctors gave non-German patients instructions which they accepted or adopted with differing degrees of willingness. Eventually, this led to a coop- 6 erative opposition, which did not erupt into an open quarrel but was not resolved ei- 7 ther. The ambivalence inherent in this type of discourse is perhaps best described by 8 the French word *rencontre* meeting in a friendly or hostile sense. A *rencontre* does 9 not count as a failure of communication. On the contrary, communicative structures 10 are activated which steer the discourse over long stretches s. They occur in economic, administrative, political and international in- 16 stitutions diplomacy s. Intercultural mediation by reflexion Fo 21 22 In the above example of an encounter of black persons from distinct social classes, 23 no intercultural communication took place in a strict sense because both clung to 24 their presuppositions as routinised forms of speaking and acting " with the result of rP 25 26 cutting off the bridge to each other. At the same time, reflection construes means of rR 33 true understanding by making recourse to a higher level of mediation, creating pro- 34 ductive and receptive forms on the part of speaker and hearer alike, thus giving rise 35 to innovative forms of communication. Successful cultural ac- ev 38 tion may involve a switch of languages or varieties. If cultural action is suppressed at these 51 points, because there is no restructuring of the mental processes involved, the cul- 52 tural load of these forms leads to a process of reifying which insulates the action sys- 53 tems even more strongly against reflection. A pre-condition is the existence of ac- 56 57 tion systems of the participants which may lead to problems in the interaction. If the doctors had applied the cultural apparatus by means of a comment or 9 another kind of interactional add-on, this could have enabled the patients to voice 10 their own medical interests. The cul- 16 tural apparatus induces techniques which help to reflect the cultural filter so that, in 17 18 intercultural communication, prejudices are detected and possibly deconstructed. A long-term objective of research, 27 therefore, is to promote multilinguality in intercultural communication in order to better 28 meet the needs of agents and clients and to improve institutional talk in monolingual 29 ee settings, too. Especially, the scandalous lack of intercultural communication in bu- 30 31 reaucracies, asylum-granting institutions and courtrooms should be focused upon. Di- 34 verse modes of communication beside the verbal ones, e. Byram shapes a 52 complex framework of five basic parameters, i. Applying the cultural apparatus seems to be especially nec- 53 essary in confrontations in economic and political settings based on cross-societal, intra-societal or on institutional rapports. Interjections in a Contrastive Perspective. Achieving rP 25 26 understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters. Manches- 30 31 ter: The Importance of Not Being Ernest. The feeling behind laughter 35 and humor. Inter-cultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse. Prolegomena zur Untersuchung 45 von Kommunikation in Institutionen. Methoden und Forschungsergebnisse der Funktionalen 47 Pragmatik, pp. The Discourse of Business Negotiation. Berlin 49 50 etc.: Authentisches und zitierendes Handeln. Cambridge 59 University Press, " Understanding in intercultural encounters. A model revisited 2nd ed. Misunderstanding in Social Life. The construction of intercultural discourse: Team 8 discussions of educational advisers. Analyzing Intercultural 10 Communication. Emotion and Intercultural adjust- 13 ment. Handbook of Intercultural 14 Communication, pp. Special Issue on Intercultural Communication in the 19 Professions. Fo 21 Redder, A. Zum Begriff der Kultur. Thoughts on the relationship between 27 language, culture, and society. Beyond 28 misunderstanding, the linguistic reconstruction of intercultural discourse, pp. International Journal of Bilingualism in 34 pr. Global Flowers and Local Complexity. Multilingual Matters ev 38 Spencer-Oatey, H. A Multidisciplinary 39 Approach to Intercultural Communication. Handbuch interkulturelle 41 iew Kompetenz und Kommunikation. The Semantics of Human Interac- 43 44 tion. Emotions across languages and cultures: Intelligibility and Inter-Ethnic Attitudes. Cross-cultural and 60

cross-linguistic perspectives. Zur reparativen Bearbeitung 4 5 von Rezeptionsdefiziten in deutschen und japanischen Diskursen. Eine 10 diskursanalytische Untersuchung zur Wissensvermittlung im mehrsprachigen 11 12 Krankenhaus. Culture, Communication and Polite- 14 ness Theory. Linguistic ana- 16 lyses, language policies and didactic concepts. The Knowledge Economy, Language and Culture.

**Chapter 3 : Table of Contents: Culture in communication**

*"Intercultural communication" is the mediation of cultural differences between social groups through verbal or nonverbal interaction. This kind of bridgeover requires specific techniques necessary for creating the participants' mutual understanding, as will be shown.*

Preliminary observations This volume is dedicated to questions arising in linguistic, sociological and anthropological analyses of intercultural encounters, a subject that is becoming increasingly relevant in the light of recent interest in multicultural societies. The collection focuses on the methodological possibilities of explanatory analyses of intercultural communication and explores the relationship between language and culture. It thus address the question of how participants in intercultural settings both in institutional and informal contexts re construct cultural differences and cultural identities. Empirical analyses go hand-in-hand with the discussion of methodological and theoretical aspects of interculturality and the relationship of language and culture. The collected papers approach the relationship between language and culture through the framework of Interpretative Sociolinguistics. Their methodological approach is therefore influenced by the phenomenological and hermeneutic tradition of the Sociology of Knowledge, Ethnography of Communication and Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis. The volume aims at presenting new theoretical and methodological aspects of Intercultural Communication, focusing on issues such as ideology and hegemonial attitudes, communicative genres and culture-specific genre repertoires, the theory of contextualization and non-verbal prosodic, gestual, mimic contextualization cues in particular. Papers in subsequent sections provide more detailed analyses, concentrating on methodological and empirical issues of ideology, genre and contextualization conventions in intercultural encounters. The papers collected in section II focus on interactions between cultural subgroups and analyze rhetoric and prosodic differences in contextualization conventions and repertoires of genres within these subgroups. Institutional and informal contexts are taken into account. What is the relationship between language, speech and culture in these intercultural encounters? What is the role of culture? The papers also seek to clarify the role of ideology in the sociocultural knowledge of speakers and in the speech situations in which they interact, as well as the role of their hegemonial or non-hegemonial attitudes toward coparticipants and their discourse. The analyses examine the relevance of the variable realization of communicative genres as well as the contextualization of extralinguistic elements in the negotiation of meaning. These are all questions that have not been generally addressed in previous research in intercultural communication. The volume is interdisciplinary. In addressing aspects of Intercultural Communication, scholars from Linguistics, Anthropology, Sociology and Psychology adopt an interactive view of language and all share the conviction that Intercultural Communication must be studied in actual dialogic contexts. Organization The volume is divided into three sections: The theoretically oriented articles collected in this section discuss the role of context and contextualization, culture-specific repertoires of communicative genres and linguistic ideologies as well as the need to include ethnographic information in the analysis of intercultural encounters. They are case studies of interpretative analyses of culture-specific contextualization conventions and different repertoires and uses of communicative genres in intercultural encounters in institutional and informal settings. All papers in the volume discuss general aspects of intercultural communication, such as cultural differences in contextualization conventions, linguistic manifestation of culture and ideology, and the use of communicative genres. They raise issues for in intercultural communication research that are intended to stimulate discussion in the area of intercultural communication in new and relevant ways. This theory starts with the notion of communicative action as developed by the sociology of knowledge, integrating the results of empirical research traditions such as conversation analysis, ethnography of communication and interpretative sociolinguistics. Cultural contexts are constructed by communicative action and are distinguished on three levels: Finally, the social context is set out in terms of social hegemony, ideology and its relevance for the study of intercultural communication. GUMPERZ demonstrates that in modern society the borders between different languages and cultures do not necessarily go hand-in-hand with geographical borders. In interactions, forms and functions of linguistic signs

and communicative and interactive practices can only be evaluated adequately within their own cultural context. As the adequate and common evaluation of speaking practices and contextualization conventions is necessary for the common negotiation of meaning, intercultural communication is prone to misinterpretation. GUMPERZ argues that there are conventional inferences and situated contextualization cues that participants take as their basis for interpreting, at every point of an interaction, what the intention of the speaker is and what is expected as an adequate reaction. These inferences are not only based on common repertoires of communicative genres but also on common socio-cultural knowledge in general and linguistic ideologies. This explanatory concept is illustrated by analysis of an intercultural episode involving a criminal court case brought against a member of an Indian minority culture in a North American town. Statements by the police, who had misinterpreted the cultural speaking practices of the Indian defendant using standards of White cultural speaking habits and ideologies, led to conviction of the Indian. Although the social knowledge of participants in interaction is never identical, social interaction in general and communication in particular still require a definable amount of shared knowledge among participants. Even if non-native speakers have excellent grammatical and lexical skills in a foreign language, they often face problems in negotiating meanings in intercultural encounters. The reason for these problems is based on various kinds of asymmetries of knowledge about culture-specific speaking practices. On the other hand, they are the sediments of socially relevant communicative processes. Communicative genres are socially constructed and thus vary from culture to culture. In intercultural situations, interactants often encounter different repertoires of communicative genres. Lack of knowledge of such differences may lead to problems in some situations. A good deal more treacherous, however, the authors claim, are situations in which interactants participate with repertoires of similar genres that are inadequately supported by knowledge about differences in the mode of employment of the genre, stylistic variations and subgenres, etc. Section 2 of the volume deals with communication between people who speak the same language but belong to different cultural groups within one society and thus do not share the same ideologies and rhetorical or stylistic conventions concerning the realization of particular communicative genres. Job interviews represent a new communicative genre for East Germans. Thus, in interview situations they are confronted with communicative challenges – genre-specific expectations which they have not encountered before. How do the East German interactants deal with the problem? In intercultural service encounters in these restaurants, the acquired strategies of politeness, personal and friendly manners are supposed to lead to positive feelings in the customers and reduce the vulnerability of personal exposure. The analysis of interactions between the trained service people and their customers reveals that culture-specific ways of interacting do not create misunderstandings but are dominated by the trained politeness and personalization of communicative contacts. He documents interactional power asymmetries related to the issue of personhood and respect. His video analysis is based on a buying-and-selling interaction between an American professor and a German representative of a Swiss publishing house. Although the German representative realizes fragments from linguistic schemata of buying-and-selling activities in a brilliant British English performance, he does not achieve a successful negotiation of his own position. By contrast, the insistent and non-responsive negotiation of the American partner represents a typical example of the successful achievement of business aims. In addition, the author raises various questions that are relevant for the analysis of intercultural business negotiation: Instead one has to look at the common interactional history and the commonly constructed institutional constraints which are relevant for the interpretation. Thus, Hinnenkamp deconstructs the notion of culture and strives to aim at something close to situative intercultural. The first part of the paper discusses aspects of interpreting culture within the process of lay translations and shows how the interpreter re-constructs and creatively reconstitutes topics that otherwise would be completely inaccessible to the co-participant. Cooperation in institutional discourse among natives and non-natives is also the topic of the other papers in Section 3. They demonstrate that besides sequential analyses of the ongoing interaction, ethnographic information about linguistic and sociocultural speaking norms of the participants is required for the investigation of intercultural communication. She raises the question of whether symmetrical interaction is possible in this kind of communicative context in which members of a dominant culture interact with members of a non-dominant one. The author also comments on the relationship between the

contextualization of asymmetry and other situational factors such as ideology, friendly and cooperative attitudes towards the co-participants, discourse topic, communicative genre and modality. The paper studies cooperative strategies in producing interactive meaning between the non-native Moroccan child and her Italian classmates and shows how she internalizes and adapts the Italian language and Italian communicative strategies and cultural speaking conventions. Whereas IA seem to create cohesion and topical coherence, EA are used to construct constitutive elements of a communicative genre. In producing IA the speaker reconfirms known constructions, and in producing EA she attempts new constructions. However, both strategies are used both as a means of acquiring linguistic competence and as participation and cooperative accommodation strategies. According to the specific contextual situation, the speaker applies these strategies as a means of interpreting situatively the communicative episode at hand. The papers in this volume were presented and discussed at a workshop on Intercultural Communication held in October at the Villa Vigoni in Menaggio Como, Italy. We wish to acknowledge the assistance of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft as well as the Third University of Rome, whose financial support made the workshop possible. We also extend our thanks to the Director of Villa Vigoni, Prof. Lill, and to his staff for their helpfulness and hospitality. We would also like to thank our publishing editor Isja Conen for her patience and support. Is communication only one subordinate element of culture, and, if so, is intercultural communication only one of many paths between cultures? Is culture to be considered as one sub-system of the communication system, and intercultural communication as something similar to an interpenetration between systems? Or is culture at the very bottom of society, so that real intercultural communication falls prey to cultural relativism and becomes virtually impossible? The relationship between culture and communication may appear obvious, if not trivial, to those influenced by the ideas of postmodernism, poststructuralism or cultural studies. However, even contemporary theoreticians like Richard Rorty still refer to culture in terms of science, philosophy or the arts. This traditional notion of culture has been defined by Scheler. This paradigm is characterised by the idea that culture is being constructed in communicative actions. Although programmatically proposing a theory of communicative action, I shall show that Habermas himself does not manage to avoid the structuralist notion of sign systems independent of social action. However, hardly any theoretical attempts have been made to recognise the contribution of these empirical approaches to the theory of communicative action and culture. Since he takes the socio-cultural lifeworld as being made up of communicative actions, it is reasonable to take this theory as a basis for a notion of communicative culture. On this basis, I intend to develop a notion of communicative action which can provide a general framework for analysing intercultural communication. Communicative action will be shown to construct contexts which are reflexively generated by the very communicative actions which are performed in this context. At an analytic level, one can distinguish three different analytical aspects of communicative actions referring to the different ways in which contextualisation is achieved. Culture can thus be considered as the construction of contexts by means of communicative action. Communicative action is characterised by reflexivity, a feature which is also emphasised in conversation analysis and interpretive sociolinguistics. Using the notion of reflexivity adopted by these approaches, it will be shown Section 3 that it is reflexivity which relates communicative actions to their contexts. The three aspects of contextualisation will then be outlined in relation to the analytical features of communicative action Section 4. These contexts constitute what may be called communicative culture, a notion which may be pertinent to the study of intercultural communication Section 5. There are two reasons for this: This view has been particularly criticised by Bourdieu. To Bourdieu, it is a mistake to look for social effects, i. It is the use of language in social contexts which makes language work. Language, therefore, has to be considered as a form of practice rather than as a system that works independently of ongoing actions. Instead of the meaning of language guiding communicative action, it is rather the social use of language and, for that matter, any sign-system in action which constitutes its meaning. By making this distinction between two types of action he builds up two distinct ontological spheres. Not only is it difficult to explain how these two worlds are held together but the separation is not even accepted by systems theory. Systems theory or the theory of autopoietic systems holds that communication is an all-penetrating phenomenon Luhmann. To systems theory, everything social is not only functional, but also communicative. Whereas systems theory proposes far too general and indistinct a

notion of communication, phenomenologically orientated sociology<sup>4</sup> provides an alternative theory of communicative action which explains how the context of communicative action is constructed by and provides meaning for these very actions. Thus, thinking about a problem may have just as much a right to be called an action as jumping into cold water in order to save someone. Since communicative action is intrinsically orientated towards someone else, it is almost by definition a form of social action.

*Intercultural negotiation / Jochen Rehbein ; External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi-party conversations / Gabriele Pallotti.*

Mon, 20 May Analyses of Intercultural situations. As clearly stated at the very beginning of the Introduction by the three editors, this collection of papers "is dedicated to questions arising in linguistic, sociological and anthropological analyses of intercultural encounters" vii. Consisting of three sections with a combination of both theoretical issues and empirical analyses, the methodological approach of which is "influenced by the phenomenological and hermeneutic tradition of the Sociology of Knowledge, Ethnography of Communication and Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis" vii , this volume has at least three objectives to achieve. First, it tries to explore new theoretical and methodological aspects of intercultural communication through elaborating topics less researched previously. Second, it aims to highlight the role of culture in intercultural communication. Third, it seeks to expound how ideology exerts an influence on participants of diverse cultural backgrounds in interactions cf. This volume has certainly opened new avenues of future research on intercultural communication. This volume is divided into three sections. Section 1 is devoted to "theoretical issues in intercultural communication". In "Communication, contexts and culture" , Hubert Knoblauch adopts a "communicative constructivist approach to intercultural communication". Accordingly, constructed by communicative actions, cultural contexts can be distinguished on three levels: In the last section, Knoblauch delves into the relationship among contexts, culture and intercultural communication, rightly arguing for a refined notion of communicative culture and a sophisticated rationale for the problem of intercultural communication necessary for a better understanding of the complexity and differentiation of modern intercultural communications. In "Contextualization and ideology in intercultural communication" , John J. Gumperz tries to expound the question of how culture, through language and interaction, exercises an influence on our way of thinking and communicating with other people of different backgrounds. Through a detailed but not lengthy presentation of a criminal law case involving intercultural communication brought against a member of an Indian minority culture in a North American town, Gumperz demonstrates that "only by considering ideology in relation to subconsciously internalized background knowledge and linguistic signaling processes can we account for the basic issues of hegemony or symbolic domination, that are so important in intercultural communication" As a pace-setter in intercultural communication research, Gumperz is always insightful in raising new research questions. The next paper, contributed by Susanne Guenther and Thomas Luckmann, is entitled "Asymmetries of knowledge in intercultural communication: The relevance of cultural repertoires of communicative genres" Starting with a small episode concerning table manners between the Chinese and the German, the authors show that social interaction and communication require a certain amount of shared knowledge and more importantly, "a minimum amount of what is significantly the same and what is significant different among the participants" 59 , the lack of which can account for, to a large extent, many an embarrassing problem in intercultural communication. The authors compellingly demonstrate that communicative genres are historically and culturally specific, fixed solutions to recurrent communicative problems and vary from culture to culture, and that knowledge of genres and of their proper use is central to the knowledge required for competent communicative interaction. Section 2 of this volume is devoted to case studies of intercultural encounters. In "Three ways of analyzing communication between East and West Germans as intercultural communication" , Peter Auer and Friederike Kern investigates the possibilities of applying the concepts of interculturality and intercultural communication to the situation in Germany after unification. The authors argue as follows. Issues for intercultural communication at work" explores how cultural variation becomes a part of the changing definitions of work enterprise and how this is made possible by the new computer production conditions of the late modern age. As this paper points out, there are several ways that service encounters enable service personnel and customers to perform this act for each other. First, the designed work environment provides an interactional situation channeling the action into certain paths; first, the creation of a more or less tight script for many service exchange provides an interactional space for

successful communication; and third, the idea of emotional labor evokes more than a mutual arrangement of damage control for self- image. All in all, this paper has shown that the apparent positive image and lack of conflict needs a great deal of work on the part of participants. The next paper, "The making of a witness: On the beheading of rabbits" , Macro Jacquemet, drawing on data from a controversial criminal trial taking place in Naples, Italy, between and , examines narrative performances in a cross- cultural, institutional environment. Jacquemet first discusses the nature and dynamics of the courtroom communication within the Italian legal system and the cross-cultural role played by government witnesses in its proceedings. This paper concludes with a discussion of the role explicit contextualization strategies play in constructing an authoritative discourse in a cross- cultural environment. In "Intercultural negotiation", the last paper of Section 2, Jochen Rehbein deals with verbal and non-verbal elements in business communication, "a type of cooperative opposition based on an institutional type of communication" After listing the characteristics of an auxiliary device , Rehbein presents an excerpt from discussions between a buyer and seller of two different nationalities: Rehbein shows, among others, that different languages employ different communicative apparatuses, both verbal and non-verbal; these apparatuses, different in character, may influence the intercultural interaction. In "Constructing misunderstanding as a cultural event" , Volker Hinnenkamp concentrates on the conflicting effects of miscommunication and misunderstandings. Hinnenkamp criticizes in this paper " the uncritical blending of misunderstanding and intercultural communication" in current relevant researches. For Hinnenkamp, a misunderstanding "may well be an interpretive accomplishment, but it may also be simply an unilateral interpretive matter and even just a felt matter" Drawing upon video analyses of several kinds of misunderstanding occurring in intercultural interactions, Hinnenkamp shows that "the bringing about of interculturality solely by virtue of connecting cultural different background of interlocutors with a misunderstanding cannot be taken for granted" In "Inter- and intra-cultural aspects of dialogue-interpreting" , Frank Ernst Mueller presents various types of lay interpretation in face-to-face interactions. For Mueller, interpreted dialogue can be conceived of as "conversation which is collaboratively designed for a specific mode of translatability" Dialogue- interpreting is an "activity sui generis" Linell Using transcribed interpreted conversation and interpretive findings from a small-scale empirical study dealing with interpreted dialogue of young French and German metal workers and apprentices, Mueller shows "the sub- culturally fine-tuned nature" of the dialogue interpreting and also points out that translatability and its cumbersome and costly machinery may have formalizing and fragmenting effects on the natural flow of conversation Adopting the perspective as advocated by Gumperz e. The last paper of this volume is "External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi-party conversations" written by Gabriele Pallotti. It is argued in this paper that external appropriations have played a vital part in helping this girl achieve the status of ratified participant in already open vectors of activity and that linguistic and sociocultural acquisition should be seen as a tightly intertwined process. One of the questions I would like to ask about this paper is: Would things be still the same if the subject under investigation were not a five-year-old Moroccan girl but a Chinese girl of the same age? Human beings are bestowed with more chances than ever to communicate with people coming from different cultural backgrounds, folkways and many other things. And one of the major and ultimate, in fact, objectives in research into intercultural communication should be how these people can come to mutual understanding without any friction. People have come to realize that cultural mistakes could be far more serious than language mistakes. This very view is also shared by the present volume under review. All the papers in this collection have been strung together by the core thread, which turns out to be the recurring theme throughout, that a comprehensive and convincing account of intercultural communication must take into consideration "actual dialogic contexts" viii. Dynamism should be counted as one of the underlying principles when it comes to explore online intercultural encounters. The volume offers a rich spectrum of intercultural communication research, from cultural differences in contextualization conventions to variable realization of communicative genres, from linguistic ideologies and hegemonial attitudes to "the contextualization of extralinguistic elements in the negotiation of meaning" xiii. All the contributions give a fair view of the state of the art in intercultural communication pursuit and more importantly touch upon new questions for future research. Of course, some of the arguments presented in this volume need to be further

evidenced and validated. And there is one tendency that we should guard against, that is, we human beings appear, if not seem, to regard conclusions drawn from some case studies as generalizations and use them as yardsticks to explain other intercultural encounters. By the way, it would be better if the spelling some authors use British spellings while others employ American spellings and references format could be consistent throughout the volume. To conclude, with both theoretical and empirical approaches going hand in hand, this is an innovative and in many ways thought-provoking collection of papers and would surely be embraced by scholars and students of anthropology, sociology, cultural psychology and, interpretative sociolinguistics. Her general research interests include discourse analysis, pragmatics and, intercultural communication.

## Chapter 5 : LINGUIST List Anthropological Ling: Di Luzio et al. ()

*List of John Benjamins publications for which Jochen Rehbein plays a role.*

## Chapter 6 : Juliane House - Wikipedia

*An analysis of the extent to which culture plays a part in communication. This title explores topics such as context and culture in theoretical issues in intercultural communication, and incorporates.*

## Chapter 7 : Linguist List - Reviews Available for the Book

*|t Communication, contexts and culture / |r Hubert Knoblauch -- |t Contextualization and ideology in intercultural communication / |r John J. Gumperz -- |t Asymmetries of knowledge in intercultural communication / |r Susanne GÄ¼nthner and Thomas Luckmann -- |t Three ways of analysing communication between East and West Germans as intercultural.*

## Chapter 8 : Table of contents for Library of Congress control number

*5th EUNoM Symposium on "ICT, e-Learning and languages" in Barcelona, Catalonia, May Jochen Rehbein (Middle East Technical University, Ankara).*

## Chapter 9 : Interkulturelle Kommunikation - Google Books

*by Jochen Rehbein The paper presents a methodology for empirical multilingual data analysis that combines quantitative and qualitative research. The data is a bilingual Turkish-German and a monolingual Turkish corpus of spoken child language.*