Chapter Sixteen

Cultural Discourse Analysis within an Ecosystem of Discourse Analytic Approaches

Connections and Boundaries

David Boromisza-Habashi, Leah Sprain, Natasha Shrikant, Lydia Reinig, and Katherine R. Peters

CULTURAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND TWO OTHER HYBRID APPROACHES TO DISCOURSE

Everyday communicative practice occurs at the point of convergence among available discursive resources (or discursive forms), meanings (or ideologies), and communicative activity (context-bound interaction). As a discourse analytic approach, cultural discourse analysis (CuDA) directs the analyst's attention to culturally distinctive communication practices—how different groups of people cultivate discursive resources with particular meanings activated by the context-bound use of those resources that, through their use, constitute social life (Carbaugh & Cerulli, 2017). In this chapter, we highlight CuDA's unique features and contributions to language and social interaction (LSI) research by bringing it into conversation with two other discourse analysis (DA) hybrids: action-implicative discourse analysis (AIDA) and socioculturally oriented discourse analysis (SODA). By discussing CuDA as a hybrid, we honor how it weaves together insights from multiple DA traditions to propel communication inquiry; by situating CuDA in relation to other DA hybrids, we honor Donal Carbaugh's career by enabling future scholars to similarly work with and combine different DA traditions to

Scollo, M., & Milburn, T. (Eds.). (2018). Engaging and transforming global communication through cultural discourse analysis : A tribute to donal carbaugh. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

advance our understanding and appreciation of communication, culture, and social problems.

Discourse can mean anything from a historical monument, a policy, text, talk, a speech, topic-related conversations, or language per se—it can be a genre, a register, or style just as it can be a political program (Wodak, 2008). Given this range of possibilities, it is not surprising that DA can take multiple forms that do not always resemble each other (see Gordon, 2015, and Wodak, 2008, for extended discussions of different discourse analytic approaches). In this chapter, we use DA as a big-tent label for the study of particular segments of talk or text, where researchers use excerpts to make scholarly arguments (Tracy, 2005). That is, we focus on DA as it is situated within LSI research, wherein discourse refers to "language in use," "talk," "text," or "social interaction." DA is strongly empirical, predominantly qualitative, theoretically grounded, detail-oriented, and focused on illuminating how language and communication construct our social and cultural worlds (Gordon, 2015).

CuDA and the other two approaches we focus on here—AIDA and SODA—fall into the category Gordon (2015) calls DA hybrids, which are approaches developed from and informed by more than one of the central LSI approaches to DA: conversation analysis, ethnography of communication, interactional sociolinguistics, and critical discourse analysis. The first three coauthors (Boromisza-Habashi, Sprain, and Shrikant) are members of a group of researchers and educators at the University of Colorado Boulder who work regularly with graduate students (such as the fourth and fifth coauthors, Reinig and Peters) in a program committed to training LSI scholars in multiple LSI traditions and approaches. This training frequently prompts students to develop an interest in the individual approaches and the possibility of combining them as they pursue research questions. In our experience, it can be challenging, at least initially, to track distinctions among approaches and to determine which might be best used in a particular project.

In our experience, one particularly productive way of helping newcomers and LSI scholars appreciate CuDA is juxtaposing it with other DA approaches, such as SODA and AIDA. In doing so, we hope that, besides bringing into relief CuDA's contributions to the study of discourse and LSI, our chapter upholds the value of putting multiple kinds of DA into dialogue with each other (Gordon, 2015) while also enabling scholars to forge new hybrids or work across scholarly tracks. Whereas this chapter is an insufficient resource for *doing* CuDA, AIDA, or SODA analysis, it should help readers navigate between these approaches and develop a better understanding of the kinds of insight CuDA can generate.

Our discussion will not focus on how each approach defines discourse. Relying on that term to trace intellectual boundaries tends to result in confusion. Instead, we attend to the three approaches' hybrid influences, metho-

dology, analytical claims, and orientation to normativity. After sketching the contours of each approach, we provide a sample analysis that illustrates each approach. In the conclusion, we draw on this illustration to situate CuDA with reference to the other two approaches and to highlight the promise of all three to serve as resources for scholars interested in developing hybrid projects.

HYBRID INFLUENCES

CuDA derives from the ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics (Carbaugh & Cerulli, in press). It draws on interactional sociolinguistics' attention to culturally distinctive uses of vocabulary and linguistic styles, linking linguistic and stylistic differences to local meanings made relevant in social interactions. As the editors discuss in the introduction to this volume, the intellectual and historical source of CuDA's impulse to study discourse culturally is the ethnography of communication tradition. Many of the theoretical commitments and methodological moves come from Hymes, Philipsen, and their associates. Indeed, scholars need a deeper understanding of the ethnography of communication's commitments in order to fully utilize CuDA since this hybrid draws so heavily from that tradition.

AIDA is a method for analyzing the talk and texts that comprise social scenes to develop grounded practical theories of communication (Tracy, 1995; Tracy, 2005; Tracy & Craig, 2010). As such, AIDA draws on the practical theory tradition as well as several approaches to discourse analysis (see Tracy & Craig, 2010, for AIDA compared to conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics). Practical theory provides the goal of cultivating practice through the reconstruction of communication practices. From conversation analysis, AIDA takes a commitment to study the particulars of everyday interaction, intonation, abrupt cut-offs, and so on. From interactional sociolinguistics (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Gumperz, 1982), AIDA adopts the view of assessments about conversational actions as culturally inflected judgments (Tracy & Craig, 2010). Discursive psychology informs AIDA's rhetorical stance toward discourse and provides its notion of dilemma. AIDA shares the critical discourse analytic desire to link micro practices with macro discourses.

SODA embodies the generative interplay between DA traditions as a hybrid approach that has been grounding published work for over a decade (e.g., Bailey, 2000; Shrikant, 2014, 2015); yet naming this approach—calling it SODA—is new. Interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982) provides SODA's foundational focus on how linguistic features like word choice, tone, and pauses act as contextualization cues that make racial, ethnic, or cultural differences relevant in implicit ways often not recognized by the

participants. As the result of this focus, SODA encourages the use of specific concepts from other DA traditions as appropriate. Conversation analysis (e.g., Heritage & Clayman, 2010) provides a means to study how, on an interactional level, participants construct identity as emergent, relational, and display shared knowledge about normative kinds of identities through the sequence of their interactions. To make connections between micro and macro, SODA draws on the linguistic anthropological concept of indexicality (Ochs, 1992; Silverstein, 2003), as indexicality holds that, in addition to indexing identities on an interactional (micro) level, participants' linguistic features also index identities through making ideologies (macro) about identity categories relevant to participants' interactions. Critical discourse analysis (Weiss & Wodak, 2003) informs the move to link the micro and macro, particularly with regard to relations of power.

METHODOLOGY

We caution that the easy tendency to rely on specific methodological choices (e.g., ethnographic fieldwork, transcripts of naturally occurring talk) provides incomplete guidance regarding the fundamental concerns of each approach. All three hybrids draw on ethnographic methods and naturally occurring interaction that researchers collect, transcribe, and systematically analyze, albeit in different ways. Like SODA and AIDA, CuDA often favors naturally occurring talk (see Fitch, 2006, about this turn in ethnography of speaking), providing instances of transcribed talk to make scholarly arguments (although exceptions to this trend remain; as recent examples see Nuciforo, 2016, and Poutiainen, 2017). Additionally, participant observation, interviews with members, and the study of organizationally important documents frequently inform AIDA interpretation (Tracy, 2005).

Nonetheless, the extent to which an ethnographic epistemology is central to analysis varies significantly among the three approaches. AIDA and SODA usually do not commit to an ethnographic epistemology that treats the embodied researcher as the primary instrument of the investigation of cultural meanings. Conversely, CuDA analysts are situated ethnographically as they focus on culturally distinctive communication practices (Carbaugh & Cerulli, 2017). Often, this means that an analyst is conducting fieldwork, engaging in participant observation of social interaction, and collecting a range of related data (e.g., documents, interviews, etc.) to fully understand a communication practice. As an example, the status of a particular lexical item as a key term—the "salient word which is identified as standing alone, but around which recurrent or new conceptual allusions may be invoked or created during the very use of the term" (Parkin, 2015, p. 7)—cannot be apparent to the cultural analyst unless she spends an extended amount of time

observing and participating in the life of a target social group. When a CuDA study claims, for example, that "hate speech" is a key term in Hungarian public discourse (Boromisza-Habashi, 2013), that claim is grounded in months or years of the embodied experience of fieldwork. Conversely, a CuDA study may use similar evidence to claim that what many would expect to be a cultural key term (e.g., "dialogue") in fact does not function like one in some contexts (Sprain, van Over, & Morgan, 2016). Such studies sometimes start with fieldwork to discover cultural terms for talk or cultural practices; at other times they start with a cultural term for talk or cultural practice in order to develop its form, function, and meanings. It is possible to complete a CuDA study without extensive ethnographic fieldwork, instead using CuDA as a type of close reading. However, even if ethnographic fieldwork is not the primary form of data collection, CuDA is an ethnographic approach because it privileges participants' meanings.

ANALYTICAL CLAIMS

Following descriptive analysis, CuDA is used to generate interpretative claims about the cultural meanings immanent in a particular communication practice. In other words, it allows the analyst to answer the question, what do participants have to take for granted to use discursive resources in this context in these ways? CuDA attends to the implicit and explicit meanings that people assume about being (personhood, identity), acting (communication), relating (social relations), feeling (affect), and dwelling (connections to places and nature). These claims can be used to provide specific insights into both communication practices and social organization in the groups in which they occur. AIDA is "centrally interested in describing the problems, interactional strategies, and ideals-in-use within existing communicative practices" and aims to develop an understanding of communication that will be action-implicative for practical life (Tracy & Craig, 2010, p. 146). As it pursues that interest, AIDA highlights the frequent discrepancy between how members believe they interact with others and how those interactions actually unfold. SODA focuses on making claims about how the micro (communication features such as word choice, tone, and sequence) reflects, reproduces, negotiates, or challenges the macro (communication ideologies or structural hierarchies). Studies taking this approach illustrate how participants index racial, ethnic, gender, or sexual identities and their intersections in everyday conversations, and how these interactions shape and are shaped by structural relationships among social groups. In sum, the difference among the three approaches' typical analytical claims becomes apparent when we contrast the types of ideology they center as analytic foci. While CuDA brings into relief taken-for-granted cultural meanings that inform indigenous standards for

competent communicative action and social participation, AIDA is concerned with members' taken-for-granted notions about their own practices in contrast to the actual practices they perform, and SODA interrogates taken-for-granted hierarchical distinctions between linguistic varieties and social groups that shape everyday interactions.

ORIENTATION TO NORMATIVITY

Typically, when CuDA moves to critical analysis it does so following an extensive, iterative process of description, interpretation, and comparison. Critical analysis explicitly asks normative questions about what is better and worse within a communication practice, either from the participants' perspective (natural criticism) or from the perspective of the analyst's moral commitments in order to express a normative stance toward the cultural practices under consideration. Through interpretive analysis, CuDA studies can also provide an understanding of why particular ways of speaking are valued (or not) for accomplishing particular social goals within a given speech community.

AIDA is centrally committed to addressing normative problems that arise within particular, situated social practices (Tracy & Craig, 2010). This is accomplished through a positive reconstruction that considers how particular communicative practices should be conducted. The starting point for this reconstruction is the situated ideals pertaining to the focal practice—participants' beliefs about good conduct apparent in moments where they praise and criticize. The scholars' reconstruction of the practice can, of course, move beyond the participants' situated ideals to offer new discourse moves or normative ideals.

By starting with research questions about how micro discourse moves reflect, reproduce, negotiate, or challenge dominant ideologies and hierarchies, SODA begins with an interest in hegemonic norms—the taken-for-granted norms that structure power relations. People may unwittingly reproduce these hegemonic norms through their everyday talk or explicitly challenge them (e.g., via identity politics). By linking micro discourse with these hegemonic norms, SODA provides an account of how hegemonic norms are implicated and upheld in talk while also providing a way of recognizing these relationships in cases where people aim to resist or dismantle hegemonic identities.

ANALYSIS

To illustrate the kinds of distinctions discussed above, we analyze audio-recorded data gathered during Shrikant's eight months of ethnographic field-

work with a Texas chamber of commerce (Shrikant, 2016). The data come from an extreme networking workshop held by the "North City" Chamber of Commerce (NCC). The two participants who appear in the data include Dan, the leader of the workshop, and Sarah, a workshop participant. Overall, there are about 50 participants in this speech event. In the below excerpt, Dan and Sarah define networking and discuss reasons that networking is important. For purposes of confidentiality, names used for people and organizations are pseudonyms. Data transcription is adapted from conversation analytic conventions (Jefferson, 2004). In the analysis below, we juxtapose CuDA, AIDA, and SODA by grounding our analysis in the transcript itself and in observations and documents gathered during ethnographic fieldwork. None of the DA hybrids would rely on this data alone for a full analysis, but we aim to provide an efficient illustration of these approaches. The analysis below (Excerpt 1) highlights the cultural propositions and premises about networking practices that underlie, explain, and are reflected in the interactions (CuDA), a dilemma inherent within networking and situated premises used for resolving it (AIDA), and how participants orient to masculinity as a hegemonic professional identity through their interactions (SODA):

1	Dan	Um (.) other reasons to network?
2		(5.0)
3	Sarah	If you let people know you care about them and you listen to
4		where they are and what they need=
5	Dan	=Bingo=
6	Sarah	=then they'll come back to you=
7		=That's great. Bob's right. Ultimately (.) at the end of the da::↓y is
8		(.) a lot of this is about (.) building business. But what I'm thrilled
9		(.) nobody raised their hand and said it's about selling stuff. (1.0)
10		Cuz there's there's definitely two schools of thought about
11		networking, if you've been to an event where there's a guy
12		working the room passing out business cards, you know hey I
13		wanna come sell ya, I wanna come sell ya, wh-who loves to be
14		sold anym↓ore

First, CuDA and AIDA share an interest in this example as a form of metacommunication, where participants talk about networking as a practice. CuDA highlights that this is an important practice within the community. Making this claim, of course, would not stem only from an analysis of this one example, but rather from spending extended time with the community and/or through interviewing community members and gathering documents. In the case of these data, during Shrikant's ethnographic fieldwork with the NCC she noted the prominence of networking (both as being practiced and

being talked about) across a variety of NCC events. For example, Shrikant attended and audio-recorded an NCC small business committee that met monthly. The purpose of the small business committee was to discuss the needs of chamber members who owned or worked for small businesses and to plan events that help small businesses build their networks. Shrikant kept a copy of the agenda for this meeting, and after the meeting, a staff member used the agenda to explain to Shrikant the importance of this particular meeting. The staff member, George, explained that this committee was one of the most important in the chamber because it taught people how to network—which he defined as "how to interact"—and gave people opportunities to practice networking. He then identified four of the five upcoming chamber events listed on the agenda, including the networking skills workshop where the data from this paper is drawn, as networking events. The fifth event, called the "Leads Group," was not discussed by George in this instance but was identified by other chamber staff members as a networking event primarily targeted toward businesspeople who wanted to gain "leads," that is, people they can connect with to grow their business.

Like CuDA, AIDA begins by developing an extended knowledge of networking as a common institutional practice through multiple forms of data that include both how participants talk with each other in the practice (the focal discourse) and how they talk about their practice (metadiscourse). Using AIDA involves teasing out how participants experience communication problems surrounding networking, the communicative means that participants use to address those problems, and the situated ideals (what counts as good and bad) about networking practices in this community. From this excerpt of metadiscourse, an analyst can reconstruct situated ideals about participants' beliefs about good conduct from the moments where Dan and Sara criticize and praise particular forms of networking.

Let us take a closer look at some of the particular discourse moves in the data that inform all the approaches. Sarah uses pronouns to create two groups: "you" and "they." Sarah constructs "you" as a business professional who "cares" and "listens," and "they" as a client or customer who tells a businessperson "where they are or what they need." The interactional goal of "you" (the businessperson) is to get "they" (the potential client) to "come back to you." Sarah proposes that these particular enactments of professional identities—someone who listens and cares—are valued ones in this community because they reach a particular interactional goal of "building business" (said earlier by another member and repeated later in this excerpt by Dan, line 8). Dan's repeated affirmation of Sarah's response illustrates his agreement.

Dan then contrasts Sarah's relational definition of how networking can build business with the notion of "selling stuff" (line 9). Dan provides a concrete example of what "selling stuff" looks like by discursively construct-

ing a hypothetical situation that is familiar to his participants ("if you've been to an event where," line 11) and a hypothetical "guy working the room passing out business cards" (lines 11–12) that participants might have met at this event. Dan voices this "guy" as repeatedly saying "I wanna come sell ya" (lines 12–13) and then negatively evaluates the "guy's" communication actions through the utterance "who loves to be sold to anymore" (lines 13–14). Although he phrases his evaluation as a question, Dan ends the question with a falling intonation, which indicates it is more of a declarative statement negatively evaluating the "selling stuff" form of networking.

Taking a CuDA perspective we notice how "networking" functions as a cultural term for talk (Carbaugh, 1989, 2017) and how participants' interactions reflect and construct cultural discourses of networking that are prominent in this community. More specifically, a cultural discourse analyst is interested in making broader claims about who the person doing it can and should be, how they are related to other people, what they should feel, and how they should live in place (Scollo, 2011; Carbaugh, 2007).

Dan's question (line 1) explicitly invokes the cultural term for talk "networking," and through asking about "reasons to network" he is inviting participants to construct meanings about networking for these community members. Sarah's answer, in addition to constructing a valued professional identity, also reflects culturally valued notions of personhood and relationships. One cultural proposition of personhood is that a good businessperson is someone who "lets people know you care about them" and "listens to where they are and what they need" and achieves the goal of getting people to "come back to you." Another, related, proposition of personhood is that a typical client is someone who has particular needs ("what they need") given their particular position in the business community ("where they are"). A cultural premise about relating, therefore, is that businesspeople and clients should develop relationships where they care for one another, take interest in one another's business needs, and attempt to maintain long-term relationships to facilitate a potential future business relationship. Through the sequence of their interactions, Dan and Sarah display their agreement about these cultural propositions and premises.

Dan's extended turn, where he contrasts Sarah's relational definition of networking with "selling stuff," also reflects several cultural propositions of personhood and relating. First, the act of networking is about "building business" and building business is *not* about "selling stuff." Through using voicing, Dan's utterances reflect a cultural proposition negatively evaluating a businessperson who simply wants to "sell ya." He contrasts the "selling" relationship with the relationship Sarah described earlier, where a businessperson cares about and listens to someone's needs and then waits for them to come back. Thus, these utterances point to a cultural premise of relating according to which networking involves building long-term relationships

between businesses and clients that are based on care and not on the ability to immediately sell something. Dan also casts clients as persons who do not like to be "sold to anymore." In doing so, Dan points to a shift in the culture of the business community, where previously good business was more directly about selling, but now good business is defined by building relationships that may eventually result in a financial benefit. In addition to propositions and premises, Dan's utterances invoke cultural norms and preferences about what one ought (not) to do during networking. Among good businesspeople, if one wants to build business, it is preferred to listen to clients and create a long-term relationship defined by caring about one another's needs; it is *not* preferable to try to sell your products and services immediately to clients. A CuDA perspective would not make these claims from simply one excerpt, but rather would make claims after seeing patterns of cultural propositions and premises related to networking interactions across ethnographic observations. This excerpt could then be one example of a larger pattern found by the cultural discourse analyst.

By contrast, AIDA can be used to foreground interactional dilemmas within the practice of networking. Overall, an AIDA analysis of this excerpt can highlight a common dilemma business professionals face when networking: how to sell products and grow business without seeming like someone whose primary interest is in selling products. A full analysis would include further instances of metadiscourse about networking (including interviews and documents about the practice) and actual networking practices where participants use particular communicative actions to both establish relationships and market their products and services, constructing participants' situated ideals of how they should network in different scenarios given their goals and institutional structures. Based on an understanding of actual practices, the AIDA analyst would reconstruct networking to show how participants might better approach networking, which might include new ideals and/or different use of discursive resources within the practice itself.

Last, from a SODA perspective, one interesting question about this set of data is how participants index a male identity as a normative professional identity. Drawing from both discourse analytic theory and social theory, a SODA analyst would illustrate how the relationships between everyday conversational practices and gender ideologies reproduce structural inequalities. In analysis of this excerpt, in particular, the analyst would focus on lines 11–12, where Dan constructs a hypothetical situation about "a guy," and in doing so, Dan constructs a man as a typical businessperson. To start, SODA would note how Dan indexes gender in this interaction through using the person reference term "a guy" (line 11) and constructs explicit meanings about "a guy" through describing and evaluating activities in which this "guy" participates ("working the room," "passing out business cards," "who loves to be sold to anymore"). Through using these descriptors, Dan is con-

structing a "guy" as a typical businessperson who many in the room might have met, and he is negatively evaluating this person's behaviors. Furthermore, Dan's use of "a guy" contrasts with Sarah's use of nongendered references ("people" and "they") for business clients, thus indicating that there are multiple ways participants index a businessperson identity, and Dan's use of *guy* does foreground gender as relevant in this interaction. Thus, Dan's utterances reflect and reproduce gender ideologies that position men as natural professionals (Lakoff, 1973) and, therefore, maintains their cultural hegemony (Woolard, 1985) as authorities in business communities.

This example on its own is not enough to make general claims about how people index men as normative professional identities through communication or about whether the male identity is indeed a normative professional identity in this organization. "Gender ideologies are socialized, sustained and transformed through talk, particularly through verbal practices *that recur innumerable times in the lives and members of social groups* (Ochs, 1992, p. 336, emphasis added). Thus, the next step for SODA would be to examine audio-and-video-recorded data across multiple speech events to see if participants regularly position men as normative professionals and identify the ways they do so. A SODA analyst would *not* claim that Dan (or other participants) are necessarily aware of this activity or are sexist people. Instead, a SODA analyst would simply highlight how the everyday, mundane practices in this business community reflect and reproduce gender ideologies and thus contribute to maintaining gender hierarchies.

CONCLUSION

Through the parallel use of CuDA, AIDA, and SODA, we hope to have demonstrated how they might together strengthen analytic insight a researcher can gain from data. CuDA can establish that *networking* is a locally recognized and culturally meaningful term for talk. It can also show that members interpret *networking* as a particular way of acting that stands in sharp contrast with other, culturally dispreferred (Carbaugh, 2005) ways of acting such as *selling*. *Networking* points the analyst to other radiants of meaning, particularly personhood (who is a good businessperson? who is a client?) and social relations (what ought to be the relationship between businesspersons and clients?). This type of insight nicely complements AIDA's interest in developing a grounded account of networking as communication practice to improve how people engage in that practice. AIDA's reconstruction of the ideals and discourse moves within networking can be further nuanced with the cultural knowledge CuDA provides. Insight from CuDA also resonates with the SODA finding that, in the business community under consideration, the businessman has hegemonic, normative status. Taking this type of find-

ing into consideration can serve as a reminder that the model of personhood immanent in talk about *networking* can become subject to contestation by those members of the business community who find the gendered interpretation of "doing business" objectionable. CuDA, on the other hand, reminds the SODA analyst that the model of acting immanent in *networking* may resist, or may be used to resist, such contestation ("We all just want to do good business here.").

Placing insights from these three approaches side-by-side helps us understand CuDA's unique strengths within the ecosystem of discourse analytic approaches. CuDA is particularly useful for analysis that aims to demonstrate people "doing culture" (Otten & Geppert, 2009)—or what Carbaugh (2005) calls "cultures in conversation"—that is, seeing how culture is both revealed and cultivated in practical action. Such insight can deepen AIDA analyses of situated ideals by demonstrating the ways in which such ideals may be deeply rooted in cultural discourses, which can explain their powerful presence in a social group's communicative habitus. The analysis of "doing culture" can also contribute to SODA's understanding of the cultural discursive terrain on which communicative contestation of hegemonic norms can unfold and is resisted.

It is worth pointing out that we are not the first to suggest that CuDA can usefully complement other discourse analytic approaches. As Bingjuan Xiong (2017) demonstrated in her work on categories of citizenship in Chinese public discourse, membership categorization analysis can be used to describe the available meanings of identity categories, and then the radiants of meaning (CuDA) can be used to interpret the implicit meanings (metacultural commentary) about being, acting, relating, feeling, and dwelling. CuDA may also provide a way to bridge the relationship between micro and macro discourses. For example, Fox and Robles's (2010) close examination of "it's like" enactments used DA to demonstrate this phrase as a resource for introducing affect-laden responses to prior events, action, or hypothetical utterances. Drawing on Carbaugh's work, they situated this discursive resource within a broader American practice of the lionization of self-revelation as a preferred mode of speaking.

We hope that the promise of combining CuDA and other DA approaches is compelling to established scholars and newcomers alike who are interested in the analysis of situated interaction. Yet we recognize the specific need for this chapter to demarcate some boundaries around CuDA so that newcomers can more ably navigate this intellectual terrain and select the path that best allows them to answer their research questions.

Our comparison of DA hybrids demonstrates that the choice, collection, and representation of data are not CuDA's primary distinguishing features. What are they, then? First, CuDA focuses on a communication practice or event in order to make claims about its cultural meanings. CuDA brings into

view cultural forms of communication, historically transmitted systems of expression, key cultural terms, cultural forms or sequences, practical norms or rules for conduct, and the conventionally codified meanings participants activate and cultivate as they use this expressive system (Carbaugh, 2008). This cultural orientation attends to ideologies about the conduct of social life, the "unspoken coherence participants take-for-granted in order to understand their communication" (Carbaugh, 2017, p. 19). Second, to support these descriptive and interpretive claims, CuDA presents interpretations of cultural patterns. A CuDA study might present a single instance in a research report, but making a cultural claim requires a broader pattern that stretches across and connects various orders of data including interactions, documents, field notes, and so on. Third, as the sample analysis illustrates, CuDA must establish the relationship between a practice and the ideological foundations of its competent use (i.e., its local "taken-for-grantedness")—this is an essential methodological move even if it does not constitute the primary intellectual contribution of the analysis. This operation involves interpreting explicit and implicit cultural meanings of one or more of the radiants of meaning: being, acting, relating, feeling, and dwelling.

As students of language use work at the nexus of CuDA, AIDA, and/or SODA—as they combine these hybrid approaches into further hybrids that serve them best as they pursue answers to their research question—their research would benefit from explicit reflection on how they mobilize the three approaches. With regard to CuDA, Carbaugh (2007) lays out five basic modes of inquiry: theoretical, descriptive, interpretive, comparative, and critical. Explicitly referencing the mode(s) in which CuDA is being used lends additional force to the analysis, findings, and claims of researchers who decide to use this approach. Following Xiong (2017), scholars can note that they are only using CuDA for interpretation, as an example. The language of modes provides a way of tracking when an analyst is using CuDA in the interpretative mode but not the theoretical mode (or vice versa), such that the analyst is better accountable to the grammar and logic of each mode of inquiry within the corresponding approach. As more scholarship combines AIDA, SODA, and/or CuDA we imagine that additional differences may require accounting for. We call for more of this type of accounting as it helps newcomers and LSI scholars alike better understand the relationship among DA hybrids such that all our work can be enriched.

CuDA is the intellectual fruit of cross-pollination, experimentation, and deep thinking between DA traditions. This book demonstrates the rich insight generated through this approach. We hope scholars embrace Carbaugh's legacy by deftly developing their own hybrids that capture his rigor, generosity, and patience to figure out how to really listen.

REFERENCES

Bailey, B. (2000). Communicative behavior and conflict between African-American customers and Korean immigrant retailers in Los Angeles. *Discourse & Society*, *11*(1), 86–108.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Boromisza-Habashi, D. (2013). *Speaking hatefully: Culture, communication, and political action in Hungary*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Carbaugh, D. (1989). Fifty terms for talk: A cross-cultural study. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), *Language, communication and culture: Current directions* (pp. 93–120). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Carbaugh, D. (2007). Cultural discourse analysis: Communication practices and intercultural encounters. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 36*(3), 167–182.

Carbaugh, D. (2008). Putting policy in its place through cultural discourse analysis. In E. E. Peterson (Ed.), *Communication and public policy: Proceedings of the 2008 International Colloquium on Communication* (pp. 54–65). Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech.

Carbaugh, D. (2017). Terms for talk, take 2: Theorizing communication through its cultural terms and practices. In D. Carbaugh (Ed.), *The handbook of communication in cultural perspective* (pp. 15–28). New York, NY: Routledge.

Carbaugh, D., & Cerulli, T. (2017). Cultural discourse analysis. In Y. Y. Kim (Gen. Ed.) & K. L. McKay-Semmler (Assoc. Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of intercultural communication* (pp. 1–9). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. doi: 10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0117

Fitch, K. L. (2006). Cognitive aspects of ethnographic inquiry. *Discourse Studies, 8*(1), 51–57.

Fox, B. A., & Robles, J. (2010). It's like mmm: Enactments with it's like. *Discourse Studies, 12*(6), 715–738.

Gordon, C. (2015). Discourse analysis. In K. Tracy, C. Ilie, & T. Sandel (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction* (pp. 382–397). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society, 2*(1), 45–79.

Nuciforo, E. V. (2016). Russian folk discourse on problem drinking. *Russian Journal of Communication, 8*(1), 80–93.

Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon* (pp. 335–358). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Otten, M., & Geppert, J. (2009). Mapping the landscape of qualitative research on intercultural communication: A hitchhiker's guide to the methodological galaxy. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 10*, Art. 52. Retrieved fromhttp://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0901520

Parkin, D. (2015). *Revisiting: Keywords, transforming phrases, and cultural concepts. Working papers in urban language & literacies, No. 164*. London, UK: King's College London.

Poutiainen, S. (2017). Finnish terms for talk about communication on a mobile phone. In D. Carbaugh (Ed.), *The handbook of cross-cultural communication* (pp. 168–181). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Scollo, M. (2011). Cultural approaches to discourse analysis: A theoretical and methodological conversation with special focus on Donal Carbaugh's cultural discourse analysis. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *6*(1), 1–32.

Shrikant, N. (2014). "It's like, 'I've never met a lesbian before!'": Personal narratives and the construction of diverse female identities in a lesbian counterpublic. *IPrA Pragmatics, 24*(4), 799–818.

Shrikant, N. (2015). "Yo, it's IST yo": The discursive construction of an Indian American youth identity in a South Asian student club. *Discourse & Society, 26*(4), 480–501.

Shrikant, N. (2016). "Race talk" in organizational discourse: A comparative study of two Texas Chambers of commerce (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved fromhttp://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/668 (668)

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & communication*, *23*(3), 193–229.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sprain, L., van Over, B., & Morgan, E. L. (2016). Divergent meanings of community: Ethnographies of communication in water governance. In T. R. Peterson, H. L. Bergea, A. M. Feldpausch-Parker, & K. Raitio (Eds.), *Communication and community: Constructive and destructive dynamics of social transformation* (pp. 249–265). New York, NY: Routledge.

Tracy, K. (1995). Action-implicative discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *14*(1–2), 195–215.

Tracy, K. (2005). Reconstructing communicative practices: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 301–319). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tracy, K., & Craig, R. T. (2010). Studying interaction in order to cultivate practice: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In J. Streeck (Ed.), *New adventures in language and interaction* (pp. 145–166). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 1–34). New York, NY: Palgrave McMillan.

Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse studies—Important concepts and terms. In R. Wodak and M. Kryzanowski (Eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*, pp. 1–29. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Woolard, K. A. (1985). Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist, 12*(4), 738–748.

Xiong, B. (2017). *Understanding internet-mediated social change in China: Analyzing categories of citizenship in Chinese public discourse* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Colorado Boulder.