琉球大学学術リポジトリ

異文化間コミュニケーションの「ことばの民族誌」研究に向けて

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 琉球大学法文学部 公開日: 2009-12-25 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Miyahira, Katsuyuki, 宮平, 勝行 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.24564/0002005197

Ryudai Review of Euro-American Studies No. 44, 2000

Toward an Ethnography of Communication Model of Language and Intercultural Interaction

Katsuyuki Miyahira

Some of the significant findings of the ethnography of communication over the last several decades are a multitude of expressions of cultural identity and how interlocutors interactionally construct distinctive senses of self and speech community. One logical extension that can be informative at this juncture is an exploration of cultural identification[1] in the influx of intercultural interaction. Without having the shared linguistic and/or cultural resources initially that are, in most cases, taken for granted by interlocutors communicating in a traditional, close-knit community, identification is a daunting challenge for any person trying to communicate interculturally.

However, the ethnography of communication has, to this date, seldom investigated the phenomena of intercultural communication per se. Consequently, its theoretical and methodological utilities for the study of intercultural communication remain unknown. As an initial step toward a model of ethnographic perspective on intercultural communication, this paper delineates some theoretical and methodological premises embedded in the ethnography of communication perspective first, and then examines some issues that may emerge when the ethnography of communication is applied to intercultural interaction. On a theoretical front, it revisits several threads of discussion on the nature of language and discusses some theses that make the ethnography of intercultural communication feasible. Then, methodologically, it

attempts to apply Hymes's (1962, 1972) original model of the interaction of language and social life in the domain of intercultural interaction. The discussion is grounded in existing ethnographic findings on the symbols, forms, and normative communicative conduct of cultural identity conveyed in and through human discourse.

The process of identification unfolds in an intersubjective world that is built in ways somewhat akin to what Geertz (1973) calls the "webs of cultural significance." Geertz (1973) presents an interpretive anthropologist perspective on meaning: "Believing that man is an animal suspended in *webs of significance* [italics added] he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning" (p. 5). Individuals are enmeshed in the constellations of meanings where things make sense only in relation to other parts of the constellations. Human knowledge thus figures in the nexus of meanings; that is, in the webs human beings have intersubjectively created. Thus, human communication plays a significant role in knowledge building. The web of significance, in other words, is spun, modified, and enhanced by way of human communicative coordination over time. This communication-centered approach to intercultural interaction is thus another principle of the ethnography of communication perspective.

The phenomena of identification are underscored here because in dealing with intercultural interaction in general, cultural identity or cultural ways of presenting the self becomes a highly salient issue. One's cultural self comes out prominently in intercultural encounters because tacit rules of social interactions are often breached and efforts are made to coordinate alternative rules collaboratively. A clearer understanding of discursive identification will facilitate the collaboration on mutual

meanings and interactional rule-building. As Collier and Thomas (1988) explain, competent persons in intercultural encounters are those who "can mutually agree upon and follow rules for appropriate conduct, and who experience positive outcomes, the most important of which is confirmation of the preferred identity" (p. 108). For the interactional accomplishment of mutually shared symbols and meanings as well as mutually agreed-upon rules of conduct, clear understanding of each other's cultural identities is essential. Cast in a different light, cultural identity and the process of identification in intercultural interaction are a prima facie issue of concern for those who seek to understand intercultural communication.

Furthermore, the concept of cultural identity problematized in this paper is fundamentally about meanings and premises of "personhood" (Carbaugh, 1996) that coherently run through social presentations of self in a given community. If individuals come to understand the others and the world that surrounds them by coming to understand the self (Malone, 1997), it is highly important to investigate various models of self as they are differently configured in cultural scenes of contemporary societies. It is also highly important to start investigating the interaction of multiple conceptions of self in everyday communication, particularly, some characteristic features of the interaction, its outcome, and what we can learn from the interaction. This study attempts to outline a theoretical perspective toward this end in the increasingly multicultural society of the time.

However, the same issue can be addressed from a multitude of theoretical and philosophical viewpoints. To properly situate the proposed inquiry in the philosophy of communication, I shall begin with the discussion of language and language use--a fundamental process through which cultural identification is accomplished.

I. The Ethnography of Communication Perspective on Cultural Identity

The interpretive philosophy of inquiry that is grounded in phenomenology and hermeneutics is fundamental to the discursive process of cultural identification. As a repercussion of the hegemonic Cartesian subject/object split, recent critics argue, following suit with Heidegger's (1962) initial conception of *Dasein* (being-in-the-world), that humans are fundamentally understanders, self-interpreting beings whose life-world unfolds in language (Dallmayr and McCarthy 1977; Stewart, 1995). Human beings are not simply rational beings (*cogito*) who "intend" to tap into others' psychological maps--a perspective that mistakenly objectifies others. Rather, human beings are fundamentally understanders of everyday events, coping with an emerging world of discursive activities. On this account, Deetz (1973) argues that interpretive-understanding is not a subjective, private idea nor empathy to other's minds; it is the opening of an intersubjective life-world by searching the "implications" of human discursive activities. Implication is the expressive structure of human (discursive) behavior that opens up the world of possibilities. Because language is constitutive of human being, one must attend to the expressions of the world of possibilities in order to understand human discourse. Deetz (1973) uses "implication" to describe this symbolic function of human linguistic activity and gives it a prominent place for interpretive understanding. He then argues, "the finding of the 'I' in the 'Thou' is not empathy or mental recreation of the actor's private experience, but grasping the world of implicative connections which are given expression by the named behavior" (p. 149). The goal of the interpretive philosophy of inquiry is to unravel intersubjectively established community knowledge systems, including values, beliefs, and norms, and go about discovering it by using

intersubjective and reflective methods. Likewise, the ethnography of communication perspective does not assume an objective world independent from interlocutors; rather, it focuses on the interactions between a person and a world because it finds quintessential human existence in the unfolding of this person-world interaction.

A paradigmatic site for human understanding, then, is the event of communicating with others and hence with the world. Heidegger (1962) describes this ontological nature of language as "house of being," and Stewart (1995) calls the event of communicating "everyday coping"; language is a kind of house of being that enables humans to accomplish understanding through everyday coping with the world. Therefore, within the ethnography of communication perspective, language is conceived as events of understanding that take place in everyday communicating with the world, and the investigations guided by this perspective attend vigorously to the unfolding of the human life-world that is wrapped in discourse. However different the dynamics may be in intercultural interaction, this unfolding of human life-world interaction is fundamental to human communication and thus provides a common framework for explicating both cultural and intercultural identification.

Language conceived as such is constitutive of human *being* (Stewart, 1995; Taylor, 1971). What happens in communication is not expressions or exchanges of thoughts residing in one's inner consciousness. Rather, interlocutors are enveloped in the events of communicating and their ontological being figures most prominently in the ongoing interplay of discursive practices. Gadamer (1992) claims that this ontological property of language is universal: "We can now see that ... coming into language of meaning, points to a universal ontological structure, namely the basic nature of everything toward which understanding can be directed. Being that can be understood is language" (474-5). He further

argues that understanding is accomplished in-between interlocutors, or in-between text and its reader, in the to-and-fro movements of "play" that takes place in-between the participants. Understanding for Gadamer is a fusion of horizons that happens in such occurrences; human agents participate in the events but are at the same time somewhat distanced from the accomplishment of understanding. The dialogical model of understanding culminates to the above universal ontological claim because, first, it permeates every human experience, including such seemingly unrelated activities as appreciation of arts, and, second, the fusion of horizons is a transformation into communion--intersubjective reality where understanding takes its shape. The ethnography of communication model of identification proposed here, then, must attend judiciously to such a formative process of communication in which interlocutors engage in the interplay in a manner responsive to each other's rights and responsibilities. Shotter (1993) proposes a rhetorical-responsive model of social constructionists' theory to this end. The new model is "responsive," for in it language is conceived fundamentally as a "communicational, conversational, or dialogical account, in which people's responsive understanding of each other is primary" (p. 8). The "rhetorical" feature of the new model is tantamount to the constitutive nature of human communication that has been discussed so far: "To talk in this model is to 'construct' new forms of social relation, and to construct new forms of social relation (of self-other relationships) is to construct new ways of being (of person-world relations) for ourselves" (p. 9). The model presents a social-practical view that is coherent with the tenet: Language is constitutive of human being. From this perspective, intercultural interaction is a paradigmatic site wherein the construction (or the failure of construction) of "new forms of social relation" and "new ways of being" can be observed and accounted for,

particularly because intercultural interaction challenges us, every now and then, with the tremendous difficulty of just "talking" to each other.

By now it must be evident that the ethnography of communication perspective buttresses the argument that human communication is collaborative (mutual, relational). Human communication is not only responsive to each other's rights and responsibilities but also, and more significantly, is the event in which interlocutors accomplish understanding and come to realize who they are in their social habitus. Stewart (1995) calls the event *worlding* (p. 111); "humans naturally and characteristically accomplish everyday coping in collaborative speech communicating" through which self shapes itself in its relationship with others and with a world. A study of such dialectic, communicative, and relational coordination must attend ethnographically to the complex unfolding of human communicative events. The ethnography of communication perspective is proposed here in part because it is a method that can describe *worlding* via the discourse that is exercised at the field site of intercultural interactions.

Another theoretical tenet that underlies the new model is the thesis that cultural identification is fundamentally a communication process. This thesis leads to a premise that some forms of communication are enactments of cultural identity. However, because not all communication is identity-implicative, a model guided by the ethnography of communication perspective would first locate salient symbols, forms, and normative communicative practices of identity enactments. It then attends to the ways the identity enactments unfold in subsequent discourse, eventually accomplishing intercultural identification by mutual coordination of discourse. Accordingly, the phenomena dealt with in this perspective go beyond the simple labels of cultural symbols, and address the ways in

which such symbols are used and played out in the local practices of the people. The interest in the symbols, forms, and normative conduct of identification in this perspective is intended to further elucidate the co-ordinated identification.

The methodological key to pin down the communicative process of coordinated identification may be found in a sociolinguistic notion of *contextualization* of social discourse (i.e., discourse that is simultaneously context-dependent and context-renewing). Gumperz (1982) uses this term to point out that what is to be interpreted in discourse is not a representation of a particular text; rather, interpretation is accomplished interactionally in the discourse. Thus he emphasizes the functions of contextualization conventions and cues (formal linguistic variations on code-switching, prosody, syntactic, morphemic, and phonemic variations as well as stylistic variations) in the *relational* organization of communicative interactions. This interactional approach to discourse is consistent with the ethnography of communication perspective because both underscore intersubjective reality constructed through discourse and the interpretation of it as social construction. Such a conception of discourse points to an observational site where cultural identity figures prominently; that is, cultural identification is best captured in the unfolding of communicative interactions between people. In this respect, ethnography of communication researchers believe that interlocutors co-construct the life-world in their discourse, thereby attending to the process rather than the product of communicative events. The underlying premise behind this principle is that cultural identity is malleable, and human communication is an active process through which changes in cultural identity can be brought about.

The fact that cultural identity is an abstraction, nonetheless, does not preclude empirical investigation of intercultural identification. To

the contrary, it is amenable to rigorous empirical investigation because the process of identification is discursive, and what Schneider (1976) called "epitomizing symbols"—a symbol that characterizes the entire culture—may be present in the rules of conduct voiced in certain interactions. Just as Schneider studied norms—"patterns for action which apply to some culturally defined unit" (p.199)—in order to investigate the overarching abstract culture, one may investigate some norms of communicative conduct so as to explicate cultural identification. Thus, a field-based study of concrete epitomizing symbols and observations of the way they are used in communicative events make the ethnography of communication study of cultural identification amenable to rigorous empirical research.

II. A Model of Language and Intercultural Interaction

Over the last several decades, this line of theoretical inquiry on intercultural identification has emerged and produced some theoretical frameworks. Cross-cultural variations in indigenous discourse of cultural identity have informed us of cultural resources that give voice to distinctive meanings of self, community, and speaking. Philipsen (1992, 1997), for example, has shown that the notions of self, society and strategic actions are distinctively thematized according to the local speech code that supersedes ends and means of social action. The chronicle of his fieldwork in Teamsterville and Nacirema[2] communities demonstrates illustrative variations on the notions of self, society, and strategic actions between *the codes of honor* (Teamsterville) and *the codes of dignity* (Nacirema). The sense of self figures prominently in his account and it has strong implications on the issue of cultural identification.

In Teamsterville, a person is fundamentally a persona, a bundle of

> social identities, such as "man," "Italian," "young," and a resident of 33rd Street. Society is existentially and morally prior to the person--it existed prior to the individuals who are part of it and it is more important than any individual. Communication is a process in which psychological similarities and social differences are manifested so as to link individuals in relations of solidarity and hierarchy.... For the Nacirema, on the other hand, the person is a psychologically unique individual; society is built up from the acts of autonomous individuals and itself is of value only in the degree to which it enhances the individual. Unique persons link themselves to others by communicating their uniqueness to each other while simultaneously paying homage to their social equality (p. 15-6).

Philipsen defines speech codes as "historically transmitted, socially constructed systems of symbols and meanings, premises and rules, pertaining to communicative conduct" (p. 124). In this line of reasoning, self and society mutually define each other. The distinctive notions of self are closely tied to a portrait of cultural identity because self is rendered significant only within the constellations of meanings that are shaped by each speech code. Therefore, the notion of self is always situated in the constellations of value ideas and it is inextricably woven with the idea of communal identification or what Philipsen (1989b) called "membering" in which a person simultaneously affirms his communal identity and experiences communal membership with other members. His ethnographic research shows that the means by which members of a speech community nurture a unique notion of self are, at least partially, a cause (affirmation of the cultural self) and an effect (experience of cultural membership) of his or her experience of identifying with others in the community. This is so because one's self is always situated in the speech code of his or her community.

Elsewhere, Philipsen (1987) contends that *communication* is what accomplishes this linkage between self and shared identity: "The function of communication in cultural communication is to maintain a

healthy balance between the forces of individualism and community, to provide a sense of *shared identity* which nonetheless preserves individual dignity, freedom, and creativity" (p. 249). In other words, through everyday discursive practices, interlocutors establish both culturally situated self and communal or cultural identity through the interplay of these two forces. Because cultural identity is considered in the new model as an identification with and perceived acceptance into a particular community, the focal point of investigation is the unfolding of identification or membering. Just as communal identification varies in its forms (e.g., ritual, myth, and social drama) based on the types of communities (personal, positional, and traditional) and overriding speech codes, so, too, does the multivocal notion of self.[3] The present study problematizes cases in which ideological assumptions about multivocal self come in contact and coordinate mutually agreed-upon meanings of identities and rules about identity enactments. Interactive tension that is comparable to the tension between communalism and individualism is at play in intercultural interaction. However, due to the lack of shared linguistic and cultural resources in intercultural interaction, the way such interactive tension is balanced through communication is believed to be quite different from those adopted by interlocutors in the same type of community. The proposed model of ethnography of communication perspective addresses this issue by capitalizing on the constitutive, collaborative, and malleable nature of human communication.

An attempt was made by Carbaugh (1990) to extend the tradition of ethnography of communication into the domain of intercultural interaction by way of presenting a version of cross-cultural synthesis of ethnographic studies. He calls it "a tentative model for the theory and practice of intercultural communication" (pp. 151-175). The schematic

model extracts three salient sources of intercultural asynchrony from cultural particulars within the context of intercultural encounters; namely, cultural identity, cultural frames and forms, and structuring norms. This heuristic model points the researchers' attention to "variations of locally designed and commonly used communicative systems as they help organize, and give coherence to, the conduct of sociocultural lives"(p. 166). One way to characterize cultural identity is that it shapes local conceptions of what constitutes a person (i.e., what types of person there can be in a particular culture); thus leading to distinctive meanings of localized "self." Furthermore, it is situated in a local system of values as well as social relations. Cultural frames and forms, on the other hand, give meaning to distinctively coded sequences of cultural interaction. Therefore, in order to interpret meanings of discourse the way indigenous people do, one needs to capture local forms and frames of metacommunicative expressions such as "communication" (Katriel and Philipsen, 1981), "griping" (Katriel, 1985), "call/response" (Daniel and Smitherman, 1976), or "styling" (Kochman, 1981). The third component, structuring norms, has to do with the way communicative interaction, information, and meaning are all locally governed. In a given cultural group, distinctive notions of cultural identity and cultural frames and forms are used normatively to structure communicative interactions. Carbaugh's model was a landmark ethnographic approach to initial phases of intercultural communication.

However, this model's prominent emphasis on intercultural asynchrony limits the utility of the conceptual framework. By highlighting salient sources and loci of intercultural asynchrony, Carbaugh was able to generate a heuristic model with which one can describe cultural patterns, explain cultural variations, and identify possible sources of intercultural asynchrony. However, the model does not lend itself well to

a type of intercultural interaction where the malleable cultural identity, frames, forms and norms are renewed in ongoing communicative interaction. Cast in a different light, the model has a limited utility to describe and explain intercultural synchrony. The underlying motive for this theoretical model is a discovery of constituent culture, its symbols, meanings and premises. The ethnography of communication model pursues, in the same spirit, cultural malleability and discursive coordination in action in a way that the analysis will illuminate distinctiveness of each constituent culture in the interaction.

Carbaugh declared his model to be "tentative," I believe, partly because it must be constantly elaborated by field findings. The notion of identity, cultural forms and frames, and structuring norms all need to be individually examined in localized cultural scenes. More importantly, the components of the model must be refined by assessing the kinds of changes brought about in the process of coordination of actions for the model to be called "intercultural." For example, in a community where one's identity is deeply enmeshed within an overriding sense of a historically-transmitted communal web, an operative feature of cultural identity may have more to do with "being in sync with the others" than with a portrait of a "cultural agent" (Carbaugh, 1988, 1996), which by definition consists of core value constellations across a variety of social identities.[4] Such communal orientations to cultural identity may be vastly different from individually based forms of identities. Fundamental ideological differences in communalism and individualism will become more conspicuous in long-term intercultural *interaction* than in initial intercultural *encounters*. One of the sites where a malleable cultural identity transforms itself is a scene where two ideologies interpenetrate. Therefore, it is incumbent upon any theoretical model claimed to be "intercultural" to go beyond initial encounters and address the

interplay of cultures and the coordination of communicative actions. These observations point to development of "a model of intercultural *communication*" from the model of intercultural *encounters*.

Anyone who grapples with such a complex and far-reaching issue of intercultural identification must put oneself on a proper analytical footing. In an attempt to do so, I have chosen Hymes's (1962, 1972) original model of the interaction of language and social life in order to critically examine its relevance to intercultural interaction. Doing so will, at least, delineate some issues that the ethnography of communication model must take into accounts.

Ⅲ. Application of Hymesian Model in Intercultural Communication

Hymes's descriptive-theoretical framework was originally developed for description of deep-seated meanings of "indigenous" speech events. A modified version of his models of the interaction of language and social life (1972) consists of the following social units: (1) speech community, (2) speech situation, (3) speech event, (4) speech act, (5) speech styles, (6) ways of speaking, (7) components of speech, and (8) rules (relations) of speaking. Each unit is hereby examined critically. By carefully considering each unit at the outset of developing a theoretical model, some rationales for using the framework become evident, and some responses to problematic issues involved in its application can be worked out.

Speech community is defined as "a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety" (Hymes, 1972, p. 54). A decisive element of speech community is one's "identification" with particular rules of speaking. Cultural identification can be characterized as being consubstantial with rules for conduct and interpretation of speech in a

speech community, some of which could be reshaped through contacts and interaction with members of other speech communities. Traditional ethnography of communication research considered the speech community as a systemic whole wherein particular speech events are situated and their cultural meanings explored. Philipsen (1989) underscores this assumptive ground of the ethnography of speaking: "The efficacious resources for creating shared meaning and motivating coordinated action vary across social groups" (p. 258). Cultural particularity in a given speech community is an underlying assumption of a situated account of communication practices, and past research has delineated variations of speaking based on speech communities. What the ethnography of communication perspective on intercultural communication problematizes is the coordination of "rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech" brought in by encounters of members of two different speech communities. Given the collaborative nature of human communication and the indeterminate nature of social interaction, it is feasible that co-construction of new rules and meanings and modification of existing rules and meanings take place through the process of intercultural coordination. The locus of interest in the new perspective then shifts from the *particularity* of speech codes that govern a speech community to the *coordination* of particularities of speech codes in two speech communities. The shift in interest is nonetheless consistent with the assumption of the ethnography of communication. After all, members of different speech communities do attempt to establish a sense of shared meaning and coordinate their actions. Therefore, speech community in the proposed research is not an a priori concept but one that is constantly shaping itself in the course of human communication processes.

Interestingly, the underlying cultural particularity that was

de-emphasized in the new perspective also asserts itself in intercultural interactions. Constant comparison is a fundamental method of describing and discovering culturally situated meanings in traditional ethnographic investigations. Philips (1983) discovered distinct ways of organizing social transactions among Warm Spring Indian children through comparisons and contrasts with those of Anglo participants. Similarly, Athabaskan ways of presenting self became crystallized as a result of juxtaposition to that of English speakers (Scollon and Scollon, 1981). Furthermore, by comparing and contrasting four sets of cross-cultural research, Philipsen (1989) demonstrated that each culture provides a distinctive way of performing the communal function of speech; that is, to use communication as a means for linking individuals into communities of shared identity. More recently, Katriel (1993) discussed the emotional and moral overtones that are distinctive to the Israeli cultural idiom, *lefargen*. Cross-cultural comparisons of terms for "social support" in her study crystallized culturally codified meanings of the term. In all cases, cultural particularities become salient when they are pitted against one another. These comparisons and contrasts of culturally coded speech are examples of a prima facie principle that guides this ethnography of communication study. Within intercultural interaction, the principle of comparisons and contrasts is embedded in the analysis of the phenomena. In order to account for the coordination of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, one must have a good grip on the particularities of each speech community. In other words, it is only after this achievement that one can account for the changes and modifications to existing speech practices as well as evolution and emergence of alternative speech practices that result from the coordination of actions. The contrastive principle then is a valid method of analysis for intercultural interaction, and by going a step

further toward the analysis of coordination, the same principle will, I believe, lead to many otherwise unavailable insights on intercultural communication practices.

Speech Situation is associated with or marked by the presence or absence of speech used in events such as ceremonies, fights, hunts, meals, and lovemaking[5] (Hymes, 1962). Culturally coded speech is inextricably tied with such speech situations. Hymes (1972) contends that "in a sociolinguistic description, it is necessary to deal with activities which are in some recognizable way bounded or integral" to speech situation (p. 56). Speech situation in intercultural interaction becomes highly problematic. What is "bounded and integral" is a perception that is, in most cases, culturally defined, and interlocutors in intercultural interaction oftentimes do not come to agreement on the definition of a given situation. For example, in my research that dealt with teacher discourse in Japanese English-as-a-second-language classes (Miyahira, 1998b), what appeared to be a marked "formal" and "task-oriented" situation for Japanese teachers was perceived by American teachers as an unmarked everyday situation. Teachers' presentations of self were henceforth quite contrastive due to the disparate definitions of the situation. In the study of "indigenous" speech, the task is to delimit and accurately describe the speech situation; in the study of intercultural interaction, the task entails descriptions of how interlocutors come up with, or fail to come up with, shared definitions of the speech situation.

Speech event refers specifically to activities, or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech. Whereas a speech event involves more than one person, a speech act is reserved for an individual's act. Hymes (1972) explains with an example; at a party (speech situation), you may have a conversation

with another guest (speech event), and tell a joke within the conversation (speech act). Furthermore, speech events are activities which involve more than one person's illocutionary acts; therefore, it is best to look at the discursive sequence of A's utterance and B's response to it, and, if available, A's feedback to B's response. By attending to the sequential organizations of talk (act sequences in Hymes's term), the systematicity of communication practices can be found concerning the speech event in question and about the constituent speech acts. The sequential analysis of speech events is certainly germane to intercultural interaction. Instead of searching for universalists' theses about norms of interaction, the ethnography of communication model is interested in microanalysing the emerging rules of establishing a shared sense of meanings, and of coordinating actions.

A particular pattern of speaking that cuts across phonology, syntax, and semantics and that shows strong correlation with sociocultural factors is called speech styles. To cite as an example, Hymes (1972) explains that the honorifics in Japanese are governed by formal rules of grammar and depict selectional regularities in their expressive, referential, persuasive, metalinguistic, and contextual functions. What allows an interlocutor to judge a certain speech as an appropriate honorific usage is a matter of *speech styles*. Ervin-Tripp's (1972) explication of rules of alternation and co-occurrence for choosing appropriate terms of address is indicative of the rules that the proposed model seeks to discover. Such rules are subject to modification in intercultural interaction to say the least. However, a comparable logical structure of selection rules with regard to appropriate forms of speech may emerge as governing a particular sequence of a speech event in, for example, American-Japanese teacher discourse as a result of coordination over time. In this respect, speech styles can be coherently applied to the

analysis of speech events in intercultural interaction.

Ways of speaking refers to both cultural particularities in shared meanings and actions as well as wide variations of the cultural particularity across speech communities (Hymes, 1974). Members of a speech community have communicative competence to communicate the particular meanings and execute actions efficaciously. Thus, ways of speaking are cultural resources that culture bearers can use to express their cultural self. Cultural particularity in ways of speaking, in one sense, denotes distinctive rules for organizing social practices and, in the other, resources for cultural expressions. Hymes explains the concept in the following terms: "Ways of speaking is the most general and primitive term which reveals the regulative ideas or communicative and consequently cultural resources within a speech community" (1972, p. 58). The other side of ways of speaking is variant features of organizing communication practices that can be observed in different speech communities. Subsequent research has provided a number of distinctive features of ways of speaking in a wide range of speech communities. The corpus of distinctive ways of speaking informs the contrastive principles that are essential to the descriptive-theoretical framework of ethnography of communication. Thus, the proposed ethnography of communication model can be characterized as a method for analysis of interaction between two diverse sets of ways of speaking, the coordination of cultural resources of the self being the centerpiece of the analysis. For this theoretical extension to be successful, intercultural communication practices must be accounted for against the backdrop of a rich corpus of ethnographic findings. Some new findings from intercultural interaction may, in turn, inform how local resources of "indigenous" speech may evolve. In this way, traditional ethnographic studies of "indigenous" speech and the proposed study of intercultural

interaction inform each other about the evolving nature of ways of speaking. The operative notion of coordination of communicative practices in the new model again seems to portray a coherent picture between traditional and intercultural ethnographic studies by shifting its focus.

The next element, *components of speech,* is subdivided into 16 schematic components (i.e., setting, scene, speaker, addressor, hearer, addressee, outcome of talk, goals of talk, message form, message content, key, forms of speech, channel, norms of interaction, norms of interpretation, and genre). The schema consists of fundamentally "etic" components for a heuristic purpose; it allows researchers to cross-culturally compare and contrast the nature of speech events. The model will be refined and made more complete as a result of comparisons. Because Hymes's (1962) proposed end of the schema is a theory of pan-cultural features and dimensions that can be applied to any speech community, the same schema can be used to analyze the coordination of "ways of speaking" in talks between two cultural groups. However, the schema is under development and far from being exhaustive, and so one must be careful not to simply conform to the schema. To illustrate, Levinson (1988), elaborating on Goffman's (1981) initial formation of participant, calls for more interactionally adequate analysis of participation, and decomposes participant into *basic* (source, target, speaker, addressee, and participant) and *derived* categories formed from Boolean operations on basic categories (producers, recipients, author, relayer, goal, intermediary). In a like manner, Malone (1997) points out that, depending on social relationship and interactional footing, pronouns refer to various participant roles that cannot be conveyed by traditional grammatical categories. Intercultural communicative practices require all possible ramifications of such schematic categories.

It must be emphasized, however, that the schematic components serve well for the current purpose as a springboard for discussion if they are used as heuristic devices for ethnographic discovery.

The last element, *rules (relations) of speaking,* appears to be most significant in the investigation of intercultural interaction. Outsiders need to discover the local system of speaking, such as a local taxonomy of address terms (Fitch, 1991), culturally salient terms for talk (Carbaugh, 1989), and how they are played out in the local "ways of speaking." One needs to be attentive to the presence or absence of rules regarding, for example, formal language and slang, variations in tone of voice, and evaluative responses to speech such as correction, praise, embarrassment, and withdrawal. In intercultural interaction, one often experiences violation of such rules of speaking, and thus tacit rules are made explicit issues for coordination. In this sense, intercultural interaction can provide ideal sites for discoveries of local rules of speaking--something that remains unspoken in traditional study of "indigenous" speech. With regard to specific speech acts such as directives, apologies, compliments, and so forth, the intercultural experience is highly problematic because it involves a high degree of interpersonal collaboration. As interlocutors discover the rules of speaking that the other interlocutor employs, and as they negotiate mutually agreeable rules, the formative process of alternative rule-building can be made explicit. Although most intercultural communication does not sustain long enough to reach that stage of interpersonal relationship, some do, and in either case, the investigation of intercultural interaction will enhance our understanding of rules of speaking in each constituent culture as well as of those potentially emerging alternative rules of speaking.

On the whole, Hymes's analytical criteria shed light on some salient

issues about cultural identification. Ethnographers have adopted in the past, either explicitly or implicitly, this descriptive framework and revealed distinctive "ways of speaking" in various speech communities. Each ethnographic study seems to feature certain aspects of the descriptive framework. For example, Basso (1976) and Katriel (1986) featured speech events (the joking performance and the *dugri* speaking ritual). Philipsen (1975, 1976, 1992), on the other hand, highlighted particular components of speech; namely, setting ("scenes," place for talk), key and instrumentalities (speaking "like a man"), and ways of speaking (codes of honor and codes of dignity). The ethnography of communication model advocated in this paper also inherits this fundamentally heuristic feature of the model. For example, my research (Miyahira, 1998b) dealing with teacher discourse underscores the act sequence (message form and message content) on the one hand and norms (norms of interaction and norms of interpretation) coupled with rules of speaking on the other. By examining the act sequence of directive discourse, some semantic, structural (or syntactic), and sequential features were captured. Attending to norms and rules of speaking enabled me to capture the process of coordinating idiosyncratic ways of speaking. To answer the questions on the discursive enactments of cultural identity, it is logical to attend closely to the relationship between what is said (message content) about cultural identity and how it is said (message form). It goes without saying that ethnographic observation attempts to describe speech in its totality; however, the particular theoretical foci warrant different weighing of parts and parcels of speech.

The cursory examination of Hymes's original model of the interaction of language and social life appears to be highly applicable to the analyses of intercultural interaction. However, there needs to be a shift

in analytical foci from description and discoveries of distinctive speech practices in indigenous speech community to description and discoveries of intercultural coordination of speech practices. Hymes's units of language can serve as analytical units with this shift in mind. What is more, the heuristic utility of the model becomes even greater given that each unit can be an analytical site for intercultural coordination. In other words, each unit does not entail an *a priori* meaning and/or rules waiting to be discovered. Rather, they are each subject to interactional coordination. The inherently communicative process of such coordination is the subject that the proposed ethnography of communication perspective on intercultural interaction seeks to uncover.

Ⅳ. Conclusion

This paper set out to develop a theoretical perspective that can explicate intercultural interaction that is typified in the practice of intercultural identification. It examined Hymes's (1962, 1972, 1974) original model of the interaction of language and social life to assess its intercultural applicability. The result depicts that with a shift in analytical foci the Hymesian model appears quite informative and particularly successful in generating many issues as well as anchoring points for analysis. The ethnography of communication perspective on intercultural interaction develops coherently from traditional ethnography of communication scholarship. In consequence, the new perspective is informative not only for explication of emerging symbols, forms, rules, and meanings that can be observed in intercultural interaction but also for explication of distinctive ways of speaking practiced in each constituent speech community.

This positive assessment is, in part, attributed to the particular philosophical and theoretical stance toward language and language use

adopted in the new perspective. Language is fundamentally an event. Speaking is fundamentally constitutive of human being. Speaking is a collaborative process through which interlocutors coordinate their actions toward shared meanings, rules, and premises of everyday interaction. Cultural identification in intercultural contexts becomes a prima facie phenomenon of interest that the new perspective seeks to address. Because identification is fundamentally a communication process, cultural identity is malleable, negotiated, and indeterminate in postmodern terminology, making it amenable for vigorous investigation in the arena of intercultural interaction.

The efficacy of the proposed ethnography of communication model of intercultural interaction is yet unknown.[6] Its utility must be demonstrated by fieldwork research. However, at the moment, it must be noted that the new perspective coherently develops from traditional scholarship on the ethnography of communication. Because speaking is structured, distinctive, and social (Philipsen, 1992), the ethnography of communication has, at least to date, primarily engaged in close observation and subsequent interpretation of situated patterns of speaking in a given speech community. Then, from the cross-cultural analyses of the accumulated corpus of ways of speaking, ethnography of communication scholars have advanced some theses that are both distinctive and common to speech communities. The thrust of the investigation has primarily been cross-cultural comparisons; intercultural communication in which interlocutors negotiate their ways into mutual understanding has been a little traveled terrain. It is understandably so because of the very agendas ethnography of communication puts forth (i.e., descriptions of structured, distinctive, and social speaking). That being the case, the ethnography of intercultural communication initially appeared to be an oxymoron, for in *intercultural*

scenes, one does not find historically transmitted, socially constructed systems of symbols, norms, meanings, and premises being collaboratively invoked, and given voice to, in interlocutors' lived discourse. Despite the bleak prospect at the outset, the interplay of culturally coded ways of speaking was shown to offer a plethora of interactional scenes in which cultural codes of speaking become problematic, bringing about the taken for granted symbols, norms, meanings, and premises to explicit issues of coordination. The new approach then explores cultural resources of speaking by shifting perspectives from traditional methods of discovery through the manifold discursive and communal revelations of the resources to ethnographic discovery through the absence of the very same communal discursive practices. Both presence and absence of shared discursive practices are equally telling about the culture that is at work in the background as well as the ways in which cultural practices are coordinated between the interlocutors. In consequence, the ethnography of communication model of intercultural communication is able not only to locate distinctive code elements, but also to describe ways in which the codes of speaking are discursively coordinated.

Notes

1) The fundamentally discursive process of identification is, albeit in different degrees, what occurs in intercultural interaction because one must "identify" with the person in order to come to agree on common meanings and norms of interaction.

2) Nacirema (American spelled backward) is a term coined by anthropologist Horace Miner and subsequently adopted in Philipsen's (1992, 1997) theory of speech codes. Philipsen explains that "Nacirema does not refer to a particular group of people or to a particular locale, but refers rather generally to a particular culture, a particular way of thinking

and acting--a way that does not necessarily include all North Americans or all citizens of the United States of America, but which is prominently associated with some of the history and some of the contemporary texture of life that can be observed there" (p. viii).

3) Building on Turner's (1980) theory of social life, Philipsen (1987) defines ritual, myth, and social drama in the following terms and speculates on their salience in the types of society (personal, positional, and traditional). "Ritual is a communication form in which there is a structured sequence of symbolic acts, the correct performance of which constitute homage to a sacred object" (p. 250). "A myth is a great symbolic narrative which holds together the imagination of a people and provides bases of harmonic thought and action" (p.251). "Social dramas consist of a dramatic sequence in which social actors manifest concern with, and negotiate the legitimacy and scope of, the group's rules of living" (p. 252).

4) Carbaugh (1996) differentiates cultural and social levels of self in the following manner and addresses primarily the social aspects of self in his recent book. "Where the concept of 'cultural agent' highlights basic codes about being that are held in common across social scenes, "social identity" highlights the variety of selves enacted through those codes" (p. 141). The ethnography of communication model addresses the cultural level of self, thereby referred to as the "cultural identity."

5) It must be noted that the speech situation explicated here is conceived differently from "setting" and "genre" under the heading of "components of speech" explained later in this section. Speech situation (e.g., second language lessons) is a social unit that delimits the context of ethnographic observation and subsumes setting (e.g., classroom) and genre (e.g., directive speech event). In the above example, the directive speech event, which happens to coincide with the name of a genre, takes

place in a setting other than the classroom, and the ethnographic description of directives made in the context of second language lessons (i.e., speech situation) may significantly differ from those done in other speech situations.

6) However, a partial support for the model is provided by my dissertation research (Miyahira, 1998a). It reports a successful application of the model with many new insights to field-based study of intercultural interaction as well as some limitations embedded in the model.

References

Basso, K. (1976). *Portraits of "the Whiteman": Linguistic play and cultural symbols among the Western Apache.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carbaugh, D. (1988). *Talking American: Cultural discourses on Dohahue.* 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.). (1990). *Cultural communication and intercultural contact.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carbaugh, D. (1995). The ethnographic communication theory of Philipsen and associates. In D. Cushman & B. Kovacic (Eds.), Watershed research tradition in human *Communication theory* (pp. 268-297). 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.

Collier, M. J., & Thomas, M. (1988). Cultural identity: An interpretive perspective. In W. Gudykunst & Y. Kim (Eds.), *Theories of intercultural communication* (pp. 99-120). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Daniel, J., & Smitherman-Donaldson, G. (1976). How I got over: Communication dynamics in the Black community. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 62, 26-39.

Deetz, S. (1973). An understanding of science and a hermeneutic science of understanding. *Journal of Communication,* 23, 139-159.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). On sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and co-occurrence. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.). *Directions is sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 213-250). New York: Basil Blackwell.

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

Gadamer, H. G. (1992). *Truth and method* (rev. ed.). (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall Trans.). New York: Cross Road. (Original work published 1960).

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

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

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time.* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). New York: Harper and Row.

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

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

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.

Katriel, T. (1985). "Griping" as a verbal ritual in some Israeli discourse. In D. Carbaugh (Ed.), *Cultural communication and intercultural contact.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Katriel, T. (1993). Lefargen: A study in Israeli semantics of social relations. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26(1), 31-53.

Katriel, T., & Philipsen, G. (1981). "What we need is communication": "Communication" as a cultural category in some American speech. *Communication Monographs, 43,* 301-317.

Kochman, T. (1981). *Black and White styles in conflict.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1988). Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order (pp. 161-227). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Malone, M. J. (1997). Worlds of talk: The presentation of self in everyday conversation. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Miyahira, K. (1998a). Intercultural coordination of discursive self: Directive-response organizations in team-taught English classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Miyahira, K. (1998b). Plotting a course of action: Ritual coordination of intercultural directive-response sequence in team-taught English classes. *Speech Communication Education, 11,* 151-72.

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian reservation.* New York: Longman.

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. (1987). The prospect for cultural communication. In D. L.

Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives* (pp. 245-254). New York: Academic.

Philipsen, G. (1989a). An ethnographic approach to communication studies. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication: Paradigm exemplar* (Vol. 2). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Philipsen, G. (1989b). Speech and the communal function 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. L. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing communication theories* (pp. 119-156). Albany: State University of New York Press.

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

Schneider, D. M. (1976). Notes toward a theory of culture. In K. H. Basso & H. A. Selby (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology* (pp. 197-220). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon S. B. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication. Norwood,* NJ. Ablex.

Shotter, J. (1993). *Conversational realities: Constructing life through language.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Stewart, J. R. (1995). *Language as articulate contact: Toward a post-semiotic philosophy of communication.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Turner, J. H. (1988). *A theory of social interaction.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

— 論文要旨 —

宮平　勝行

異文化間コミュニケーションの「ことばの民族誌」研究に向けて

「ことばの民族誌」研究は伝統的に、特定の文化内での言語行動の記述調査を通して当該文化内での「アイデンティティー」や「社会」の意味、もしくは多様な「アイデンティティー」の表現方法を明らかにした。本稿では、このような「ことばの民族誌」の伝統的な研究方法を再考し、ことばの解釈学の論点を取り入れながら、異文化間コミュニケーションの研究に「ことばの民族誌」的アプローチが有効であるかを考察する。

ことばが人間の存在そのものとなる社会的行動であるという点に着目すると、異文化間のコミュニケーション、とりわけ異文化間での自他同一化においては、個々の文化的話法の調和を図ることが必要となる。このことは、＜言語共同体に土着のことばとその意味の発見＞という伝統的な「ことばの民族誌」研究の視点から、＜個々の文化的話法の調和とその方法＞に分析の視点を移すことによって、異文化間コミュニケーションにおいても「ことばの民族誌」が有効に活用できることを示唆する。このような視点の転換を通して、それぞれの文化の特徴がより明白となり、絶えず変容する文化的アイデンティティーの実像が明らかになる。本稿は、こうした視点の移行を立脚点とし、「ことばの民族誌」を確立した原点の理論にたち返ることによって、異文化間コミュニケーションにおける「ことばの民族誌」研究の可能性を検討した試論である。