Hand book of International and Intercultural Communication (eds. W. Gudykunst & B. Mody). Sage. 2002.

3

Cultural Communication

GERRY PHILIPSEN
University of Washington

Cultural communication is a complex human practice that encompasses two interrelated aspects of social life. The first aspect is culturally distinctive ways of communicating—the use of particular means and meanings of communication that can be found in particular times, places, and social milieus. In this sense, cultural communication is communicative conduct that is infused with the particulars of cultures. The second aspect is the role of communication in performing the cultural, or communal, function—the workings of communication in constituting the communal life of a community and in providing individuals the opportunity to participate in, identify with, and negotiate that life. In this sense, cultural communication is the work that people do in coming to terms with the communicative demands of their life-worlds. In this chapter, I examine cultural communication in both of these aspects and in terms of their interrelation.

THE TERM *CULTURAL COMMUNICATION*

When people use the term ***cultural communication,*** what do they mean? I begin with a consideration of three early, undefined uses of the term, and then turn to a later, programmatic use of it, to provide a basis for establishing a working definition of cultural communication that is grounded in the way the term has been used in extant scholarship.

An early use of cultural communication in anthropology suggests a reference to communication as a process through which cultural difference is expressed and constructed. Schwartz (1980) used the title *Socialization as Cultural Communication: Development of a Theme in the Work of Margaret Mead* for an edited collection of works by the anthropologist Margaret Mead. Hanson (1982) makes a similar use of the term in his edited volume of

essays dedicated to the memory of Gregory Bateson, *Studies in Symbolism and Cultural Communication*. The theme that both of these collections develop is that humans grow up not to be just any human, or universal human, but rather, through a process of communication, become socialized into a particularly cultured version of a human being. Schwartz and Hanson, and by implication Mead and Bateson, think of cultural communication in terms of differences in conduct across societies and of the mediating role of communication in socializing individuals into a particular cultural way of being.

In "The Problem of Speech Genres," first published in Russia in 1953, the Russian literary scholar Bakhtin (1953/1986) used an expression that was later translated as "cultural communication." In that essay, Bakhtin refers to "highly developed and organized cultural communication (primarily written)," "complex cultural communication," "complexly organized cultural communication (scientific and artistic)," and "cultural communication." He juxtaposes "cultural communication" in apparent contrast to "active speech communication" and to "various primary (simple) genres that have taken form in unmediated communication." He also integrates secondary and primary genres into one inter-animating system of communicative practices. In this usage, cultural communication refers to those speech genres of a society that manifest its public, relatively permanent, widely distributed forms and ways of communicating, but ways and forms that are interdependent with the everyday speech habits of individuals in that society.

Writing in the field of communication studies, in an essay about communication systems, Cushman and Craig (1976) articulated the basic functions, typical structures, and typical processes of cultural, social-organizational, and interpersonal communication systems. For cultural communication systems, Cushman and Craig proposed that "consensus about institutions" is the basic function. The basic structures of cultural communication are, to Cushman and Craig, networks (nation, culture, class, subculture, region, community, and family) and codes (language, dialect, and accent). Typical processes are diffusion, especially via mass media, and customs and rituals. In this usage, cultural communication refers to a process of activity in which individuals in a society act so as to produce and regulate shared understandings about social life that will serve as a warrant for shared meaning and coordinated activity among the members of that society.

Each of these early uses of cultural communication emphasizes a particular aspect of cultural communication, but they all have two features in common as well. First, each is concerned with the distinctiveness of communication in particular societies and cultures. Second, each treats communication as a site and resource for establishing, sustaining, and negotiating a community's sense of identity and an individual's sense of membership in and identification with a community.

The three early uses of cultural communication mentioned above can be seen, in retrospect, as having set the stage for an explicit formulation of cultural communication as a programmatic enterprise in the field of communication. Cultural communication, as a named field of study, was proposed by Philipsen in an essay titled "The Prospect for Cultural Communication," which was first circulated in 1981 but not published until 1987. Prior to its eventual publication, the 1981 formulation of cultural communication was acknowledged as a programmatic enterprise by Carbaugh (1985), Cushman and Cahn (1985), Eastman (1985), Hiemstra (1983), Katriel (1986), and Ting-Toomey (1984). Subsequent references to the program pro-

posed by Philipsen include Baxter (1993), Braithwaite (1990b), Carbaugh (1988a, 1988b, 1995), Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn (1997), Collier and Thomas (1988), Dissanayake (1989), Griffin (1997), Hall (1994), Hecht, Collier, and Ribeau (1993), Katriel (1991), Miyahira (1999), Ruud (1995), and Sequeira (1993, 1994). Carbaugh's (1990b) article and (1990a) edited volume, *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact,* use the expression in a way that is consistent with the earlier formulation.

At the time of the writing of "The Prospect for Cultural Communication" (Philipsen, 1981, 1987), there were in the communication studies discipline several important lines of research and pedagogy that treated communication from a cultural standpoint. "The ethnography of communication" was a call for and realization of a program of descriptive-comparative study of cultural ways of speaking (see Hymes, 1962; Philipsen, 1975; Murray, 1993). "Intercultural communication" emphasized the study of misunderstandings between people who use different cultures from each other (Condon & Yousef, 1975; Leeds-Hurwitz, 1990; Samovar & Porter, 1972). The study of "cultural commu nication systems" emphasized the role of communication as a practical resource in facilitating consensus about institutions among members within social groups (Cushman & Craig, 1976). Communication and critical "cultural studies" (Hall, 1980) treated communicative practices as a site and resource for the expression and maintenance of cultural domination by some people over others, thus problematizing the consensus model of cultural communication systems explicated by Cushman and Craig. By 1981, all of these had been conceived and had been developed into full-blown areas of study, each with its own assumptions, literatures, and commitments.

Philipsen (1981, 1987) proposed cultural communication as a distinctive approach to the study of culturally situated communication, one that is related and indebted to, but distinctive from, such approaches as cultural communication systems, intercultural communication, critical studies of communication and culture, and the ethnography of communication. Drawing from these other traditions, cultural communication, as proposed by Philipsen, brought together two important strands of earlier research on culture and communication. These two strands are (1) differences across groups in terms of communicative practices and (2) the role of communication as a resource in managing discursively the individual-communal dialectic. Woven together, these strands constitute the fabric of cultural communication as an academic enterprise, and it is to that fabric that I now turn.

TWO PRINCIPLES OF CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

In this section of the chapter, I present and develop two principles of cultural communication. For each of these, I state and elaborate the principle. Then, for each principle I acknowledge key texts from which it is in part drawn and point to some of the empirical evidence that cultural communication researchers have produced that bear on it.

Principle 1: Every communal conversation bears traces of culturally distinctive means and meanings of communicative conduct.

A *communal conversation* is a historically situated, ongoing communicative process in which participants in the life of a social world construct, express, and negotiate the terms on which they conduct their lives together. In

The Philosophy of Literary Form, Kenneth Burke (1941) describes such a process:

> Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent, depending upon the quality of your ally's assistance. However, the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress. (pp. 110-111)

Burke's description of a "discussion" has several features that apply to what I am calling a communal conversation. First, it is an ongoing communicative event—in this case a discussion—with a past ("others have long preceded you"), present ("they are engaged in . . . discussion"), and future ("the discussion is interminable"). Second, the discussion is situated physically—this one is in "a parlor." Third, the discussion precedes and outlives its momentary participants ("others have long preceded you," "you . . . depart, with the discussion still . . . in progress"). Finally, individuals figure out the nature of the discussion and then insinuate themselves into it ("you listen for a while" and when "you have caught the tenor of the argument . . . then you put in your oar").

The discussion that Burke describes is an ongoing communicative event, is physically situated, transcends its momentary participants, provides an opportunity for individuals to learn to participate in it, and has a dynamic potential. In these ways, it is much like any communal conversation. But his characterization also has many local particulars written into it. It is a *particular type* of communicative event, a discussion, and if discussions might be found everywhere, in all times and places, not every community has a word for "discussion" and not every community has discussions precisely like the one Burke imagines. Such ongoing communicative events are held in *various places* across various societies, not always in parlors. They are, for example, conducted around the stove in a general store (Bauman, 1972), on the street or street corner (Philipsen, 1976), in an office or office building (Carbaugh, 1988a; Hiemstra, 1983), in electronic space (Wick, 1997), and so forth. The discussion has a *particular tone*—described here in terms of heat. Some societies, historical and contemporary, do indeed have "heated" (Burke's word) discussions and have a vocabulary for talking about "heat" in speech. Such a historical society is 17th-century New England, where everyday discourse was filled with many common expressions for heated speech (St. George, 1984), and the Chamula use many terms and expressions to designate the speech of "people whose hearts are heated" (Gossen, 1974). Two reports by French observers of contemporary American discussion comment on how cool American discussions seem in contrast to similar communicative events in France (Carroll, 1988; Varenne, 1977). Although there might be heated discussions in every communal conversation, they vary in terms of how heated they are, how frequent they are, how they are judged because of their heat, and how many types of heated speech there might be. Finally, Burke's discussion is characterized by a *particular discursive structure,* with one person speaking, another responding with an objec-

tion, another then responding to the objection; it is not ever or everywhere thus (Reisman, 1974).

The members of every group or community partake of a communal conversation. This is a universal aspect of human experience. But each particular communal conversation has traces of a distinctive culture; that is, it is infused with local particulars of setting (parlor vs. corner), genre (discussion vs. small talk), tone (heated vs. cool), structure (sequential vs. contrapuntal participation), and so forth. When Burke, inevitably, infuses cultural particulars into the hypothetical discussion he describes, he describes it as something very particular—very cultured. Although his portrait of a communal conversation is infused with cultural particulars, it is, at the same time, a portrait that is true of all communicative events—that is, all communal conversations bear traces of local, particular means and meanings. The particulars vary; that there are particulars is a constant.

A communal conversation is always conducted in and through particular means of communication, and these means have particular meanings for the people who use and experience them. *Means* refer to particular languages, dialects, styles, routines, organizing principles, interpretive conventions, ways of speaking, and genres of communication. The *meanings* of these means refer to the significance that people experience in relation to them, that is, what they take them to be and whether they judge them to be appropriate, intelligible, efficacious, pleasing, and so forth. The culturally distinctive resources for communicative conduct that appear in a communal conversation consist of the particular communicative means and meanings, or the particular configuration of means and meanings, which can be found in it.

Wherever people construct, express, and negotiate the terms on which they conduct their lives together, there will be traces of means of communication, and of their meanings to those who produce and experience them, that are particular to that setting, era, or milieus. Therefore, to come to know the possibilities for participation in a given communal conversation requires learning the answer to two questions. First, what, here and now, are the particular means with which the particular conversation is conducted? The answer encompasses languages, dialects, styles, gestures, speech genres, communicative routines, principles for interpreting and evaluating communicative conduct, and the like. Second, what, in this particular here and now, do these means mean to those who use and experience them? What, for example, does it mean, in the context of a particular communal conversation, for someone to use one or another language, to perform a particular communicative act, to enact a particular episodic sequence, and the like?

An early seminal statement about the cultural distinctiveness of communicative conduct is found in Hymes (1962), a treatise that sets forth key assumptions and a call for fieldwork pertaining to culturally distinctive communication in various speech communities. This was followed by a restatement of the original program, a modification of the initial descriptive framework that had been proposed, and a review of preliminary fieldwork that had been produced, or discovered, to illustrate and help refine the framework (Hymes, 1972). Hymes's development of the ethnography of communication as a programmatic enterprise, and his reviews of fieldwork studies that provided empirical materials in which to ground the development, painted a picture of substantial difference in communicative means, meanings, and conduct not only across but also within social communities (Hymes, 1962, 1972, 1977). They also painted a picture of such means, meanings,

and conduct as subject to negotiation and change within communities (in this regard, see, especially, Hymes, 1977).

Initially, Hymes (1962, 1972) worked with a body of fieldwork data that bear only indirectly on cultural distinctiveness in communication. But his calls for basic fieldwork directed to cross-cultural studies of communication, first sounded in 1962 (Hymes, 1962), had by 1986 yielded some 250 separate publications that document culturally distinctive patterns of communicative conduct (Philipsen & Carbaugh, 1986). By 1993, the ethnography of communication had been established as an "elite interdisciplinary scientific field" (Murray, 1993), whose literature documented considerable variation across speech communities in the ways people talked about, conceptualized, practiced, and experienced communication.

Building on the work of the ethnography of communication, Philipsen (1989a) presents the axiom of cultural particularity and arrays a wide range of ethnographic research that supports the axiom. The central claim of the axiom of cultural particularity is that the efficacious resources for creating shared meaning and motivating coordinated action vary across social groups. The support arrayed for this axiom consists of a series of ethnographic studies that, following Hymes's original proposal, provides evidence for cultural particularity, rather than universality, in terms of such communicative phenomena as speech acts (Rosaldo, 1982), the self concept as a generative mechanism in communicative conduct (Philipsen, 1975), facework rules (Katriel, 1986), and rules of conversational sequencing (Reisman, 1974).

Philipsen (1992, 1997) draws from a program of ethnographic fieldwork in multiple societies so as to formulate speech codes theory, that is, a theory of culturally distinctive codes of communicative conduct. See, for empirical works that have particularly influenced the development of the theory, ethnographies by Carbaugh (1988a), Fitch (1991), Katriel (1986), Katriel and Philipsen (1981), and Philipsen (1975, 1976, 1986) and the comparative review by Carbaugh (1989) of a wide range of ethnographies. Speech codes theory, building on the extant literature, posits that the distinctive communicative record of a communal conversation can be interpreted as implicating a distinctive code (or, as in Philipsen, 1992, codes) of communication. In this sense, a speech code refers to a historically enacted, socially constructed system of terms, meanings, premises, and rules pertaining to communicative conduct.

A speech code, the theory posits, implicates a distinctive way of answering the following questions: What is a person, and how is personhood efficaciously and properly enacted communicatively? What is an ideal state of sociation, and how do people efficaciously and properly link themselves into such states through communicative conduct? What are efficacious and proper means of communication, and what meanings are expressed in and through their situated use? Thus, to say, from this perspective, that every communal conversation bears traces of distinctive means of communicative conduct and distinctive meanings associated with their use is to say that every communal conversation is its own world of personal possibility, social morality, and strategic efficacy. This is a principal theoretical conclusion of cultural communication research.

Scholars working in the cultural communication tradition have now produced a substantial body of empirical fieldwork that examines in depth a culturally distinctive communicative practice in a particular society. These include such studies, cited chronologically, as the following:

- Philipsen (1975, 1976, 1986, 1992; Katriel & Philipsen, 1981): "Teamsterville" and "Nacirema" ways of communicating, ways found within a single society, the former reporting an indigenous system of rules and terms for communicative conduct that manifest a code of honor, the latter reporting an indigenous code that configures historically distinctive meanings that are mapped by such words as *communication, self, relationship,* and *work*
- Hiemstra (1983): a code of meanings pertaining to communication technologies used in an American office
- Katriel (1986): Israeli "speaking dugri," a culturally distinctive way of communicating whereby speakers simultaneously express themselves to others in a confrontational way and affirm a widely appreciated social code of assertiveness, sincerity, and naturalness
- Carbaugh (1988a): talk, on an American television talk show, about communication in the intimate aspects of the speakers' lives, talk that implicates a code of "communication" that privileges the individual over the social
- Fitch (1991): Colombian terms for addressing others in face-to-face interaction, with an emphasis on multiple meanings and terms that configure culturally distinctive senses of Spanish *madre* (mother)
- Sequeira (1993, 1994): personal address, speaking in tongues, and performance of healing rituals, in an American church, that at once express, for the participants who enact them, a personal faith and a code of communal identification
- Hecht et al. (1993): African American communication patterns and their meanings to those who produce them
- Braithwaite (1990b): rituals, myths, and social dramas, in the communal talk of American veterans of the Vietnam War
- Carbaugh (1996): American ways of expressing one's culturally distinctive sense of "self" and attendant ideological expressions
- Fong (1998): Chinese immigrant responses to Euro-American compliments and the social code implicated therein
- Miyahira (1999): Japanese and American presentations of self in a bilingual English classroom, with attention to ritualized expressions of a code of personhood
- Covarrubias (1999): pronouns of personal address (*tu* and *usted*) and the ethic of cooperativeness that they implicate, in a Mexican business organization
- Coutu (2000): oppositional codes in justificatory political discourse in American discussions of the Vietnam War
- Carbaugh (2000): Blackfeet (Native Americans in Montana, United States) communicative practices for experiencing self in relation to nature
- Winchatz (in press): pronouns of personal address (*du* and *Sie*) in German daily interactions, and the culturally distinctive dimensions of social meaning they express for those who produce and experience them in context

Each of the studies cited above draws from the communal conversation of a different society. Taken together, they represent research conducted in several languages, including English, Hebrew, Spanish (including a Colombian and a Mexican variety), Japanese, and German. They differ in terms of the specific communicative and cultural phenomena with which they deal. These include, as examples: ways of presenting oneself in social situations, rules for participating in communicative events, the enactment of everyday speech genres, rules and meanings pertaining to personal address, and meta-communicative terms and premises (i.e., culturally distinctive

terminology pertaining to communicative conduct).

For all their differences in terms of what phenomena were focused on and in terms of the distinctiveness across societies of communicative practices found, there are substantial similarities in approach in all of these studies. First, all of them were based on the descriptive framework of the ethnography of communication model. Second, all of them examined particular means of communication and the particular meanings these means have for the participants in some particular communal conversation. Third, all of them go beyond describing a communicative practice in terms of behavioral enactment and meaning to show the culturally distinctive model of an ideal person, social relations, and strategic action implicated in the local practice.

In addition to studies done in one particular society, several cultural communication researchers have reviewed ethnographic studies from multiple societies, based on multiple languages, with an eye to differences across societies in the way particular communicative practices are enacted. In all of the following, a common methodological approach was used. Ethnographies were selected for comparative study that (1) employ a common descriptive-comparative framework (that of the ethnography of communication; Hymes 1962, 1972), (2) represent a range of communities and languages, and (3) focus on a similar particular aspect of communication. In each study, the separate ethnographies were then juxtaposed to each other so as to search for comparisons and contrasts in terms of how a particular communicative phenomenon does or does not occur across distinctive communal conversations.

Studies using this comparative approach have found substantial differences, across societies, in terms of the particular cultural elements that are infused into such communicative acts or practices as

- The use of indirection in speech acts (Katriel, 1986)
- Indigenous terms used to refer to communicative acts and ways of communicating (Carbaugh, 1989)
- Local ways of expressing one's sense of identification with a local code or community and for presenting oneself as a member of a community (Philipsen, 1989b)
- Indigenous terms and associated practices pertaining to gossip (Goldsmith, 1989/1990)
- Rules for whether to speak or remain silent in a given social situation (Braithwaite, 1990a)
- Cultural forms for providing social support (Katriel, 1993)
- Rules for responding to compliments (Fong, 1994)
- Rules for the giving of advice in interpersonal contexts (Goldsmith & Fitch, 1997)
- Expressions of power in interpersonal relationships (Fitch, 1998)

These comparative studies show considerable variation across societies, in terms of how culture is manifested in a wide range of communicative activities.

It is important to emphasize not only what is said in this explication of Principle 1 but also what is not said. In saying that every communal conversation bears traces of a distinctive culture is to say that everywhere there are particulars in the means and meanings of communicative conduct. It is not to say that there are no universal features of communicative conduct, that is, ways of communicating that transcend particular times, places, and milieus. The empirical record suggests that, indeed, there are universals in communicative conduct. Two types of universals that have received empirical support are (1) ways that people produce and interpret nonverbal expressions of emotion (Ekman & Keltner, 1999) and (2) ways that conversations are

structured, in terms of some of the details of how persons are referred to and in how turns are managed in conversation (Hopper & Chen, 1996; Moerman, 1988). These appear to be consequential findings, in and of themselves, and further consequential in that they suggest, by implication, the possibility and probability of universals in communicative conduct. The point of Principle 1 is that one of the transcultural facts of communicative conduct is that there is much in communicative conduct that is culturally distinctive.

Principle 2: Communication is a heuristic and performative resource for performing the cultural function in the lives of individuals and communities.

The cultural, or communal, function is concerned with what a group or individual has settled, or is trying to settle, as to how individuals are to live as members of a community. From the standpoint of the community as a whole, the cultural function consists of establishing, sustaining, and negotiating a communal sense of what its principles and standards are for conducting the communal conversation. These are principles and standards of who may communicate to or with whom, about what, through which means, and toward what ends. From the standpoint of an individual, the cultural function consists of establishing, sustaining, and negotiating how the individual can, will, or should, personally, come to terms with the communal sense of communicative conduct. This involves whether and how individuals participate in, and thereby identify and align with, a given communal conversation.

It is in communicative conduct that the locally distinctive agreements and understandings about communication are displayed for observers of and participants in a communal conversation. It is through observing the conversation that its prospective participants learn the ways that people act, and respond to communicative actions, in that conversation. Thus, the terms of a communal conversation—the means (and the meanings of those means) that constitute it—are displayed in the conversation itself. This is the sense in which communication is *heuristic*—it is a resource in and through which the infant or the newcomer can learn about the distinctive local means and meanings of communication.

Communication is also a *performative* resource. It is a means in and through which an individual not only can learn about the communal conversation but can participate in it as well. As Burke (1941) put it, "You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar" (p. 10). The listening until you decide that you have caught the tenor is a heuristic use of the communication that constitutes, at any given moment, a communal conversation; the putting in of your oar is a performative act in which an individual acts in and toward the conversation. Treating communication as a performative act draws attention to human purposes, to the individual capacity for artful and strategic conduct in coming to terms with the codes of a given life-world.

The ethnography of communication had focused attention on the speech community as a site for studying communicative conduct, on the multiple functions that communicative conduct can serve in the life of a community, and on the diversity of communicative means across and within communities (Hymes, 1962, 1972, 1974, 1977). This emphasis on diverse functional possibilities created an opportunity to think about what I am calling the cultural function. Although Hymes did not formulate a cultural function of communicative conduct, he hinted at it in his treatment of two previous lines of thinking. One is Malinowski's (1935) idea of phatic communion, the use of language in creating contact, a tie of pure interpersonal

union, independent of any referential content (Hymes, 1972, p. 40). The second is Mead's (1937) proposal, and reference to suggestive cases, that a sense of communal participation and identification is accomplished with different communicative means and meanings in different societies. Drawing on these resources, Hymes (1972) left the way open for an eventual formulation of the cultural function.

The work of the anthropologist Victor Turner (1980) is also an important resource in developing the idea of the cultural function of communication, as it is formulated here. Turner focused on communicative forms in the cultural work of a community and in the cultural work of individuals within a community. His formulation of such forms as myth, ritual, and social drama, as processual enactments in the life of a community, provided the basis for proposing communicative conduct as a site of cultural work and as a resource for doing that work. It is in and through the creative use of such forms that, first, the communal life of a community is enacted, and thus, second, those who experience a particular communal conversation can learn what is being said about the possibilities and proprieties of communication as social action in that community. The use of such forms, third, provides the individual with resources for communicative performance. In Turner's scheme, it is in and through the use of such forms that the individual can do three things. One of these is to enact an identity vis-à-vis the community, as through participation in a ritual. Another is to appropriate and to display some variation on the communal story, through monitoring myths and telling, in communal terms, one's own story. A third is to monitor and engage critically with the communal moral system through taking a part in the social dramas, what Burke called the "dramas of living," of the community.

Building on both Hymes and Turner, Philipsen (1981, 1987) proposed an explicit theoretical formulation of cultural communication. That proposal can be summarized in three parts. First, cultural communication is that communicative conduct that performs the cultural function. Second, communication is a performative resource in doing the cultural work of communities and individuals. Third, the cultural function is performed, communicatively, in distinctive ways across different communal conversations.

Philipsen's (1981, 1987) formulation of cultural communication called for fieldwork studies that focused on communication in the performance of the cultural function. By 1989, it was possible to review a body of work that had responded to that call. Philipsen (1989b) reviews studies of four different communal conversations: (1) that of a working-class neighborhood in Chicago, Illinois (Philipsen, 1975, 1976, 1986), (2) a generalized U.S. conversation that is carried out at the public level (on televised talk shows) and at the interpersonal level in face-to-face interaction (Carbaugh, 1988b; Katriel & Philipsen, 1981), (3) that of Israeli Sabras (Katriel, 1986), and (4) that of a small community in Bond, Kentucky (Ray, 1987). For each of these communal conversations, there were found distinctive communicative routines and episodic sequences in and through which participants experienced a subjective sense of social identity and community membership. Furthermore, each of these distinctive ways of performing the cultural function also implicates a distinctive communal sense of the nature of persons, society, and communicative action.

Following the early studies of communication in the performance of the cultural function, a large body of studies was published in which distinctive cultural ways of performing the cultural function and different cultural

outlooks on persons, society, and communicative action were documented. These include, among others, the following:

- Studies of rituals as episodic sequences in and through which a local code is implicated and individuals enact a sense of communal membership: Braithwaite (1990b), Carbaugh (1993), Fitch (1991), Katriel (1991), Katriel and Philipsen (1981), Philipsen (1992, 1997), Sequeira (1993), and Schely-Newman (1999)
- Studies of stories, myths, and narratives as forms in which communal identities are displayed, appropriated, and deployed in expressions of personal identity: Braithwaite (1990b), Hiemstra (1983), Katriel (1986), Philipsen (1992, particularly chaps. 4 and 5), and Schely-Newman (1999)
- Studies of social dramas as a processual form in and through which the rules for communicative conduct in a communal conversation are exposed, tested, and negotiated: Baxter (1993), Braithwaite (1990b), Carbaugh (1996), Katriel (1986), Philipsen (1975, 1986, 2000), and Ruud (1995, 2000)
- Studies of the use of indigenous meta-communicative vocabularies as resources for communal identification and alignment, and expression of division and tension: Carbaugh (1989, 2000), Coutu (2000), Eastman (1985), Huspek (1993), Katriel and Philipsen (1981), and Katriel (1991, 1993)

Although the initial formulation of the descriptive-theoretic framework for cultural communication (Philipsen, 1981, 1987, 1992) provided specific ways that diversity, difference, and dynamism are manifested in a community's communicative life, much of the early work in this tradition emphasized identification and alignment with a single community and a dominant code. Recently, however, several cultural communication researchers have applied the framework in ways and to situations that foreground diversity, even division, within a particular communal conversation. Furthermore, recently several cultural communication scholars have focused on communicative situations in which the focus is the contact of distinctive codes in interaction. For example, Carbaugh's (1990a) volume addresses *cultural* communication and *inter*cultural contact. Philipsen (1992, particularly chap. 6) shows the dialectical relation of two codes operative in the communicative conduct of one society. Huspek (1993, 2000) opens the way for a treatment of dueling or opposing codes. Such work has, at once, demonstrated the robustness of the basic impetus of the initial formulation but has also led to its expansion. Such studies include the following:

- Carbaugh (1993) shows how a specific series of televised confrontations between Russians and Americans reveals the use of two communicative codes, Russian and American, codes that differentially treat the nature of the individual, social relations, and strategic action. This shows, in a powerful way, how the framework can be used to create an understanding of cross-cultural communication that is truly cross-code communication (see also Lindsley, 1999).
- Huspek and Kendall (1993) show workers in a lumberyard consciously using meta- communicative vocabularies as a strategic resource to position themselves in opposition to a dominant organizational and societal code of communicative conduct.
- Baxter (1993), Coutu (2000), and Ruud (1995, 2000) apply the framework in such a way as to produce pictures of communal conversations in which the use of divergent (Huspek, 1993, would say "dueling") codes manifests discursive tension as a central fact of those conversations.
- Schely-Newman (1999) shows communication as a performative activity through which

individuals not only adapt to the communal conversation but also act so as to remake that conversation.

- Philipsen (2000) shows how speakers who challenge the dominant practices of a communal conversation can demonstrate that such practices are incompatible with a larger social code and thus serve to undermine the legitimacy of those practices.

Cases such as those described above have prompted an elaboration and reformulation of the cultural communication framework. Philipsen (1998) proposes that every person's life task, and it is a task that must be performed and renewed throughout one's life, is to come to terms with the communal conversations of one's life-worlds. Performing that task can include (1) fashioning and expressing a cultural identity, (2) communicating across cultural codes, (3) appropriating and integrating from among the multiple cultural identities that are available to oneself, and (4) critically evaluating, or endeavoring to undermine, a given culture. Coming to terms with a communal conversation is the performance of such tasks as these.

Each of the four tasks mentioned above varies in terms of the communicative demands placed on the individual and in terms of the communicative competencies linked to performance of the task. The first situation, fashioning and expressing a cultural identity, requires locating action chains, scenarios, and scripts that are at the center of a communal conversation and with which the individual's story can be identified. The second situation, communicating across codes, requires locating differences in interpretation and evaluation in the discourses indigenous to other communal conversations and then negotiating bases of meaning and action that transcend the codes drawn from different conversations. The third situation, appropriating and integrating from among the multiple cultural identities that are available to and have existential significance for oneself, requires learning to think through paradoxes and reconcile elements of disparate discourses into an integrative whole (Orbe, 1998, is an important resource here). Finally, critically evaluating requires that one locate contradictions between theory and practice of a code, locate internal contradictions in a dominant code, and articulate a new image of good that has rhetorical power in a particular community.

Philipsen (1998) presents a systematic framework for investigating cultural communication in the various situations described above—learning a single cultural code, communicating across codes, integrating diverse codes within one life, and critically undermining a dominant code. That framework posits underlying mechanisms that characterize each of the four situations as well as rhetorical devices that interlocutors deploy in working through the demands of those situations. This new framework, like that proposed in Philipsen (1981, 1987), was inspired by and grounded in cases produced by cultural communication researchers. Likewise, it was formulated so as to be open to revision based on new cases, a methodological strategy that has informed the ethnography of communication since its inception (Hymes, 1962, 1972).

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have discussed cultural communication, first, by interpreting what the term *cultural communication* means. I have proposed that cultural communication refers to that communicative conduct that is infused with cultural particulars of the means and meanings of communicative conduct. Furthermore, I have proposed that cultural communication refers to the activity in and

through which a community and the people that comprise it construct, enact, and negotiate a communal sense of communicative conduct. Thus, the term refers to a structural aspect of all communicative conduct—it is infused with cultural particulars. And it refers to a functional aspect of communicative conduct—it is a resource through which communities and the individuals that comprise them come to terms with their cultures.

During the past 20 years, a considerable body of research has been produced that documents the distinctiveness of communicative conduct across distinctive times, places, and milieus. Thus, the research provides substantial support for Principle 1: Every communal conversation bears traces of culturally distinctive means and meanings of communicative conduct.

Although the research conducted under the name of cultural communication does not argue against universals in communicative conduct, it does provide substantial evidence of the universality of cultural particulars. These particulars can be observed at two levels. One is the particular communicative means that are deployed in a particular milieu—in short, distinctive ways of communicating. The second level is the meanings of those means to those who use and experience them. The empirical record documents considerable variety across and within communal conversations in what those means are and in what significance they have for those who partake of them. The record is based on studies conducted in several parts of the world and on studies done in several languages.

The research record shows that the diverse ways of communicating that have been observed and reported by cultural communication researchers have an important common characteristic. That common characteristic is that the communicative details of each particular communal conversation implicate preferred ways of being a person, a model of the ideal society, and a theory of the role of communication in linking persons in social relations.

Given the distinctiveness, across and within communal conversations, of the codes of communication that people use, and given the social ideologies implicated in those codes, it should be no surprise that communicative conduct is an arena for learning about and performing the communal function in particular societies. The research record documents (a) great variety in the communicative forms used to perform the cultural function and (b) great variety in the ways that individuals use communication as a strategic resource in performing the cultural function. Such research provides substantial illustration and elaboration of Principle 2: Communication is a heuristic and performative resource for performing the cultural function in the lives of individuals and communities.

Current theoretical work is directed to encompassing cultural communication research generated in all four of these contexts, and others, to produce a systematic, comprehensive framework of culture in communication and communication in the process of learning, sustaining, negotiating, and transforming cultures.

Cultural communication, as a complex human practice, has been formulated here by defining it and by developing two related principles that elaborate and constitute that formulation. There is a substantial record of research that supports, illustrates, and elaborates this formulation. The record of research in cultural communication is one that is marked by new discoveries in ways of communicating and in performing the cultural function, and thus it is anticipated that there are many new discoveries to be anticipated in the years to come.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press. (Original work published 1953)

Bauman, R. (1972). The La Have Island general store: Sociability and verbal art in a Nova Scotia community. *Journal of American Folklore, 85,* 330-343.

Baxter, L. (1993). "Talking things through" and "putting it in writing": Two codes of communication in an academic institution. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21,* 313-326.

Braithwaite, C. (1990a). Communicative silence: A crosscultural study of Basso's hypothesis. In D. Carbaugh (Ed.), *Cultural communication and intercultural contact* (pp. 321-327). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Braithwaite, C. (1990b). Cultural communication among Vietnam veterans: Ritual, myth and social drama. In R. Morris & P. Ehrenhaus (Eds.), *The cultural legacy of Vietnam* (pp. 145-170). Norwood, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Burke, K. (1941). *The philosophy of literary form.* New York: Random House.

Carbaugh, D. (1985). Cultural communication and organizing. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 9,* 30-47.

Carbaugh, D. (1988a). Cultural terms and tensions in the speech at a television station. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 52,* 216-237.

Carbaugh, D. (1988b). *Talking American: Cultural discourses on* Donahue. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Carbaugh, D. (1989). Fifty terms for talk: A cross-cultural study. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 13,* 93-120.

Carbaugh, D. (Ed.). (1990a). *Cultural communication and intercultural contact.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Carbaugh, D. (1990b). Toward a perspective on cultural communication and intercultural contact. *Semiotica, 80,* 15-35.

Carbaugh, D. (1993). "Soul" and "self": Soviet and American cultures in conversation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 79,* 182-200.

Carbaugh, D. (1995). The ethnographic communication theory of Philipsen and associates. In D. Cushman & B. Kovacic (Eds.), *Watershed research traditions in human communication theory* (pp. 269-298). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Carbaugh, D. (1996). *Situating selves: The communication of social identities in American scenes.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Carbaugh, D. (2000). "Just listen": "Listening" and landscape among the Blackfeet. *Western Journal of Communication, 63,* 250-270.

Carbaugh, D., Gibson, T., & Milburn, T. (1997). A view of communication and culture: Scenes in an ethnic cultural center at a private college. In B. Kovacic (Ed.), *Emerging theories of human communication* (pp. 1-24). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Carroll, R. (1988). *Cultural misunderstandings: The French-American experience* (C. Volk, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collier, M., & Thomas, M. (1998). Cultural identity: An interpretive perspective. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 12,* 99-120.

Condon, J., & Yousef, F. (1975). *An introduction to intercultural communication.* Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Coutu, L. (2000). Communication codes of rationality and spirituality in the discourse of and about Robert S. McNamara's *In retrospect. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33,* 179-212.

Covarrubias, P. (1999). *Pronominally speaking: Mexican enactments of* tu *and* usted *as interpersonal components of organizational networks of cooperation.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Cushman, D., & Cahn, D. (1985). *Communication in interpersonal relationships.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cushman, D., & Craig, R. (1976). Communication systems: Interpersonal implications. In G. Miller (Ed.), *Explorations in interpersonal communication* (pp. 37-58). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dissanayake, W. (1990). Intercultural communication as a focus of research: A programmatic note. In S. King (Ed.), *Human communication as a field of study: Selected contemporary views* (pp. 105-112). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Eastman, C. (1983). Establishing social identity through language use. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 4*, 1-20.

Ekman, P., & Keltner, D. (1999). Universal facial expressions of emotion: An old controversy and new findings. In U. Segerstrale & P. Molnar (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication: Where nature meets culture* (pp. 27-46). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fitch, K. (1991). The interplay of linguistic universals and cultural knowledge in personal address: Colombian *madre* terms. *Communication Monographs, 58*, 254-272.

Fitch, K. (1998). *Speaking relationally: Culture, communication, and interpersonal communication.* New York: Guilford.

Fong, M. (1994). *Chinese immigrants' interpretations of their intercultural compliment interactions with European Americans.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Fong, M. (1998). Chinese immigrants' perceptions of semantic dimensions of direct/indirect communication in intercultural compliment interactions with North Americans. *Howard Journal of Communications, 9*, 245-262.

Goldsmith, D. (1989/1990). Gossip from the native's point of view: A comparative analysis. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 23*, 163-194.

Goldsmith, D., & Fitch, K. (1997). The normative context of advice as social support. *Human Communication Research, 23*, 454-476.

Gossen, G. (1974). *Chamulas in the world of the sun: Time and space in a Maya oral tradition.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Griffin, E. (1997). Speech codes theory (the ethnography of communication) of Gerry Philipsen. In *A first look at communication theory* (pp. 432-443). New York: McGrawHill.

Hall, B. (1991). An elaboration of the structural possibilities for engaging in alignment episodes. *Communication Monographs, 58*, 79-100.

Hall, B. (1994). Understanding intercultural conflict through an analysis of kernel images and rhetorical visions. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 5*, 63-87.

Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/decoding. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, & Paul Willis (Eds.), *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies, 1972-1979* (pp. 128-138). London: Hutchinson.

Hanson, A. (Ed.). (1982). *Studies in symbolism and cultural communication* (Publications in Anthropology No. 14). Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Hecht, M., Collier, M., & Ribeau, S. (1993). *African American communication: Ethnic identity and cultural interpretation.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hiemstra, G. (1983). You say you want a revolution? "Information technology" in organizations. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 7* (pp. 802-827). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hopper, R., & Chen, C. (1996). Languages, cultures, relationships: Telephone openings in Taiwan. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 29*, 291-313.

Huspek, M. (1993). Dueling structures: The theory of resistance in discourse. *Communication Theory, 3*, 1-25.

Huspek, M. (2000). Oppositional codes: The case of the Penitentiary of New Mexico riot. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*, 144-163.

Huspek, M., & Kendall, K. (1993). On withholding voice: An analysis of the political vocabulary of a "nonpolitical" speech community. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77*, 1-19.

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13-53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hymes, D. (1974). Ways of speaking. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 433-451). London: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1977). Qualitative/quantitative research methodologies in education: A linguistic perspective. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 8*, 165-176.

Katriel, T. (1986). *Talking straight: Dugri speech in Israeli Sabra culture.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Katriel, T. (1991). *Communal webs: Communication and culture in contemporary Israel.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Katriel, T. (1993). Lefargen: A study in Israeli semantics of social relations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26,* 31-54.

Katriel, T., & Philipsen, G. (1981). "What we need is communication": "Communication" as a cultural category in some American speech. *Communication Monographs, 48,* 301-317.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (1990). Notes on the history of intercultural communication: The Foreign Service Institute and the mandate for intercultural training. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 76,* 262-281.

Lindsley, S. (1999). Communication and "the Mexican way": Stability and trust as core symbols in maquiladoras. *Western Journal of Communication, 63,* 1-31.

Malinowksi, B. (1935). *Coral gardens and their magic* (Vol. 2). London: Allen and Unwin.

Mead, M. (1937). Public opinion mechanisms among primitive peoples. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 1,* 5-16.

Miyahira, K. (1999). Plotting a course of action: Ritual coordination of intercultural directive-response sequence in team-taught English classes. *Speech Communication Education, 2,* 151-172.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Murray, S. (1993). *Theory groups and the study of language in North America: A social history.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Orbe, M. (1998). *Constructing co-cultural theory: An explication of culture, power, and communication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Philipsen, G. (1975). Speaking "like a man" in Teamsterville: Culture patterns of role enactment in an urban neighborhood. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61,* 13-22.

Philipsen, G. (1976). Places for speaking in Teamsterville. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62,* 15-25.

Philipsen, G. (1981). *The prospect for cultural communication.* Unpublished manuscript, East-West Center, Honolulu, HI.

Philipsen, G. (1986). Mayor Daley's council speech: A cultural analysis. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 72,* 247-260.

Philipsen, G. (1987). The prospect for cultural communication. In D. Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication theory from Eastern and Western perspectives* (pp. 245-254). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Philipsen, G. (1989a). An ethnographic approach to communication studies. In B. Dervin (Ed.), *Paradigm dialogues: Research exemplars* (pp. 258-268). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Philipsen, G. (1989b). Speaking as a communal resource in four cultures. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 13,* 79-92.

Philipsen, G. (1992). *Speaking culturally: Explorations in social communication.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes. In G. Philipsen & T. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing communication theories* (pp. 119-156). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Philipsen, G. (November, 1998). *Coming to terms with cultures.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, New York.

Philipsen, G. (2000). Permission to speak the discourse of difference: A case study." *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33,* 213-234.

Philipsen, G., & Carbaugh, D. (1986). A bibliography of fieldwork in the ethnography of communication. *Language in Society, 15,* 387-397.

Ray, G. (1987). An ethnography of nonverbal communication in an Appalachian community. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 21,* 171-188.

Reisman, K. (1974). Contrapuntal conversations in an Antiguan village. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 110-124). London: Cambridge University Press.

Rosaldo, M. (1982). The things we do with words: Ilongot speech acts and speech act theory in philosophy. *Language in Society, 11,* 203-237.

Ruud, G. (1995). The symbolic construction of organizational identities and community in a regional symphony. *Communication Studies, 46,* 201-221.

Ruud, G. (2000). The symphony: Organizational discourse and the symbolic tensions between artistic and business ideologies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28,* 117-143.

Samovar, L., & Porter, R. (Eds.). (1972). *Intercultural communication: A reader.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Schely-Newman, E. (1999). Competence and ideology in performance: Language games, identity and Israeli bureaucracy in personal narrative. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 18,* 96-113.

Schwartz, T. (Ed.). (1980). *Socialization as cultural communication: Development of a theme in the work of Margaret Mead.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sequeira, D. (1993). Personal address as negotiated meaning in an American church community. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26,* 259-285.

Sequeira, D. (1994). Gifts of tongues and healing: The performance of charismatic renewal. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 14,* 126-143.

St. George, R. (1984). "Heated" speech and literacy in seventeenth-century New England. In D. Hall & D. Allen (Eds.), *Seventeenth-century New England* (pp. 275-322). Boston: Colonial Society of Massachusetts.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1984). Qualitative research: An overview. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 8,* 169-184.

Turner, V. (1980). Social dramas and stories about them. *Critical Inquiry, 6,* 141-168.

Varenne, H. (1977). *Americans together: Structured diversity in a Midwestern town.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Wick, N. (1997). *Speech community in the virtual world: The case of one listserv.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Winchatz, M. (in press). Social meanings in German interactions: An ethnographic analysis of the second-person pronoun *Sie. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 34.*