Journal of Multicultural Discourses
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t794020039

Cultural approaches to discourse analysis: A theoretical and methodological conversation with special focus on Donal Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Theory

Michelle Scollo[a]
[a] Department of Communication Arts & Sciences, Bronx Community College, City University of New York,

Online publication date: 21 March 2011

To cite this Article Scollo, Michelle(2011) 'Cultural approaches to discourse analysis: A theoretical and methodological conversation with special focus on Donal Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Theory', Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 6: 1, 1 — 32
To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/17447143.2010.536550
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2010.536550

Journal of Multicultural Discourses
Vol. 6, No. 1, March 2011, 1–32

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Cultural approaches to discourse analysis: A theoretical and methodological conversation with special focus on Donal Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Theory

Michelle Scollo*

Department of Communication Arts & Sciences, Bronx Community College, City University of New York

(*Received 26 March 2010; final version received 31 August 2010*)

This essay opens a conversation in the *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* on cultural approaches to discourse analysis. Culturally-inclusive approaches to discourse analysis and communication that critique Western-biased theories and methods are covered including Jan Blommaert's *Critical Discourse Analysis*, Shi-xu's *Cultural Approach to Discourse*, and Asian communication theories. An extensive review of the historical development of Donal Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Theory and Analysis is given as well as an explanation of its current practice today. All four approaches are compared and contrasted in terms of their definitions, objectives, methods of data collection and analysis, and the role of critique. It is hoped that the essay will invite future extended discussions of culturally-inclusive approaches to discourse analysis in the journal.

Keywords: discourse analysis; cultural discourse analysis; Donal Carbaugh; cultural discourse theory; ethnography of communication; Jan Blommaert; critical discourse analysis; Shi-xu; cultural approach to discourse; Asian communication theories

Introduction

Since its inception in 2006, the *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, guided by its founding editor Shi-xu, has sought to create a space for, and to advance the agenda of, culturally-inclusive discourse research, focusing on non-Western data, theories and methods, marginalized, disadvantaged, and developing discourse communities, with a particular focus on Asian, African, and Latin American cultures.[1] But how do we conduct such research? Is there a growing body of theories and methods that enables and promotes culturally-inclusive discourse analysis in a rigorous and systematic manner, available to all those who are interested in such endeavors? Or is it more of a hodgepodge, with researchers rummaging through various fields and native contexts, amalgamating different theories and methods to meet their research needs? We need to make our theories and methods transparent, not only to advance our agenda, but also to buttress our research and future students and scholars in our field.

In this spirit, I aim to open such a conversation, beginning here with a small set of cultural discourse research programs and approaches that support this cause: Jan Blommaert's *Critical Discourse Analysis*, Shi-xu's *Cultural Approach to Discourse*,

*Email: michelle.scollo@bcc.cuny.edu

ISSN 1744-7143 print/ISSN 1747-6615 online

DOI: 10.1080/17447143.2010.536550
http://www.informaworld.com

writings in support of Asian communication theories, and Donal Carbaugh's *Cultural Discourse Analysis.* I spend much of my time explicating the latter, Cultural Discourse Analysis, as it is the approach I use in my own work. At the end of the essay, I compare and contrast the approaches, enabling readers to examine the benefits, particularities, and constraints of each program. I hope that this is the beginning of a productive, multi-voiced conversation, with extensive discussion of other approaches that enable and promote analysis of discourse across cultures and avoid implicit cultural bias in their theories and methodologies.

Cultural approaches to discourses analysis and communication

First, I begin with Jan Blommaert's approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which is a culturally-inclusive CDA approach that avoids implicit "universalist" positions often taken in CDA research, theories, and methods (Shi-xu 2009). In his book, *Discourse: A Critical Introduction,* Blommaert synthesizes concepts, theories, and methods from a variety of fields "... to produce a set of suggestions for how to organize an interdisciplinary field of Critical Discourse Analysis, one that offers input to, and receives input from, a wide variety of social-scientific approaches" (2005: 19). Unlike much CDA work, the roots of Blommaert's approach are in linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics, both of which he explains have historically been critical approaches to the study of language in society. He distills a set of "theoretical principles" from this work, including a final principle from different work, that form the foundation of his approach:

1. In analyzing language-in-society, the focus should be on *what language use means to its users*
2. We have to be aware that *language operates differently in different environments*
3. Our unit of analysis is not an abstract "language" but *the actual and densely contextualized forms in which language occurs in society*
4. People ... are not entirely "free" when they communicate, they are constrained by the range and structure of their repertoires, and *the distribution of elements of the repertories in any society is unequal*
5. We have to conceive of communication events as ultimately influenced by *the structure of the world system* (2005: 14–15).

To analyze discourse on this foundation, Blommaert is similarly interdisciplinary, utilizing "... a very eclectic theoretical, methodological, technical-analytic apparatus, drawing mainly on sources from (different branches of) linguistics, anthropology, cultural studies, sociology, and history" (2005: 16). For Blommaert, discourse is "... a general mode of semiosis, i.e. meaningful symbolic behaviour" (2005: 2). He explains:

> Discourse to me comprises all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use ... What is traditionally understood by language is but one manifestation of it; all kinds of semiotic "flagging" performed by means of objects, attributes, or activities can and should also be included for they usually constitute the "action" part of language-in-action. What counts is the way in which such semiotic instruments are actually deployed and how they start to become meaningful against the wider background mentioned above (2005: 3).

Likewise, language is not the only object of inquiry, but rather, potentially all meaningful, situated symbolic activity.

Blommaert explains that the purpose of CDA should not be to critique power, but rather to examine the "effects" of power in the globalized world system. He argues:

> It is a commonplace to equate "critical approaches" with "approaches that criticise power"... The suggestion I want to offer is that it should be an analysis of power *effects,* of the outcome of power, of what power *does to* people, groups, and societies, and of *how* this impact comes about. The deepest effect of power everywhere is *inequality,* as power differentiates and selects, includes and excludes ... The focus will be on how language is an ingredient of power processes resulting in, and sustained by, forms of inequality, and how discourse can be or become a justifiable object of analysis, crucial to understanding wider aspects of power relations. I situate my argument in a particular environment, that of the present world system, that of so-called "globalization". A critical analysis of discourse, I shall argue, necessarily needs to provide insights in the dynamics of societies in the world (2005: 1–2).

Toward this end, Blommaert is particularly interested in issues of "voice", which he argues should be the main object of critical investigation. He explains that:

> Voice stands for the way in which people manage to make themselves understood or fail to do so. In doing so, they have to draw upon and deploy discursive means which they have at their disposal, and they have to use them in contexts that are specified as to conditions of use. Consequently, if the conditions are not met, people "don't make sense" – they fail to make themselves understood... An analysis of voice is an analysis of power effects – (not) being understood in terms of the set of sociocultural rules and norms specified – as well as of conditions for power – what it takes to make oneself understood (2005: 4–5).

Much of Blommaert's discourse analyses in the book concern issues of "voice", and hence power effects, in the globalized world, specifically how persons in particular situations find that their discursive resources do not enable them to be understood and the consequences of that lack of "voice". Exposing these differences and inequalities, or "effects" of power, is a step toward solving real problems in the globalized world, a major objective of critical approaches to discourse analysis (Blommaert 2005, 19).

Also a critical approach to discourse, with more of a cultural bent, next is Shi-xu's (2005) research program entitled *Cultural Approach to Discourse* or CAD. CAD is an "interrelated research system" with its own epistemological, theoretical, and methodological principles as well as a set of empirical commitments (Shi-xu 2005: 4). Specifically, CAD takes knowledge and reality as social, symbolic, and cultural constructions (Shi-xu 2005, 4). Theoretically, CAD is open to multiple viewpoints. CAD positions itself "between cultures", examining power relations between discourses "from a global-and-local position and views discourse as a diversity of 'language games' in competition with each other" (Shi-xu 2005, 5). Empirically, CAD sets specific topics, issues, and objectives for study; specifically, pressing problems and discourses of cultural repression and domination (Shi-xu 2005, 4). After elucidating such discourses from different sides of the same issue or problem, illuminating power relations between them, CAD seeks to offer new, integrative discourses for the involved parties. As Shi-xu explains:

> Empirically, the present approach is not interested in just any sort of discourse or just any problem constituted through discourse, but particularly those discourses where urgent cultural issues, especially questions of cultural relationship in the contemporary world, for example domination, exclusion, rebuilding or transformation, are at stake. Moreover, it does not merely analyze past and present discourses, but also, as an actively transformative mode of research, imagines and advocates possible future discourses in pursuit of cultural equality and emancipation (Shi-xu 2005, 6).

Its methods are a form of political ethnography, "globally eclectic", not defined a priori, and develop organically in the research process with an eye to native meanings and tools as well as reflexive recognition of the role of the researcher in the process (Shi-xu 2005, 5–6). However, Shi-xu does outline two "broad" research strategies for CAD studies: *deconstructive* and *transformational* (2005: 68). He explains:

> On the one hand, CAD strives to undermine culturally repressive discourses, that is, those discourses that dominate, exclude or discriminate against groups and communities on the ground of "cultural difference", be it historical, geographical, ideological, racial, ethnic or linguistic. I shall call it a deconstructive strategy. On the other hand, CAD endeavours to create and advocate new or alternative discourses that are inclusive, non-hegemonic and collaborative with regard to cultural "others". I shall call it a transformational strategy (Shi-xu 2005, 68).

Taken together, CAD as a research program focuses largely on the analysis of discourse from a pluralist, "in-between" cultural perspective, with a specific political agenda. In concert with its objectives, Shi-xu defines "discourse" as:

> ... linguistic communication in social, cultural, historical and political contexts ... discourse is conceived of as construction of meaning – representing and acting upon reality – through linguistic means in concrete situations. It is thus a unity of both form and meaning. And it is not merely a form of talking or writing, but also a way of thinking (2005: 1).

As an example of his notion of discourse, he explains: "The phenomenon of thinking and talking of the Third World countries amongst western businessmen as 'cheap labour' " (Shi-xu 2005, 1–2). For Shi-xu, discourse is "infiltrated by culture" (2005: 2). He explains culture "from a cultural studies perspective... as a diversity of competing practices of meaning construction, or forms of life, of particular groups of people. Such symbolic practices are not in equal relation with each other, but in contest or opposition" (Shi-xu 2005, 2).

Shi-xu calls for a focus on and elaboration of indigenous discourse theories and methods, especially non-Western ones, in much of his work (e.g., 2005, 2009), as a critique of "universalist" positions often taken in discourse research, to better understand and analyze native conceptions and practices of discourse, and to enlarge scholarly perspectives on discourse. Over the past two decades, there has been a growing body of work on Asian discourse and communication theories, with Shi-xu playing a significant role in this. Under his direction and guest editor Yoshitaka Miike, another major contributor in Asian communication theory, the *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* published a special issue on "New Frontiers in Asian Communication Theory" in 2009. Miike (2009) introduces the special issue and its contributors, arguing that much important work has been done, but more needs to further develop Asian communication theory and the unique perspective it has to offer communication theory and research, which has long had a strong Western bias.

In the lead essay of the special issue, Wimal Dissanayake (2009) chronicles his career, focusing in particular on his early work "excavating" classical Indian communication concepts (i.e., *apoha, sphota, akansa, dhvani, rasa)* for their insights into the process of human communication. To do so, he compared the aforementioned conceptions to similar Western theories and concepts. While in retrospect Dissanayake questions the utility of this exercise, he does see some merit in it, particularly as it was his beginning foray into the (re)introduction of Asian communication theories into the Western-dominated Communication field.

In reading Dissanayake's descriptions of traditional Indian communication concepts, we see fascinating, significant, and illuminating conceptions and features of communication that do not need parallel comparisons to Western theories, but rather can and should stand on their own. This is perhaps somewhat easier some 30 years later, when cultural conceptions of communication have been embraced in the Communication field due in large part to the work of the Ethnography of Communication (of which more later). The Ethnography of Communication, led by its founder Dell Hymes, has encouraged examination of indigenous terms for and conceptions of communication as entre points into cultural systems of communication, to broaden our understanding of communication, and to critique Western-biased communication models, theories, and concepts. While Dissanayake examines centuries' old *scholarly* Indian communication concepts, the Ethnography of Communication typically focuses on lay terms for and conceptions of communication. In reading Dissanayake's work however, one has to wonder if these scholarly conceptualizations are not laced with native beliefs and values. The striking differences between classical Indian contextual, poetic, and receiver-focused conceptions of communication versus mid-twentieth century Western transmission, conduit, sender-focused models illustrates that deep-seated cultural currents *must* be influencing our supposedly acultural "universal" theories.

My reason for this extended look at Dissanayake's and others' work on Asian communication theories is an argument for the future of culturally-inclusive communication and discourse research and theorizing. The scholars reviewed thus far (Blommaert 2005; Shi-xu 2005, 2009; see also Jia 2000) all argue for culturally-inclusive discourse and communication research that critiques Western-biased theories, methods, and conceptions with its findings. Miike (2009), Chu (1986), and Dissanayake (2009) all call for an Asian communication theory or perspective on communication. The danger of this is that we have replaced a Western-biased theory and perspective with an "Asiacentric" one (Miike 2009), the very thing we have been arguing against in the first place.[2] Surely, we need indigenous, cultural theories of communication and discourse, but we need to press these into service of a general, pancultural understanding and theory of communication and discourse, formulated on the basis of comparative analysis of indigenous theories, producing a heuristic tool that can be used to examine communication and discourse across cultures. We need a *multicultural* approach to the study of *human* communication and discourse, one that embraces cultural diversity and uses this diversity to understand what is *particular* and what is *general* in discourse and communication across cultures. One such approach is Donal Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Theory, housed within the Ethnography of Communication, which is where we now turn.

Donal Carbaugh's Cultural Discourse Theory

In the next three sections, I present a comprehensive review of the development of Donal Carbaugh's (2005, 2007a, 2010) Cultural Discourse Theory (CDT) and explication of its current practice today. To do so, I detail the development of CDT through Carbaugh's publications over roughly two decades (the late-1980s to present day), with particular emphasis on a small set of seminal publications. I then give an explication of the theory in its current state today as well as suggestions and sources for those interested in conducting cultural discourse analysis (CuDA).[3] This extensive review and explanation is intended to give readers a thorough understanding of Cultural Discourse Theory and Analysis as part of a robust conversation on culturally-inclusive approaches to discourse analysis as well as a depth of information such that those interested in conducting CDA studies have the tools to do so.

The development of Cultural Discourse Theory

As few things start from zero, to give a proper history of CDT we need to start at the beginning, or as close to the beginning as necessary. CDT has developed within the Ethnography of Communication research program, originally conceived of by linguistic anthropologist Dell Hymes as the Ethnography of Speaking (1962), brought to the Communication field by Gerry Philipsen (1975, 1976), who trained Carbaugh amongst a number of other scholars (e.g., Braithwaite 1990, 1997; Fitch 1998; Katriel 1986) in this tradition. Over a roughly two-decade period (1975–1997),[4] through a combination of ideas, novel research, and data-based theorizing, the fledgling field took shape (Carbaugh 1995b; Carbaugh and Hastings 1995; Philipsen 1990; Philipsen and Carbaugh 1986) and CDT emerged, along with Philipsen's closely allied Speech Codes Theory.[5] While I will not cover the Ethnography of Communication research program in depth (but see Carbaugh 1995b; Carbaugh and Hastings 1995; Philipsen 1990; Philipsen and Carbaugh 1986) or Philipsen's Speech Codes Theory (Philipsen 1986, 1992, 1997; Philipsen, Coutu, and Covarrubias 2005), some background is of necessity.

Hymes (1962, 1972) originally envisioned and developed a program of research in which scholars would comparatively study the means and meanings of speech in diverse communities utilizing a common descriptive theory.[6] Hymes was frustrated with the lack of linguistic data in anthropologists' ethnographic studies and the lack of data on actual language-in-use in linguistic studies. Likewise, he sought to combine the two into "ethnographies of speaking" and later "ethnographies of communication",[7] believing that speaking and communication were cultural systems worthy of study in their own right. Several scholars from anthropology, linguistics, and sociology took Hymes up on his call, conducting the first ethnographies of speaking and further developing the program with programmatic essays (e.g., Bauman and Sherzer 1974; Gumperz and Hymes 1964, 1972; Hymes 1974a).

Philipsen, trained in the Ethnography of Speaking in graduate school, set out to conduct his doctoral dissertation on the means and meanings of speech in Teamsterville, a blue-collar neighborhood in Chicago, USA. Several publications in Communication journals ensued (e.g., Philipsen 1975, 1976, 1977, 1986; Katriel and Philipsen 1981) as Philipsen toiled with the program and trained several students, whom set out to conduct their own ethnographies on the patterns and meanings of

communication in various speech communities (e.g., Braithwaite 1990, 1997; Fitch 1998; Katriel 1986). Carbaugh was one such student who conducted his (1984) dissertation on cultural symbols and ways of communicating in a prominent American scene, *The Phil Donahue Show*. It is in this research that the seeds of CDT were first sewn and subsequently germinated in several early publications.

In Carbaugh's (1987) first publication stemming from his dissertation on "Communication rules in *Donahue* discourse", we see the seeds of CDT sprouting, as he unraveled rules for and meanings of communication in *The Phil Donahue Show,* a televised talk show popular in the 1970s through 1990s in the United States. What is perhaps most striking about this publication and a harbinger of CDT is his early and insightful connection of communication to models of personhood, or who and what the model person is conceived to be in different cultures. He cited several anthropological studies, explaining that "A long-standing feature in cultural studies of human action is the native conception of personhood" (Carbaugh 1987, 48). He is careful to point out that the conception of the person-*cum*-speaker is expressively constructed, constituted, *and* displayed in talk in the *Donahue* scene, in this case a "self" who can and should present their "self" through statements of personal opinion.

Importantly, we see here the beginning foundation of CDT, that ways of communicating are inextricably linked to conceptions of personhood and that this varies cross-culturally: "Considered in the abstract, ways of speaking a language are linked intimately to ways of conceived personhood" (Carbaugh 1987, 48–49). In addition, conceptions of the person are constructed *and* displayed in communication, this latter point being a major component of CDT today, namely, that as we communicate, a metacultural commentary is also at play, in this case, displaying or expressing by virtue of the very act of communication itself who the person can and should be, and how they can and should act, in this and related scenes.

Carbaugh's next publication in 1988 was his first book, *Talking American: Cultural Discourses on* Donahue, also based on his dissertation.[8] The analysis again focused on talk on *The Phil Donahue Show,* but it is important to note that it is not purely about the show. Rather, the show is treated as one ~~American scene~~ among many (perhaps the epitome of such scenes) where particular symbols and ways of speaking can be heard. Cultivated in the book is an extraordinary, complex, and detailed analysis of the spoken system of symbols and symbolic forms, intricately interrelated, that can be heard on and made sensible through *Donahue.* We also see extensive development of the concept of "cultural discourse", how to go about analyzing discourse with this construct, and the beginnings of a "cultural discourse theory" that can be used to study and theorize communication cross-culturally.

Throughout *Talking American,* Carbaugh referenced his intellectual inspirations for the project including Dell Hymes, Clifford Geertz, David Schneider, Victor Turner, and Donald Cushman; indeed, we hear elements of their work commingling with Carbaugh as he sought to analyze the speech on *Donahue* from a cultural perspective (Carbaugh 1987, xv). As such, he examined over 100 shows aiming to discover the spoken system of symbols that animated and made intelligible the talk on the show, as well as other American scenes (Carbaugh 1987, 13–14).

He found two major "cultural discourses" in the talk of *Donahue*, his guests, audience, and callers: one, the most predominant, a cultural discourse of personhood; the other, interwoven with the former, a cultural discourse of speaking. The discourse of personhood, which takes up much of the book (105 of its 187 pages),

paints the person as the most important aspect, or "symbol", of American culture: an "individual" with "rights" who has a "self" and makes "choices". These symbols and actions are organized into two cultural codes, which he calls the political and personal codes of personhood. Since the "individual" is the epicenter of the culture, it does not like to be oppressed, such as by social roles that individuals might be called or feel the need to fill. As such, there is also a positional code of social roles and a polemical code where self and social roles are in conflict. Taken together, a cultural discourse is treated here as comprised of interrelated thematic codes, which are "subsystems of symbols, symbolic forms and their meanings" (Carbaugh 1987, 8).

It is important to note that Carbaugh did not go into this research looking for symbols, discourses, or codes of personhood. Rather, he began by analyzing the talk on *Donahue* for its spoken system of symbols. What came to the fore most predominantly was a discourse (or system of symbols, meanings, codes) related to personhood. Not all cultural systems of communication will have the person and how it is conceived (e.g., as a "self" or "role") as its central symbol or dominant discourse, but it is often the case that personhood, however it is fashioned, is so fundamental in cultural systems that it deeply influences how people communicate.

The other major discourse concerns speaking and is comprised of a set of native terms (or symbols) that label specific ways and forms of communicating on *Donahue* and their meanings, which in turn are related to the symbols, codes, and discourse of personhood. First is "being honest", a way of communicating that involves the individual in expressing their "true" opinions, thoughts, and feelings. The second is "sharing", during which participants share experiences and stories concerning a common topic. While "being honest" focuses more on the individual via "self" expression, "sharing" has more of a "relational embrace", with stories and experiences being shared to help others and, through this help, displaying and constituting relationships between individuals (Carbaugh 1987, 145). Interestingly, relationships are condoned and valued in the culture since they are often personal relationships that are of one's own choosing (hence an act of "self") and they also help the individual to grow, develop, and change (see also Katriel and Philipsen 1981). Lastly, there is "communication", a ritualized sequence of acts in which a problem often concerning self or relationship is posed to other(s), there is a sharing of opinions, thoughts, and experiences related to the issue, through which it may or may not be solved. Its purpose is more a social function of being willing to participate in the ritual and through it to valorize the culture's unquestionables: "self", "relationship", and "communication" as a way to express, validate, and develop both. Again, cultural discourse is treated as a system of interrelated thematic codes, these codes largely focused on native terms for and enactments of specific ways and forms of speaking, symbols related to them (e.g., "relationship"), and their meanings. Note also how the cultural discourse of speaking is deeply intertwined with the more dominant discourse of personhood, creating a larger symbolic universe or supra-symbolic system.

This is a brief summary of the major findings presented in *Talking American* that relate to cultural discourse. Indeed, the development of this construct, type of analysis, and theorization can be traced to Carbaugh's study of talk on *Donahue*. Working within the Ethnography of Communication research program, Carbaugh set out to study and treat the speech on *Donahue* as a cultural system. Treating culture as a system of symbols and meanings (Schneider 1976), Carbaugh set out to discover

the system in the talk that occurred on *Donahue.* Then came the task of organizing the numerous symbols and meanings, though systematic, into some sort of sense: a native sense, but also one that was intelligible to readers and could build a program of research in which multiple researchers could analyze and theorize discourse culturally.

To make sense and order of the multiplicity of symbols, forms, and meanings that Carbaugh found, he employed multiple concepts culminating in cultural discourse. As he explained:

> One of the tasks in studies of cultural discourses is the organization of the grand symbolic complexity that persons use, coherently and intelligibly, into a useful fiction that embraces its diversity, enables its plurivocity, and places—hopefully in a productive way—such taken-for-granted resources (Hopper 1981) into a publicly scrutable domain. The general project is the intensive and sustained rendering of cultural communication into multi-layered and systematically interrelated cultural discourses (Carbaugh 1987, 180).

His conceptualization, distilled from *Talking American,* is that cultural discourses are systems of interrelated thematic codes: codes are subsystems of symbols, symbolic forms, and meanings; the meanings consist of cultural premises (combination of belief and value) that express the meanings of the symbols and forms, as well as their sociocultural functions. We see also that culture can be conceptualized as a system of interrelated discourses and further that since no two cultures are alike they may not be organized natively or theoretically the way Carbaugh has done in *Talking American.* Rather, the many concepts he presents can be treated as a "sensitizing lens", as tools that researchers may use variously as they formulate cultural descriptions and interpretations of discourse (Carbaugh 1987, 118).

While the concept of cultural discourse and how to go about CuDA are major contributions from *Talking American,* equally important is Carbaugh's finding that notions of personhood and ways of speaking are intimately interrelated. It suggests that in most, if not all, cultural systems, understanding what the native conception of personhood is will help researchers understand why speaking is conducted the way it is. Based on his findings, Carbaugh also included social relations or how people are related to each other. Thus, culture can be conceptualized as a system of interrelated cultural discourses, with these discourses likely involving conceptions of personhood, social relations, and speaking, pointing the way to understanding how and why communication is conducted the way it is.

A last significant contribution of *Talking American* is a cultural critique of several prominent theories of self, self-awareness, self-conception, and speech (e.g., Cushman and Cahn 1985; Goffman 1959; Grice 1975; Hallowell 1955; Mauss 1938/1985; Searle 1976), which based on Carbaugh's findings are likely culturally-biased or, at the very least, need cross-cultural comparative analysis before they can be treated as universal theories of the person and social action (Carbaugh 1987: 115–120, 9, 17, 113).[9] Carbaugh cites several cultural cases of personhood, illustrating that the person is not everywhere conceived of as a "self", having a self-concept or self-awareness, or that motivation for speech and action flows from inside the person outward. In the process, he quietly deconstructs fields such as Interpersonal Communication, forcing the reader to question if they are Westernized constructions and not manifestations of people and communication the world over. To rectify the above and similar theories, Carbaugh suggests several shifts in theoretical loci, for example, in studies of

personhood from individuals to discourses, in studies of speech from abstract dimensions to patterns of use; in studies of communication from unknown cultural premises to explicit cultural research. One way he proposes doing this is by focusing on native terms for and symbols of personhood and communication, their meanings including semantic dimensions, metaphors, codes and discourses of personhood, social relations and communication, with cross-cultural comparative analysis to assess and formulate native and general theories of personhood and communication.

Continuing with his research on speech patterns on *Donahue,* in 1988/1989 Carbaugh published a piece on a potentially universal discursive form, "deep agony", which is a form of agonistic discourse, that he found in talk among participants on the show as well as other American scenes. Picking up on the personal code of "self", the positional code of social roles, and the polemical code in which "self" and social role are in conflict from *Talking American*, Carbaugh broadened these findings through instances of talk on *Donahue* and other American scenes in which the symbols of "self" and "society" were played against each other. He found a specific and recurrent discursive form in which symbols and talk of "self" were played against the oppressive forces of "society" and traditional social roles, creating a deep agony between the two. This tension was resolved through a *communal* discursive form in which "self" was valorized and triumphant over problematic social roles and "society".

Carbaugh goes on to suggest that this agonistic form can be found in other American and Western times and scenes as well as other times and cultures. Based on these cases, Carbaugh argues that agonistic discourse is likely a feature of all cultural systems of communication in which symbols of personhood (being) are pitched against those of sociation (relating). What the symbols are and their meanings, what the agony between them is and how it is resolved, will vary cross-culturally, but the basic form perdures over time and culture. Carbaugh also argues (as does Philipsen 1987) that this tension between self and society, or individual and community, is a classic one that all cultures and times face, with an attendant necessity to forge cultural communicative forms and events that, if momentarily, resolve this tension (e.g., deep agony, [Carbaugh 1988/1989] or ritual, myth, and social drama [Philipsen 1989]).

For the development of CDT and CuDA, the agonistic form becomes a tool for analysis, suggesting that symbols of personhood and sociation may be in opposition in a cultural system of communication. It likewise opens avenues for inquiry and sensitizes researchers to the possible shapes and forms of discourse. Carbaugh concludes that "deep agony" seems a universal discursive form, with the universal aspects of the form including contrasting symbol clusters that form an interrelated semantic system, social and cultural functions, and cultural particularity in the universal form (Carbaugh 1987, 206).[10]

Building on findings from *Talking American* again, in 1989 Carbaugh published a cross-cultural comparative analysis of cultural terms for talk that culminated in a conceptual framework for study of them across cultures. A cultural term for talk, for example "being honest" or "sharing", is a native term that is used to conceive of and evaluate a particular way or form of speaking. Hymes' early conception of the Ethnography of Speaking (1962, 1972, 1974b) was that researchers would study all the ways of speaking in a speech community, thus producing ethnographies of the total cultural system of speaking in a community. Often terms for talk label significant ways of speaking, thus providing quick entry points into cultural systems

of communication. Further, etymological analysis (e.g., Katriel 1986; Scollo and Poutiainen 2006) often provides rich information about the meanings, functions, and uses of indigenous terms and the enactments they label.

To formulate a conceptual framework that could be used to analyze terms for talk across cultures, Carbaugh comparatively analyzed 50 terms for talk from seven extant ethnographic cases on 11 different societies for what was specific to each term and enactment and what was general across them. Carbaugh formulated the generalities or constant features across cases into a two-part conceptual framework. First, he found that terms for talk refer to four different levels of enactment: (1) the *act* level, terms that refer to speech performances produced by one participant; (2) the *event* level, terms that refer to speech performances that require more than one person or co-participatory production; (3) the *style* level, terms that refer to selection of a general way or variety of speaking among other ways; and (4) the *functional* level, terms that refer to the function of speech activities for those who engage in them and thus less a level of enactment and more an outcome of them.

Second, Carbaugh found that as people use terms for talk they convey literal messages about the speech or communication enactments to which they refer and more metaphorical messages about the models of personhood and social relations invoked in them. Messages about the communication practice itself divide into four categories, each of which suggests some possible dimensions upon which communication may vary: (a) mode of action (direct—indirect); (b) degree of structuring (fixed—flexible, restricted—elaborate); (c) tone (formal—informal, serious—playful); and (d) efficaciousness of the practice (substantial—insubstantial). Messages about sociality divide into three categories, with the middle category containing some possible dimensions of variation: (a) social roles or identities; (b) social relations (solidarity—intimacy, competitive—cooperative, close—distant, powerful—powerless); and (c) social institutions. Messages about personhood divide into four categories, each of which suggests some possible dimensions of variation: (a) loci of motives (relational—intentional); (b) bases of sociation (organically enmeshed—contractually interdependent); (c) styles of personhood (impersonal—personal, positional—intimate); and (4) overall types of personhood (sociocentric organic model—egocentric contractual model) (Carbaugh 1989, 103–12).

Since its publication, several studies have been conducted utilizing this two-part framework to analyze terms for talk in different cultures (e.g., Baxter 1993; Baxter and Goldsmith 1990; Bloch 2003; Carbaugh, Boromisza-Habashi, and Ge 2006; Garrett 1993; Goldsmith and Baxter 1996; Hall and Noguchi 1995; Hall and Valde 1995; Katriel 2004; Townsend 2004; Wilkins 1999). More recently the framework has been broadened to include terms for and enactments of nonverbal communication, for example, Blackfeet and US American nonverbal ways of communicating with nature (e.g., Carbaugh 1999; Carbaugh, Berry, and Nurmikari-Berry 2006; Carbaugh and Poutiainen 2000, Scollo 2004). There has also been movement toward using the framework to analyze cultural terms for pragmatic action. These are indigenous terms that label pragmatic actions rather than ways of communicating, but are nevertheless communicative and rich with significant cultural meaning, for example, terms that frame environmental efforts in a public meeting on pollution in Puget Sound (Washington, USA) including "restore", "recover", "clean up", and "protect" (Scollo and Townsend 2008).

For the development and practice of CuDA, the terms for talk framework focuses on an important aspect of cultural codes and discourses, cultural terms and symbols,

with a framework that fosters interpretation of the native meanings of the terms, symbols, and enactments they label, which can be subsequently formulated into cultural codes and discourses. Cultural terms and the terms for talk framework thus are additional analytical tools, sensitizing researchers to key cultural phenomena as well as offering a productive theoretical framework for descriptive and interpretive analysis.

In 1990 Carbaugh (1990b) published a piece that outlined his developing perspective on cultural communication and intercultural contact, which he refined in subsequent writings (e.g., Carbaugh 1990a, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1994a, 1994b). He argued that communication is creatively conducted on the basis of cultural models of communication, personhood, and emotion. When intercultural communication occurs, communication is being conducted via different cultural models and conceptions of what is appropriate communication for the situation, who the person can and should be, and how they should feel and express emotion. Likewise, difficulties and misunderstandings can ensue. Carbaugh suggested study of one, the interrelations of two or all of these structures of communication for understanding how and why people communicate the way they do and improving intercultural understanding. Significant for the development of CDT is the addition of premises of emotion for cultural interpretive analysis. This is a theoretical broadening of data-based findings presented in Carbaugh's first book, *Talking American,* which included ways of speaking associated with an affective dimension (e.g., the "righteous tolerance" of "being honest") as well as ways of speaking that focused on expressing feelings (e.g., "sharing").

Carbaugh (1990a) also edited a collection of significant ethnography of communication studies by a variety of authors on cultural communication, intercultural contact and cross-cultural comparative analysis, with Carbaugh introducing each of these topical areas with original commentary. The collection covers diverse communicative phenomena in a wide range of cultures including Teamsterville, African American, Osage, Anglo-American, Israeli, Aboriginal people of central Australia and Anglo-Australian, native speakers of English and Zulu in South Africa, Athabaskan and English speakers in Canada, Western Apache, Warm Springs Indian, and Ilongot cases. While the concept of "cultural discourse" is rarely used (though "cultural code" is at some points), the commentary and data-based studies center on sociocultural interpretation of communicative practices in different cultures, with much focus on personhood, social relations, and emotion expression as hubs of key cultural premises for understanding how and why communication is patterned and practiced the way it is in different cultures. As such, although the later, more fully developed vocabulary of CDT does not appear in the volume, the studies included can be taken as cultural discourse analyses. The broad array of studies can thus be used as exemplars of this kind of research and also for future cross-cultural comparative analysis of various phenomena.

In 1996 Carbaugh published a collection of his essays, *Situating Selves: The Communication of Social Identities in American Scenes* (1996b), which focused on social identities in a variety of American scenes, including fans at basketball games, workers at a television station, spouses' selections of last names upon marriage, vacillating identity talk among talk show participants, and developers and environmentalists in a land-use controversy. His thesis was that social identities are communication practices, situated in both physical settings and rich symbolic culturescapes, and thus can be studied for how they are "discoursed", both in

everyday talk and broader cultural discourses. Although "cultural discourse" is not mentioned extensively, the communication practices examined (e.g., last names upon marriage, verbal depictions of nature) are interpreted via premises of being, acting, relating, feeling, and dwelling. Notable here is the addition of premises of dwelling, that is, beliefs and values about how to live in the world and with nature, which is of special relevance to the chapters on a land-use controversy. The concept of cultural code is employed, as strands or components of larger cultural discourses (e.g., "economic" and "ecologic" codes involved in the land-use controversy; "traditional", "modern", and "integrative" marital name codes). Suggested with this conceptualization as well as the studies in this collection is that clusters of symbols or codes can be in opposition within a synergistic cultural discourse or system of communication.

Carbaugh finds two forms of communication in which these dialectical oppositions play out. First, similar to the agonistic form discussed above, is a "vacillating form of identity talk" found on *The Phil Donahue Show.* With this form, participants play social identities such as gender identities (e.g., female, male) against the culturally preferred model person, the "individual", with the latter being favored. Though both forms can be treated broadly as antagonistic, the main difference between the vacillating form and the agonistic form is one of domains. The vacillating form occurs *within* one domain: identities are played against identities; while the agonistic form occurs *between* domains: identities are played against social formations.

Second is a practice, "verbal depictions of nature", that Carbaugh finds in the discourse of a controversy over a parcel of land in western Massachusetts. Those who want to develop the land verbally depict it through different symbols and associated premises than those who want to preserve it, creating "dueling depictions" which make it difficult to forge a shared plan for the land.

In all of the scenes and identities covered, from fans at sporting competitions and stratified workers at a television station (see also Carbaugh 1985), to individuals who select different names upon marriage and developers and environmentalists in a local environmental debate, there is a dialectical play between and within clusters of symbols, practices, and codes, suggesting that cultural discourses and systems of communication are more an "organization of diversity" (Hymes 1974a) than uniformity.

In 1997 Carbaugh published a landmark piece in the development of CDT with Timothy A. Gibson and Trudy Milburn that was the lead chapter in an edited volume on emerging perspectives in human communication. This is the first publication in which we see "cultural discourse" and related constructs explicitly defined as well as extended discussion of how to conduct CuDA. The cumulative effort of years of research and theorizing, the essay contains the most fully-articulated version of CDT to this point (but see also Carbaugh 2005, 2007a, 2010), which guides cultural discourse analyses of numerous scholars today.

Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn begin by explaining that their goal is to propose a way of theorizing human communication that integrates both social interaction and culture. Toward this end, they outline three grounding constructs of CDT: communication practice, scene, and cultural discourse. The basic strategy is to examine communication practices situated in scenes and the cultural discourses that are immanent in, radiating through, and composed of them. A communication practice is defined as "a *pattern of situated, message endowed action* that is used in a scene(s)" (Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn 1997, 6). Typically, a researcher will collect multiple instances of a single type of communication practice (e.g., address

terms, apologies) across scenes as well as related practices (e.g., greetings, accounts) within a discourse community. Communicative scene identifies both the physical setting and stream of utterances in which communication practices occur as well as the broader symbolic culturescape that is presumed for their enactment and of which they are part. The symbolic culturescape is "a *system of expressive meaning* that is imminent in communicative occasions, and through them ... [and] runs across other occasions as well" (Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn 1997, 6). A cultural discourse is *part* of the symbolic culturescape, it is an analyst's formulation of the larger culturescape which is radically implicated in a practice.

Importantly, we see the addition of cultural discourse to the concept of code in this piece, with more of a focus on the former, though both remain important in CDT. For conceptual clarity, it is important to distinguish the two. As we know from earlier work, a cultural discourse may be comprised of multiple, related cultural codes, these being composed of symbols or symbolic forms and their meanings. Another way to conceptualize this is as a "nested conceptualization", a cultural discourse being the bigger idea, with symbols nested within codes, and codes nested within discourses (see Berry, Carbaugh, and Nurmikari-Berry 2004). Cultural discourses typically involve multiple codes; this is not necessary but is most likely. Note that this is not a matter of theoretical imprecision. The concepts ask about empirical matters and for this reason whether any specific cultural discourse involves one or more codes is an empirical, not a conceptual matter.

A cultural discourse can be defined topically (e.g., health, education, law, environment), as a set of interactional functions (e.g., creating identity, social institutions, relations), or a combination of both. Thus, when using the concepts of code and discourse, a cultural discourse of "health" for example, may be comprised of multiple, interrelated codes. Conversely, if just using the concept of discourse, a cultural discourse of "health" would be comprised of a system of interrelated communication practices (symbols, symbolic acts/forms), rules or norms, and their meanings (premises) which pertain to health matters. Importantly, unlike a cultural code, which concerns a communication practice and its meanings, a cultural discourse organizes *multiple,* related practices in and across scenes, rules or norms, and their meanings (see also Carbaugh 2010). Further, as Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn explain:

> The meanings of cultural discourses—of the symbols, acts, forms, rules—consist in basic premises about being (identity), doing (action), relating (social relations), feeling (emoting), and dwelling (living in place) ... Not all premises are always relevant, nor equally salient in all scenes (1997: 22).

That is, the deep meanings of particular communication practices (the *why* of those practices) will typically have something to do with a people's beliefs and values about who the person is, how they should act, how they are related to other people, what they should feel, and how they should live in place. It is in this sense that communication practices, implicitly or explicitly, "say" something about who we are, what we believe we should be doing, feeling, how we should be relating to others and living in place. Note also that part of the basis for this aspect of CDT stems from the interpretive component of the earlier Terms for Talk framework (Carbaugh 1989), that is, messages of personhood, sociation, and communication that radiate during the use of terms for talk and the enactments they label.

When conducting CuDA, there is a deliberate tacking back and forth between communication practice, scene, and cultural discourse, with each presuming, invoking, and constituting the other.[11] As the authors explain:

> Cultural discourses are, in other words, immanent in communication practices, composed of specific communication practices, and draw attention to a system of symbols, premises, rules, or norms, and meanings that radiate within those practices (p. 7).

Taken together, when conducting CuDA there is a set of concepts that can be employed to structure analyses and organize findings (e.g., symbol, symbolic act/form, communication practice, scene, premise, code, discourse). These should be treated as an investigative lens, a way of inquiring, sensitizing researchers to the possibilities of sociocultural life and ways of articulating it in a meaningful, "native" interpretation. The move toward more of a focus on cultural discourse, its conceptual focus on communicative act, scene, discourse and premises of being, acting, relating, feeling and dwelling, signifies a more robust development of this theory as well as data (e.g., Blackfeet, Russian, Finnish communication practices) that required such a theory for its explanation.

In the remainder of the essay, the authors offer two brief examples of CuDA, the first, some of the findings from Milburn's doctoral dissertation on symbols of "time" and "community" in a Puerto Rican cultural center, the second, findings from Gibson's master's thesis on practices in educational scenes at Hampshire College. Taken together, the essay is one of the key pieces in the development, explanation, and demonstration of CDT and CuDA.

Cultural Discourse Analysis

Over the next decade, Carbaugh published several cultural discourse analyses of different cultures,[12] practices,[13] and intercultural interactions,[14] as well as extensions of the theory and form of analysis to particular fields including environmental communication (Carbaugh 1996a), rhetoric (Carbaugh and Wolf 1999), international language learning (Berry et al. 2004), health (Carbaugh 2007d; Suopis and Carbaugh 2005), and public policy (Carbaugh 2009). From reading this research, one senses that Carbaugh has formulated a vigorous theory based upon past research and theorizing, culminating in his 1997 piece with Gibson and Milburn, and now is applying it to numerous cultural contexts and practices, intercultural interactions, as well as various fields, to test the theory, its interdisciplinary utility, and to add to the fund of data-based studies utilizing it.

Much of this research culminates in Carbaugh's (2005) book, *Cultures in Conversation,* which focuses on ethnographic and cultural discourse analysis of intercultural interactions involving communication practices from England, Finland, Russia, Blackfeet Country (Montana, USA), and the United States.[15] The book treats conversation as a radically cultural phenomenon, demonstrating how different cultural premises ground conversational conduct, causing difficulty and misunderstanding in specific intercultural episodes. His major thesis, illustrated by analyses in the book, is that:

> Conversation can be understood . . . as a symbolic phenomenon, as a kind of metasocial commentary—whether intended or not—about the activities we are doing, about who

> we are, how we are related to each other, how we feel about what is going on, and the nature of the situation. In some sense, then, in every conversation, one or more cultures is at work, if by culture we are drawing attention to symbolic phenomena that say something about our common senses of acting (what we are doing together and how we do it), of being (who we are), of relating (how we are linked to each other), of feeling (about people, actions, and things), and of dwelling together (how we relate to the world around us) (Carbaugh 2005, 1).

As such, Carbaugh, though commending their work and claiming complementary goals, critiques "conversation analysis" for its lack of attention to cultural features of interaction, demonstrating that there are cultural differences in such aspects as the topics, symbolic structuring, sequencing, pacing, and communicative modes of conversation (Carbaugh 2005, xix–xx). He also critiques the field of Intercultural Communication for reduction of cultural differences to traits such as individualism-collectivism, rather than careful cultural analysis of the communicative practices involved in actual intercultural interactions (Carbaugh 2005, 13).

The bulk of the book (Chapters 2–7) contains detailed transcriptions and analysis of actual intercultural interactions. Insights from these analyses are formulated in the final chapter into "cultural conversations", or the typical ways conversation is conducted and why, in the United States, Finland, Russia, and Blackfeet Country. Carbaugh demonstrates throughout the book how different symbols, premises, forms, and motivations for conversation can cause difficulties in intercultural interaction, even when speaking a shared language, as conversation is conceived, conducted, and evaluated in different ways. Knowledge of these ways, and this kind of research, can thus be instrumental in fostering greater intercultural sensitivity, understanding, and more fruitful conversations.

The first and final chapters of the book also offer useful strategies for how to conduct CuDA (see also Carbaugh 2007a, 2010). Carbaugh explains the "investigative modes" involved in CuDA, beginning with the *discovery* of a communication practice, with this itself being a descriptive and interpretive claim, of a significant, recurrent, meaningful practice to participants (Carbaugh 2005, 6). Next, researchers collect multiple instances of the practice across scenes, creating a corpus of data to be examined. Each instance is *recorded* through methods such as field notes, audio and video recordings, and transcriptions to create a public record and to facilitate detailed, ongoing analysis. Transcriptions, increasingly important in the Ethnography of Communication and CuDA, are also a descriptive and interpretive claim of a practice that actually occurred and features of it that are culturally significant (Carbaugh 2005, 7–8, 127–28). Next the researcher *describes* each instance, for example, its integral features, symbolic structuring, and/or how to engage in the practice, and then *interprets* its meaningfulness to participants through key symbols, cultural premises and propositions, semantic dimensions and norms, which are formulated into cultural codes and discourses (see Carbaugh 2010).[16]

As CDT highlights interpretive analysis, much of Carbaugh's remaining comments focus on this kind of analysis. In the final chapter, he outlines a set of propositions and questions that can be used to guide interpretive analysis, specifically, for interpreting and formulating the native meanings of communication practices into cultural premises and discourses. A guiding question that he offers, which can be asked of any communication practice to interpret its deeper, cultural meanings is: "What must be presumed—believed and/or valued—in order for that contribution to the conversation to be indeed what it is for these participants" (Carbaugh 2005,

128)? These beliefs and values are formulated into cultural premises, which he explains as: "... analysts' formulations of conversants' beliefs about the significance and importance of what is going on, both as a condition for that practice of conversation, and as expressed in that very practice" (Carbaugh 2005, 5).[17]

He next offers a set of propositions and questions that ground CuDA and guide the formulation of cultural premises and discourses (see also Carbaugh 2007a, 2010). First are two propositions concerning descriptive and interpretive inquiry:

> A proposition about descriptive inquiry: Conversation is a practice that can and should be described on its own, in its own right, while attentive to its discursive codes (Carbaugh 2005, 128).
>
> ... a general proposition about interpretive inquiry: Communication, conversation and social interaction involves a complex metacultural commentary, explicitly and/or implicitly, about identities, actions, feelings, relations, and living in place (Carbaugh 2005, 129).

Though these dimensions of cultural discourses may not be "equally relevant" or "salient" for all communication practices, each can be used to systematically formulate a cultural interpretation or "reading" of the deep, cultural meanings of communication practices (Carbaugh 2005, 129). In this spirit, Carbaugh offers questions and corollaries for each dimension that can be used for analysis:

(1) For being or identity: "To begin, we can ask, in this practice of communication, through this discourse, who are we presumed or presented to be? *Corollary one: Conversation is a metacultural commentary about being, and identity, with messages about who we are—and should be—being coded into this practice of conversation"* (Carbaugh 2005, 129).
(2) Acting or doing: "In this practice of communication, what are we doing, and what should we be doing? *Corollary two: Conversation is a metacultural commentary about acting, with messages about what we are doing, and should be doing, being coded into the practice of conversation"* (Carbaugh 2005, 130).
(3) Feeling or emotion: "How do we feel about this practice of communication, in and about which we are engaged? *Corollary three: Conversation is a metacultural commentary about emotion, with messages about how we feel—and should feel—being coded into acts of conversation"* (Carbaugh 2005, 130).
(4) Relating or sociation: "How are we being related in this practice of communication? *Corollary four: Conversation is a metacultural commentary about relating, with messages about social relations being coded into acts of conversation"* (Carbaugh 2005, 130).
(5) Dwelling or living in place: "How does this communication relate us to places? *Corollary five: Conversation is a metacultural commentary about dwelling, with messages about living in place being coded into acts of conversation"* (Carbaugh 2005, 131).

Responding to these questions should assist researchers in formulating systems of premises regarding each dimension, which then can be formulated into cultural discourses that invoke, and are invoked by, particular communication practices.[18]

As such, and as demonstrated and explicated in the book, CuDA offers a rich, nuanced, and systematic way of describing and interpreting the cultural meaningfulness of communication.

Since the book, Carbaugh has continued this work, publishing cultural discourse analyses of terms for talk in different cultures (e.g., Carbaugh, Berry, and Nurmikari-Berry 2006; Carbaugh, Boromisza-Habashi, and Ge 2006), Blackfeet communication practices (e.g., Carbaugh and Boromisza-Habashi in press; Carbaugh, Boromisza-Habashi, and Ge 2006; Carbaugh and Rudnick 2006), Finnish communication practices (Carbaugh, Berry, and Nurmikari-Berry 2006, Carbaugh, Boromisza-Habashi and Ge 2006), and environmental communication (Carbaugh 2007c; Carbaugh and Bormisza-Habashi in press; Carbaugh and Rudnick 2006). Particularly relevant is his recent turn toward explicating in detail the methodology of CuDA (e.g., Carbaugh 2007a, 2007b, 2010), educating those who wish to conduct cultural discourse analyses in its methods, from the theoretical orientation and conceptualization of a problem for study, to data collection and recording techniques, methods of descriptive and interpretive analysis, as well as comparative and critical inquiry.

CDT and CuDA's developmental arc and practice today

If we look at the arc of the development of CDT during Carbaugh's career, we see that many of the initial ideas and conceptual components of the theory were originated in his (1984) doctoral dissertation, which later formed the basis of his first book (1988), *Talking American.* Through subsequent years, Carbaugh expanded on conceptually rich parts of his dissertation and *Talking American,* such as terms for talk (1989) and agonistic discourse (1988/1989), in the process creating robust conceptual frameworks for analyzing these communicative forms as well as continuing to develop CDT in the process. Utilizing this emerging theory, over the next decade he examined communication practices in different cultures and intercultural interactions (e.g., Blackfeet, Finnish, Russian, US American), as well as intensively read ethnographic reports of communication in different cultures, which served to expand CDT further (e.g., the addition of the dimensions of emotion and dwelling for interpretive analysis). In 1997, after almost a decade and a half of work, we see the first formal published statement of "cultural discourse theory" (Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn 1997), presenting the most fully-formed version of the theory to that date, which is used by numerous scholars today to guide cultural discourse analyses. Over the next decade, Carbaugh, numerous scholars, as well as master's and doctoral students of Carbaugh's utilized the theory to guide analyses of cultural communication and intercultural interactions. We also see during this time extensions of CDT and analysis to various fields (e.g., environmental communication, health, public policy).

Much of Carbaugh's most recent work has been on explicating the methodology of CuDA in detail (e.g., Carbaugh 2005, 2007a, 2010), thus we see the arc coming full circle, from the theory's initial impetus, gradual building, full formation, interdisciplinary application, use by numerous students and scholars, to detailed theoretical and methodological explanation by Carbaugh. Future work by Carbaugh, students, and scholars will likely follow this path, with continued use of the theory to analyze cultural and intercultural communication practices in various domains of social life, with theoretical frameworks for cross-cultural communicative forms discovered in the

process serving to expand the theory, as well as cross-cultural comparative analysis of such research serving to build an ethnographically-informed, culturally-sensitive, general understanding of human communication.

Numerous students and scholars of communication have conducted research utilizing CDT and CuDA on a variety of topics, for example, communication practices in a variety of cultures and intercultural interactions (Boromisza-Habashi 2008; Hastings 1995, 2000a, b, 2001; Mahoney 1995, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2009; Poutiainen 2004, 2005; Poutiainen and Gerlander 2009; Rudnick 2001; Saito 2007, 2009; Saxe 2001; Tanamura 2001; Wilkins 2005, 2009; Wilkins and Isotalus 2009; Wolf 1998), environmental communication (Aiu 1997; Foley 1997; Morgan 2002, 2003, 2007; Scollo 2004), health (Suopis 2002), rhetoric (Boromisza-Habashi 2007a; Townsend 2004, 2006, 2009; Witteborn and Sprain 2009); education (Gibson 1995; Wilkins 1999), music (Mackenzie 2005 and McLeod 1999; Saxe 1994; Scollo 2000), media and mediated communication (Boromisza-Habashi, 2007b; Poutiainen 2007; Scollo 2007), and public policy (Miller and Rudnick 2008).

For those interested in learning more about CDT and conducting cultural discourse analyses, a short list of key pieces to read includes: (1) Carbaugh's first book, *Talking American,* for the originating components of the theory as well as its superb interpretive analysis; (2) the first formal statement of CDT by Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn (1997); one of Carbaugh's later books, *Cultures in Conversation* (2005), for its explanation of CuDA as well as analyses of intercultural interactions based on two decades of research; and (4) more recent pieces by Carbaugh (2007a, 2010) which include detailed explanation of the methodology of CuDA.[19] In addition, the prior paragraph and portions of this essay include examples of data-based research utilizing CDT that may be of use to interested readers.

Discussion

It is clear from the review of CDT and the brief synopses of Blommaert's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Shi-xu's Cultural Approach to Discourse (CAD), and Asian communication theories that there are an array of conceptions, theories, and methods for analyzing discourse and communication from cultural and critical perspectives. Each brings significant features of discourse and its analysis into view and all can benefit from each other. What I aim to do now is to compare and contrast these programs. Specifically, the programs have similarities and differences in their: (1) definitions; (2) objectives; (3) methods of data collection and analysis; and (4) the role of critique.

Definitions

Each of the programs defines fundamental terms such as discourse, communication, and culture. While it may seem overly mundane to focus on definitions, they are the foundation of the research process, setting the stage for what counts as problems for study and data as well as influencing analytical tools and processes. Likewise, definitions of key terms are critical in any research program.

Discourse, communication, or both are defined in all the programs. Discourse is defined by Blommaert and Shi-xu in a similar fashion, as a semiotic activity in social, cultural, historical, and political contexts. Blommaert is careful to point out that discourse may be non-linguistic, while Shi-xu focuses on the plural and competing

nature of discourse, though both focus largely on linguistic materials in their data-based analyses. Shi-xu also notes that discourse is a process of meaning construction and way of thinking. This is the slippery point in discourse studies, that the object of analysis is, at the very least, a duality: (1) the linguistic and/or non-linguistic activity often referred to as "text", "talk", or "discourse"; and (2) the system of ideas, beliefs and values expressed, reflected and constituted in and through linguistic and nonlinguistic activity, also referred to as "discourse" or "cultural discourse". This dual use of the term can make defining, understanding, and implementing discourse analysis challenging.

Being in the field of Communication, Carbaugh side-steps this issue by identifying the former as "communication practice" (i.e., meaningful patterns of text, action, or talk), and the latter as "cultural discourse". Indeed, much of Carbaugh's 25 years of work on CDT was dedicated to formulating the idea of "cultural discourse" and what it entails. By 1997, after over a decade of data-based analysis of communication practices in different cultures, the idea took its full shape, that is, "cultural discourse" as a system of symbols, symbolic acts, cultural premises, norms, or rules that say something about being, acting, relating, feeling, and dwelling. Note how closely related this definition is to methods of analysis for CuDA. That is, researchers analyze sets of cultural communication practices for their associated symbols, rules, or norms as well as premises of being, acting, relating, feeling, and dwelling. Likewise, we see how intimately related definitions of fundamental concepts are to methodology.

Similar to Carbaugh, Shi-xu focuses on the symbolic, cultural, and ideational aspects of "discourse". Shi-xu, along with Blommaert, in traditional discourse analysis fashion also focuses on linguistic features of "text" and "talk". Similar to Carbaugh in some aspects, the Asian communication theory program focuses on indigenous definitions of communication. In contrast, while Carbaugh is in strong favor of studying indigenous terms for and conceptions of communication (see his 1989 Terms for Talk framework), he uses these to understand what is *particular* about communication in specific places and communities and what is general about communication across cultures.

Lastly, Carbaugh and Shi-xu also offer definitions of culture. Carbaugh's is more symbolic, treating culture as a system of symbols and meanings (Schneider 1976), while Shi-xu, following Cultural Studies, treats culture as competing systems of meaning construction. Note here also how all these definitions set the stage for research questions and hypotheses that will be posed, problems for inquiry, data to be collected, and methods of analysis.

Objectives

Most of the programs are quite vocal about the objectives of their research. All aim to examine discourse or communication without cultural bias, to understand cultures and their discursive practices or communication conceptions in their own right, with some sort of critical move. Blommaert's CDA seeks to examine effects of power, inequality, and issues of voice in discourse to help solve pressing social problems. Shi-xu, the most forthright in stating his objectives for CAD, seeks to expose and undermine repressive cultural discourses, while offering new transformative discourses of "cultural equality and emancipation" (Shi-xu 2005, 6). The Asian communication theorists aim to add their conceptions of communication to the Communication field to critique and ameliorate the Western bias in the

Communication field, to draw attention to and formulate their own theory and perspective on communication, and to enlarge the Communication field's conception of communication. Carbaugh's CuDA seeks to formulate cultural discourse theories of communication practices in situated scenes utilizing a general descriptive and interpretive theoretical framework, with cross-cultural comparative analyses of similar practices utilized to refine this general framework and to critique cultural bias in extant communication theories. Further, the situated or cultural theories aid in understanding different cultures and their practices, fostering cultural sensitivity and awareness, and also aid in understanding and improving intercultural interactions. Lastly, findings from CuDA studies may be used to help with communication and social problems (e.g., Carbaugh 1996b).

Placing multiple approaches to cultural discourse analysis side-by-side brings into view the specific objectives of each program and how each may draw from the other. It also forces us to examine the objectives of our own research. This is critically important not only because research should have explicit objectives, but also, as can be gleaned from above, our objectives deeply influence our research, from selection of problems for study, to generation of data, to methods of data analysis and the use of our findings.

Methods of data collection and analysis

While each program's methods of data collection and analysis are quite different, they do share a focus on generating data on and analyzing discourse and communication. Once again, definitions of key concepts and research objectives influence both data collection and analysis. Beginning with data collection, how one defines "discourse" or "communication" is directly linked to what "count" as data. For example, Blommaert and Carbaugh include linguistic and non-linguistic activity in their conceptualizations of discourse and communication practice, respectively, whereas Shi-xu focuses on linguistic materials. Likewise, the field of possible data is broader for Carbaugh and Blommaert.

Research objectives also influence data collection. Shi-xu is perhaps the most vocal about this as he argues that CAD should focus on problems of cultural repression and domination. Likewise, only discourse that focuses on this topic area, which arguably covers a wide range of cultures and problems, can be selected as data. Blommaert wishes to focus on power effects, inequality and issues of voice in the globalized world, thus only discourse, including linguistic and nonlinguistic activities, related to these can be selected as data. Carbaugh focuses on communication practices (that is, culturally significant, recurrent, meaningful patterns of verbal and nonverbal communication) thus seemingly insignificant or random acts may not be selected as data as well as practices out of view of the researcher. Asian communication theorists focus on scholarly and lay, traditional and current Asian conceptions of communication, restricting data to conceptions rather than, for example, communication practices or culturally-hybrid conceptions of communication (see however, Jia 1997/1998, 2003). From this brief review, we can see that the definitions and objectives of each program not only restrict what 'count' as data, but further potentially bias the research process as we head into the field with blinders on, narrowing our focus to certain problems, discourse and communication activities. Not surprisingly, from the programs covered, there is a broad range of data covered, from newspaper articles, written documents, interviews, naturally-occurring

and scripted talk on television, face-to-face interaction, public meetings, to Internet discussion boards. These data are recorded in a variety of ways including document collection, audio and video recordings, transcripts, and field notes.

Turning to data analysis, definitions and objectives deeply influence how data is analyzed. Blommaert and Shi-xu are similarly eclectic, multidisciplinary, and critical (of which more later) in their analytical methods. Blommaert's focus is organizing an interdisciplinary field of CDA around shared problems, thus his methodology follows suit (Blommaert 2005, 19). However, he does propose an overarching analytical strategy, that discourse should be examined in relation to its global context. Shi-xu is more concerned with cultural bias in research strategies, arguing that Western theories are often used to analyze non-Western data to unproductive ends. Likewise, he suggests using indigenous theories and methods whenever possible. He does offer, however, two overarching analytical strategies: deconstructive (i.e., deconstructing repressive discourses) and transformational (i.e., formulating new, transformative discourses). Since Shi-xu's primary objective is to undermine culturally repressive discourses, his analytical strategies focus on detailing discourses of different parties involved in particular issues and, significantly, the power relations *between* them. Examining these relationships brings cultural domination and repression directly into view, facilitating the deconstructive process.

A major difference between these programs and CDT is Carbaugh's use of a pancultural theory to analyze cultural communication practices in situated scenes. The idea stems from Hymes' (1962) initial conception of the Ethnography of Speaking, in which a common descriptive theory, developed on the basis of extant ethnographic cases and subject to continual revision, would be used to describe and interpret ways of speaking across cultures, with the common use of this theory facilitating cross-cultural comparative analysis. With CDT, Carbaugh has built on this idea, adding an additional tool for interpretive analysis, formulated on the basis of extant ethnographic research and also subject to continual revision. Indeed, much of Carbaugh's career has been dedicated to formulating and revising this theory, as each study he and others conduct brings new insights into view.

As we know, CuDA focuses on describing and interpreting communication practices in situated scenes with attention to the cultural discourses that animate them. Hymes' (1972) descriptive theory may and often is used in CuDA studies, with CDT being used to further interpret the cultural meaningfulness of practices, that is, their associated symbols, symbolic acts, norms or rules, and premises of being, acting, relating, feeling, and dwelling. In addition, specific theories related to the practice being examined (for example, address terms, narrative, or indirect speech) may be culled from the literature to aid in analysis. What is built is a theoretical framework, a combination of Hymes' descriptive theory, Carbaugh's CDT, and any additional concepts and theories needed, which is used to analyze each datum that is generated. The findings of the analysis are formulated into a situated or native theory of how communication is practiced in a specific scene, with this theory being utilized to evaluate and potentially revise theories and concepts from the theoretical framework, particularly if they are found to be culturally-biased (see Carbaugh and Hastings 1995 for more on these points).

Likewise, we see a contrast between Shi-xu, Blommaert, and Asian communication theorists' reticence for selecting analytical tools a priori or utilizing general theories for analysis for fear of cultural bias. Carbaugh's point (and Hymes') is that general theories can be formulated and utilized successfully to conceptualize and

analyze discourse and communication across cultures, with continual revision of these theories as necessary. However, it is worth noting, as pancultural as these theories are, they may bias researchers who employ them to only look for and examine certain features of communication and discourse, as well as to interpret them in certain ways.

The role of critique

The role of critique is the last major difference between the programs. All have their critical components, but critique plays a different role in each, at local and global levels. For CDA and CAD, critique is a major component and objective of their programs. CDA focuses on the critical analysis of discourse to address pressing social problems. For Blommaert, rather than merely criticize power, he urges CDA to focus on the role of discourse in the production and effects of power as well as their consequences for individuals, groups, and societies in the globalized world. CAD is focused on problems of cultural repression and domination, critiquing those in power by exposing and undermining culturally repressive discourses and offering new integrative and transformative discourses. Critique and critical discourse analysis *is* the objective of these programs, with the addition of new discourses in CAD.

In regard to these programs and the role of critique, however, we can ask: Who decides what is a social problem or an instance of cultural repression or domination? Is it the researcher and, if so, on what basis are such claims made? Is it those involved in the problem, community(s), or issue? What if those involved do not see it as an issue? Or if the multiple parties involved see different issues? Further, when new discourses are offered, from what stance are they made? Are they the researcher's, based on academic research or their own cultural backgrounds? Or do researchers work with the involved parties to construct new discourses that meet their needs, as Shi-xu suggests?

CDT, which has been criticized as not being critical, takes a different track. First, as Carbaugh (1989/1990) and Blommaert (2005) point out, the Ethnography of Communication (EC), of which CDT is part, and related fields including Linguistic Anthropology and Sociolinguistics, are critical enterprises though critique is not always explicit. First, for EC and CDT, the findings of situated, cultural research are used to evaluate, potentially revise and critique extant communication theories if they are culturally-biased. EC and CDT researchers take a critical stance, that communication and discourse *are* cultural and should be investigated and theorized upon this basis (Carbaugh 1989/1990). Further, as Blommaert explains, Linguistic Anthropology, of which EC and CDT are part, believes all cultures to be equal, sensible within their own system, and worthy of study in their own right, leveling cultural inequalities (Blommaert 2005, 7–8). Different cultures were also and continue to be studied as a critique of one's own society (Blommaert 2005, 7). Sociolinguistics also revealed the unequal distribution of ways of speaking in societies and its effects.

"Critique" in the traditional sense is difficult for ethnographers because they investigate discourse, communication, and culture from the "native's" point of view, without passing judgment. The goal is to understand communication and discourse as much as possible from members' point of view before, if ever, conducting critical analysis. Thus, as Carbaugh (1989/1990) recommends, the first step is to describe communication and discourse as they are practiced in a particular community or site. Next, their meaning to participants is interpreted. From these two types of analysis,

researchers come to an understanding of the "how" and "why" of a practice. If critical analysis is desired, researchers should first see if there are any cultural critiques of practices naturally occurring in the discourse community. For example, Carbaugh (1996b) examined communication at a television station in which multiple participants referred to "the communication problem". This, then, becomes an avenue for inquiry, following and understanding this critique from members' point of view.

Lastly, an ethnographer may decide to engage in critique of cultural practices after conducting descriptive, interpretive, and naturally-occurring critical analyses. Early on, Carbaugh did so in *Talking American* (1988) when, after describing and interpreting codes of personhood and ways of speaking on *Donahue* and in the United States more broadly, he critiqued them for fostering a "tyranny of openness" (pp. 111–112). Later, in a compelling essay on Blackfeet ways of communicating in an Anglo-American public speaking course, Carbaugh (1995a) lodged a convincing critique of oppressive communication expectations and practices in US college classes that seriously disadvantage Blackfeet students. Carbaugh and Rudnick (2006) also exposed how Blackfeet people and history were erased in many tours given in Glacier National Park (Montana, USA).

These examples and ethnographic approaches to cultural discourse analysis raise an important question: from whose stance are researchers making their critique? Is it on the basis of academic research, her or his cultural backgrounds, personal beliefs, or with the group(s) under study in mind? This is why critique is problematic for ethnographers, as it takes them out of the native point of view and likewise should be handled with caution.[20] This, in a way, is what all the programs are working toward, exposing and undermining cultural domination, repression, and bias. We must make sure that our research methods do not unwittingly create the very outcomes we are rallying against.

The Asian communication theorists are also critical, utilizing their research on traditional and current Asiacentric conceptions and perspectives of communication to critique the Communication field as Western-biased, suggesting that researchers likewise use indigenous theories and methods for the study of communication.

Taken together, each of these programs is critical in their own way and can learn from the others. CDA and CAD are explicitly critical in their desire to aid in solving pressing social problems in the globalized world, critiquing power relations and effects in their research, offering solutions and new discourses to aid in the process. CDT research, at a more local level, has also helped resolve organizational and public issues, for example, Carbaugh's (1996b) findings on communication practices at a local television station and in a land-use controversy. CDT and the Asian communication theory program have been largely critical of Western bias in the Communication field, exposing this bias, revising extant communication theories and offering additional cultural perspectives on communication and discourse. All the programs are critical of Western bias in research methods and theories in their fields, whether the "power" being examined is within and between organizations, communities, and societies or within the walls of academia.

In summary, all of the programs have differences and similarities in their definitions, objectives, methodology, and the role of critique. Placing them side-by-side brings the benefits and constraints of each into view and can sharpen our own approach to research. What this comparative analysis does suggest is that it is incredibly important that we outline our research programs, from definitions of key terms, to philosophical foundations, objectives, methods of data collection, analysis,

and critique in precise detail. This can only serve to fortify our research and advance our agenda, through more rigorous research, enabling others to understand and evaluate our programs, to train future students and scholars, and to use our research to aid in significant social problems.

In conclusion, I hope that there will be similar contributions to the *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* on other approaches to the cultural analysis of discourse so that we can continue this conversation. As Carbaugh has often said, "there is much work to be done"; hopefully this essay has inspired some and offered tools to continue this important work.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Shi-xu for the opportunity to write this essay as well as his helpful guidance on it. The author would also like to thank Donal Carbaugh for the opportunity to write the essay, his superb scholarship and teaching, as well as the many helpful conversations and guidance concerning the essay. Lastly, a special thanks to Trudy Milburn for her review of the essay.

Notes

1. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~db=all~content=t794020039~tab=summary
2. This is perhaps easier for me to argue as a white, middle-class female born and raised in the United States.
3. Cultural Discourse Theory (abbreviated as CDT) refers to the theory that Carbaugh has developed over several years of research (first officially termed this in Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn 1997). Cultural Discourse Analysis (abbreviated as CuDA) refers to analysis conducted with this theory.
4. This period is roughly from the first publication of Philipsen's (1975) ethnographic study of Teamsterville communication patterns to publications by Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn (1997) on Cultural Discourse Theory and Philipsen (1997) on Speech Codes Theory.
5. This essay in no way downplays the importance of Speech Codes Theory, its role in the Ethnography of Communication, or its role in the development of Cultural Discourse Theory. Both have developed in tandem, inspiring each other en route to a way of analyzing and theorizing communication culturally. The focus of the present essay is Cultural Discourse Theory, therefore Speech Codes Theory is not discussed at length. For more information on Speech Codes Theory see Philipsen (1986, 1992, 1997) and Philipsen, Coutu, and Covarrubias (2005).
6. Hymes's (1972) descriptive theory, the basis of most ethnographic studies of communication, consists of a set of social units of analysis (Speech Community, Speech Situation, Speech Event, Speech Act, Speech Style, Way of Speaking) and their components (Situation, Participants, Ends, Acts, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms of interaction and interpretation, Genre) that can be used for descriptive and interpretive analysis of any communication anywhere and also for native, comparative, and global theorizing.
7. See Leeds-Hurwitz (1984) on the distinction between the Ethnography of Speaking and the Ethnography of Communication.
8. Interestingly, the publication of *Talking American* was held up in litigation for approximately one year by Donahue's lawyers (Carbaugh, personal communication, December 2009).
9. On the role of critique in the Ethnography of Communication, see Carbaugh (1989/1990). See Carbaugh (2002b) for a critique of some features of US American conversation.
10. Specifically, he posits the universal components of "deep agony" as: "*The functional aspects:* deep agony functions culturally through models of personhood and sociation, which mediate (and momentarily resolve) the social tensions of autonomy and union;

The structural aspects: deep agony is structured linguistically through the juxtaposition of two clusters of symbols, which creates an interrelated semantic system of contrastive meanings; *The cultural aspects:* the models of personhood and sociation, the valuing and elaboration of autonomy and union, the juxtaposed symbols and their meanings, vary from scene to scene, culture to culture, time to time'' (Carbaugh 1988/1989, 206).

11. Trudy Milburn (personal communication, March 2010) has suggested that in some studies it may be useful to focus on just one of these constructs in depth (i.e., communication practice, scene, discourse), while elaborating the others in later studies. Further, she notes that it is important to let the data, the local case, lead the researcher to what is most important to focus on, empirically emerging in the course of study.
12. See, for example, work on Blackfeet (Carbaugh 1995a, 1999, 2001, 2002a), Finnish (Berry, Carbaugh and Nurmikari-Berry 2004; Carbaugh 2002b; Carbaugh and Berry 2001; Carbaugh and Poutiainen 2000), and US American (Berry, Carbaugh and Nurmikari-Berry 2004; Carbaugh 1995a, 2002b; Carbaugh and Berry 2001; Carbaugh and Poutiainen 2000) cultures.
13. See, for example, research on Blackfeet ''listening'' (Carbaugh 1999), Finnish-American introductory events (Carbaugh & Poutiainen 2000), Blackfeet narrative (Carbaugh 2001), and Blackfeet ''talking Indian'' (Carbaugh 2002a).
14. See, for example, Berry, Carbaugh & Nurmikari-Berry 2004, Carbaugh 1995, Carbaugh & Berry 2001, Carbaugh & Poutiainen 2000.
15. Carbaugh (2005) is careful to locate culture in communication practice, rather than peoples' minds or qualities of groups of people (see also Carbaugh 2007a, 2010).
16. For more information on how to conduct descriptive and interpretive analysis and the methodology of the Ethnography of Communication in general see Carbaugh and Hastings (1995). For explanation of descriptive and interpretive analysis in cultural discourse theory see Carbaugh, Gibson, and Milburn (1997) and Carbaugh (2007a, 2010). For discussion of descriptive and interpretive analysis of intercultural communication in cultural discourse theory see Carbaugh (2005, 2007a).
17. See pp. 4–5 (Carbaugh 2005) for a conceptualization of cultural premise and suggested questions for how to formulate them. See Carbaugh (2007a) for an explanation of cultural premise and related concepts for interpretive inquiry in cultural discourse analysis including symbols, cultural propositions, semantic dimensions, and norms. See also Carbaugh (2010) for explanation of cultural premises.
18. See Carbaugh (2007a, 2010) for similar lists of questions regarding each dimension of meaning in cultural discourse theory which may be useful for cultural discourse analysis.
19. For those interested in the Ethnography of Communication research program, a short list of key pieces to read include: Hymes (1962, 1972), Philipsen (1990), Carbaugh (1995b), Philipsen and Carbaugh (1986), and Carbaugh and Hastings (1995).
20. Interested readers should see the (1989/1990) special issue of *Research on Language and Social Interaction* on the role of critique in the Ethnography of Communication.

Notes on contributor

Michelle Scollo received her master's and doctoral degrees (2000; 2007) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, specializing in the Ethnography of Communication. She is currently a Substitute Assistant Professor at City University of New York, Bronx Community College. Her research foci include cultural and intercultural communication, media references in social interaction in diverse cultures, and the role of culture in environmental and interpersonal communication.

References

Aiu, P. 1997. This land is our land: The social construction of Kahoolawe Island. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Bauman, R., and J. Sherzer, eds. 1974. *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Baxter, L.A. 1993. "Talking things through" and "putting it in writing": Two codes of communication in an academic institution. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 21: 313–26.
Baxter, L.A., and D. Goldsmith. 1990. Cultural terms for communication events among some American high school adolescents. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54: 377–94.
Berry, M., D. Carbaugh, and M. Nurmikari-Berry. 2004. Communicating Finnish quietude: A pedagogical process for discovering implicit cultural meanings in languages. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 4: 261–80.
Bloch, L.-R. 2003. Who's afraid of being a *friere*? The analysis of communication through a key cultural frame. *Communication Theory* 13: 125–59.
Blommaert, J. 2005. *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Boromisza-Habashi, D. 2007a. Freedom of expression, hate speech, and models of personhood in Hungarian political discourse. *Communication Law Review* 7: 54–74.
Boromisza-Habashi, D. 2007b. Voice and moral accountability: Burlesque narratives in televised Hungarian political discourse. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 20: 81–107.
Boromisza-Habashi. D. 2008. "Hate speech" in Hungarian Public Discourse. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Braithwaite, C.A. 1990. Communicative silence: A cross-cultural study of Basso's hypothesis. In *Cultural communication and intercultural contact*, ed. D. Carbaugh, 321–7. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Braithwaite, C.A. 1997. "Were you there?": A ritual of legitimacy among Vietnam veterans. *Western Journal of Communication* 61, no. 4: 423–47.
Carbaugh, D. 1984. On persons, speech, and culture: American codes of "self", "society", and "communication" on *Donahue*. PhD diss., University of Washington.
Carbaugh, D. 1985. Cultural communication and organizing. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 9: 30–47.
Carbaugh, D. 1987. Communication rules in Donahue discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 21: 31–62.
Carbaugh, D. 1988. *Talking American: Cultural discourses on Donahue*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Carbaugh, D. 1988/1989. Deep agony: "Self" vs. "society" in *Donahue* discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 22: 179–212.
Carbaugh, D. 1989. Fifty terms for talk: A cross- cultural study. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 13: 93–120.
Carbaugh, D. 1989/1990. The critical voice in ethnography of communication research. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 23: 261–82.
Carbaugh, D. 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. 1993a. Competence as cultural pragmatics: Reflections on some Soviet and American encounters. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 17: 168–83.
Carbaugh, D. 1993b. Cultural pragmatics and intercultural competence. In *The competent intercultural communicator: AFinLA Yearbook, Vol. 51*, ed. L. Lofman, L. Kurki-Suonio, S. Pellinen and J. Lehtonen, 117–29. Publications de l'association finlandaise de linguistique applique. Netherlands: Kluwer.
Carbaugh, D. 1993c. "Soul" and "self": Soviet and American cultures in conversation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79: 182–200.
Carbaugh, D. 1994a. Cultural communication and intercultural encounters: Personhood, strategic action, and emotions. *Teoria Sociologica* 3: 17–45.
Carbaugh, D. 1994b. Personhood, positioning, and cultural pragmatics: American dignity in cross-cultural perspective. *Communication Yearbook* 17: 159–85.
Carbaugh, D. 1995a. "I can't do that" but "I can actually see around corners": American Indian students and the study of public communication. In *Critical perspectives on*

communication research and pedagogy, ed. J. Lehtonen, 215–34. St. Ingbert, Germany: Rohrig Universitatsverlag.
Carbaugh, D. 1995b. The ethnographic approach of Gerry Philipsen and associates. In *Watershed research traditions in human communication theory*, ed. D. Cushman and B. Kovacic, 269–97. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Carbaugh, D. 1996a. Naturalizing communication and culture. In *The symbolic earth: Discourse and our creation of the environment*, ed. J. Cantrill and C. Oravec, 38–57. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
Carbaugh, D. 1996b. *Situating selves: The communication of social identities in American scenes*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
Carbaugh, D. 1999. "Just listen": "Listening" and landscape among the Blackfeet. *Western Journal of Communication* 63, no. 3: 250–70.
Carbaugh, D. 2001. "The people will come to you": Blackfeet narrative as a resource for contemporary living. In *Narrative and identity*, ed. J. Brockmeier and D. Carbaugh, 103–27. Amsterdam and New York: J.J. Benjamins.
Carbaugh, D. 2002a. "I speak the language of the universe": A universally particularizing form of Native American discourse. In *Discourse in search of members: A festschrift in honor of Ron Scollon*, ed. David Li, 319–34. New York and Oxford: University Press of America.
Carbaugh, D. 2002b. Some distinctive features of US American conversation. In *The changing conversation in America*, ed. W. Eadie and P. Nelson, 61–75. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Carbaugh, D. 2005. *Cultures in conversation*. Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
Carbaugh, D. 2007a. Cultural Discourse Analysis: The investigation of communication practices with special attention to intercultural encounters. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 36: 167–82.
Carbaugh, D. 2007b. From cognitive dimensions to cultural discourses: Peoples through their own terms. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 2: 20–5.
Carbaugh, D. 2007c. Quoting "the environment": Touchstones on earth. *Environmental Communication: The Journal of Nature and Culture* 1: 63–73.
Carbaugh, D. 2007d. Six basic principles in the communication of social identities: The special case of clinical discourses. *Communication and Medicine* 4: 111–5.
Carbaugh, D. 2009. Putting policy in its place through cultural discourse analysis. Unpublished paper presented at the International Colloquium on Communication, Schoodic Peninsula, Maine.
Carbaugh, D. 2010. Resituating cultural studies in communication: Cultural discourse analys. In *Hybrids, differences, visions: On the study of culture*, ed. Claudio Baraldi, Andrea Borsari and Augusto Carli, 101–16. Aurora, Colorado: The John Davies Group.
Carbaugh, D., and M. Berry. 2001. Communicating history, Finnish and American discourses: An ethnographic contribution to intercultural communication inquiry. *Communication Theory* 11: 352–66.
Carbaugh, D., M. Berry, and M. Nurmikari-Berry. 2006. Coding personhood through cultural terms and practices: Silence and quietude as a Finnish "natural way of being". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 25: 203–20.
Carbaugh, D., and D. Boromisza-Habashi. in press. Discourse beyond language: Cultural rhetoric, revelatory insight, and nature. In *The interplay of rhetoric and culture*, ed. Christian Meyer and Felix Girke. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Book Studies in Rhetoric and Culture III.
Carbaugh, D., D. Boromisza-Habashi, and X. Ge. 2006. Dialogue in cross-cultural perspective. In *Aspects of intercultural dialogue*, ed. N. Aalto and E. Reuter, 27–46. Koln, Germany: SAXA Verlag.
Carbaugh, D., T.A. Gibson, and T. Milburn. 1997. A view of communication and culture: Scenes in an ethnic cultural center and a private college. In *Emerging theories of human communication*, ed. B. Kovacic, 1–24. Albany: SUNY Press.
Carbaugh, D., and S.O. Hastings. 1995. A role for communication theory in ethnographic studies of communication. In *Social approaches to communication*, ed. W. Leeds-Hurwitz. New York: Guilford Press.

Carbaugh, D., and S. Poutiainen. 2000. By way of introduction: An American and Finnish dialogue. In *Among us: Essays on identity, belonging, and intercultural competence*, ed. M.W. Lustig and J. Koester, 203–12. New York: Longman.

Carbaugh, D., and L. Rudnick. 2006. Which place, what story? Cultural discourses at the border of the Blackfeet Reservation and Glacier National Park. *Great Plains Quarterly* 26: 167–84.

Carbaugh, D., and K. Wolf. 1999. Situating rhetoric in cultural discourses. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 22: 19–30.

Chu, G.C. 1986. In search of an Asian perspective of communication theory. *Media Asia: An Asian Mass Communication Quarterly* 13, no. 1: 3–5.

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

Dissanayake, W. 2009. The desire to excavate Asian theories of communication: One strand of the history. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 4, no. 1: 7–27.

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

Foley, P. 1997. Views from the summit: An ethnographic study of ritualized communication on Mt. Holyoke. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Garrett, M. 1993. Wit, power, and oppositional groups: A case study of "pure talk". *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79: 303–18.

Gibson, T. 1995. The liminal institution: An ethnography of communication at Hampshire College. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Goffman, E. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.

Goldsmith, D., and L. Baxter. 1996. Constituting relationships in talk: A taxonomy of speech events in social and personal relationships. *Human Communication Research* 23: 87–114.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts*, ed. P. Cole and J.L. Morgan, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Gumperz, J.J., and D. Hymes, ed. 1964. The ethnography of communication. Spec. issue of *American Anthropologist* 66: 6 (part 2).

Gumperz, J.J.. and D. Hymes, ed. 1972. *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hall, B.J., and M. Noguchi. 1995. Engaging in "kenson": An extended case study of one form of common sense. *Human Relations* 48: 1129–47.

Hall, B.J., and K. Valde. 1995. Brown nosing" as a cultural resource in American organizational speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28: 131–50.

Hallowell, A.I. 1955. *Culture and experience*. New York: Schoken Books.

Hastings, S.O. 1995. Cultural discourses on identity and morality by Asian Indians in the United States: An ethnographic analysis. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Hastings, S.O. 2000a. Asian Indian "self suppression" and self-disclosure: Enactment and adaptation of cultural identity. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 19, no. 1: 85–109.

Hastings, S.O. 2000b. "Egocasting" in the avoidance of disclosure: An intercultural perspective. In *Balancing disclosure, privacy, and secrecy*, ed. S. Petronio, 235–48. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hastings, S.O. 2001. Social drama as a site for the communal construction and management of Asian Indian "stranger" identity. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 34, no. 4: 309–35.

Hopper, R. 1981. The taken-for-granted. *Human Communication Research* 7: 195–211.

Hymes, D. 1962. The ethnography of speaking. In *Anthropology and Human Behavior*, ed. T. Gladwin and W. Sturtevant. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Hymes, D. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, ed. J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hymes, D. 1974a. *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, D. 1974b. Ways of speaking. In *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*, ed. R. Bauman and J. Sherzer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jia, W. 1997/1998. Facework as a Chinese conflict-preventive mechanism: A cultural/discourse analysis. *Intercultural Communication Studies* VII, no. 1: 43–58.
Jia, W. 2000. Chinese communication scholarship as an expansion of the communication and culture paradigm. In *Chinese Perspectives in Rhetoric and Communication*, ed. D.R. Heisey, 139–61. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
Jia, W. 2003. The Chinese conceptualizations of face: Emotions, communication, and Personhood. In *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, ed. L.A. Samovar and R.E. Porter, 48–57. United States: Thomson Wadsworth.
Katriel, T. 1986. *Talking straight:* Dugri *speech in Israeli Sabra culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Katriel, T. 2004. *Dialogic moments: From soul talks to talk radio in Israeli culture*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
Katriel, T., and G. Philipsen. 1981. "What we need is communication": "Communication" as a cultural category in some American speech. *Communication Monographs* 48: 301–17.
Leeds-Hurwitz, W. 1984. On the relationship of the "ethnography of speaking" to the "ethnography of communication". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 17, no. 1: 7–32.
Mackenzie, L.B. 2005. When words fail, music speaks: How communication transforms identity through performance at the Berkshire Hills Music Academy. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Mahoney, J. 1995. Celebrating the sacred: Ritualized communication among the witches of Salem, Massachusetts. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Mauss, M. 1938/1985. Une categorie de l'Espirit Humaine: La notion de personne celle de "moi". *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 68: 263–82. [Republished in M. Carrithers, S. Collins and S. Lukes. *The category of the person.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1985.]
McLeod, K. 1999. Authenticity within hip-hop and other cultures threatened with assimilation. *Journal of Communication* 49, no. 4: 134–50.
Miike, Y. 2009. New frontiers in Asian communication theory: An introduction. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 4, no. 1: 1–5.
Milburn, T. 1998. Conversation and culture in the Puerto Rican Cultural Center: An ethnographic exploration of personhood. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Milburn, T. 2000. "Enacting 'Puerto Rican time' in the United States". In *Constituting cultural difference through discourse, the international and intercultural communication annual*, ed. M.J. Collier, Vol. 23, 47–76. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
Milburn, T. 2002. Collaboration and the construction of Puerto Rican community. In *Building diverse communities*, ed. M.P. Orbe, T. McDonald and T. Ford-Ahmed, 287–303. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc.
Milburn, T. 2009. *Nonprofit organizations: Creating membership through communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
Miller, D., and L. Rudnick. 2008. *The security needs assessment protocol: Improving operational effectiveness through community security.* New York and Geneva: United Nations Publications.
Morgan, E. 2002. Structuring places: Cultural discourses of place in the Pioneer Valley of western Massachusetts. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Morgan, E. 2003. Discourses of water: A framework for the study of environmental communication. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication* 2, no. 3: 153–9.
Morgan, E. 2007. Regional communication and sense of place surrounding the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. In *Nuclear Legacies: Communication, Controversy, and the US Nuclear Weapons Complex*, ed. B.C. Taylor, W.J. Kinsella, S.P. Depoe and M.S. Metzler. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
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. 1977. Linearity of research design in ethnographic studies of speaking. *Communication Quarterly* 25: 42–50.
Philipsen, G. 1986. Mayor Daley's council speech: A cultural analysis. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72: 247–60.
Philipsen, G. 1987. The prospect for cultural communication. In *Communication theory: Eastern and western perspectives*, ed. D. Lawrence Kincaid. San Diego: Academic Press.
Philipsen, G. 1989. Speech and the communal function in four cultures. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 13: 79–92.
Philipsen, G. 1990. An ethnographic approach to communication studies. In *Rethinking communication, V. 2, paradigm exemplars*, ed. B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. O'Keefe and E. Wartella, 258–68. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Philipsen, G. 1992. *Speaking culturally: Explorations in social communication*. New York: SUNY Press.
Philipsen, G. 1997. A theory of speech codes. In *Developing communication theories*, ed. G. Philipsen and T. Albrecht. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
Philipsen, G., and D. Carbaugh. 1986. A bibliography of fieldwork in the ethnography of communication. *Language in Society* 15: 387–98.
Philipsen, G., L. Coutu, and P. Covarrubias. 2005. Speech codes theory: Restatement, revisions, and a response to criticisms. In *Theorizing about communication and culture*, ed. W. Gudykunst. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Poutiainen, S. 2004. Vieras on hyvä ja ottaa. Vuorovaikutusta kahvipöydässä [Do have some coffee. Interacting at the coffee table]. In *Suulla ja kielellä. Tulkintoja ruuasta*, ed. M. Knuuttila, J. Pöysä and T. Saarinen, Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
Poutiainen, S. 2005. Kulttuurista puhetta deittaamisesta [Cultural talk about dating]. *Puhe ja kieli* 25, no. 3: 123–36.
Poutiainen, S. 2007. Finnish cultural discourses about mobile phone communication. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Poutiainen, S., and M. Gerlander. 2009. Cultural dialectics in Finnish advising relationships. In *Speech culture in Finland*, ed. R. Wilkins and P. Isotalus, 85–116. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Rudnick, L. 2001. "Hygge" and "jantelovn": An ethnographic study of two symbolic terms in the communication of Danish cultural identity and a Danish model of personhood. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Saito, M. 2007. Silencing identity through communication: Situated enactments of sexuality in Japan. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Saito, M. 2009. *Silencing identity through communication: Situated enactments of sexual identity and emotion in Japan*. VDM: Germany.
Saxe, J. 1994. An ethnography of a Yiddish folksong gathering on Miami Beach. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Saxe, J. 2001. Communicative practices of Yiddish-speaking Jewish elders of South Miami Beach. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Schneider, D. 1976. Notes toward a theory of culture. In *Meaning in anthropology*, ed. K. Basso and H. Selby. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Scollo, M. 2000. "Living music" or "museum piece"?: An ethnographic study of the "debate" over opera translation in the United States. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Scollo, M. 2004. Nonverbal ways of communicating with nature: A cross-case study. In *The environmental communication yearbook, Vol. 1*, ed. S.L. Senecah, 227–49. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Scollo, M. 2007. Mass media appropriations: communication, culture, and everyday social life. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Scollo, M., and S. Poutiainen. August 2006. A cultural critique of relationship stage models. World Communication Association, North America, Springfield, MA.
Scollo, M., and R.M. Townsend. November 2008. 'Restore', 'protect', 'clean up', 'recover': The consequential use of framing terms in an environmental public meeting. Seminar at Talking a Better Environmental Future into Being through Public Meetings at the Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Searle, J. 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5: 1–23.
Shi-xu, 2005. *A cultural approach to discourse*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Shi-xu, 2009. Reconstructing eastern paradigms of discourse studies. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 4, no. 1: 29–48.
Suopis, C. 2002. Women's ways of speaking about menopause and hormone replacement therapy: An American discourse on personhood. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Suopis, C., and D. Carbaugh. 2005. Speaking about menopause: Possibilities for a cultural discourse analysis. In *Diagnosis as a cultural practice*, ed. J. Duchan and D. Kovarsky, 263–76. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Tanamura, N. 2001. A Japanese cultural discourse of names and marriage: Key symbols, motives and terms of address. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Townsend, R. 2004. Deliberation and democracy: Ethnography of rhetoric in a New England town meeting. PhD Diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Townsend, R.M. 2004. "Speaking to the issue": An act and event of political deliberation in a town's governance. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Townsend, R.M. 2006. Widening the circumference of scene: Local politics, local metaphysics. KBJournal. www.kbjournal.org/townsend.
Townsend, R.M. 2009. Town meeting as a communication event: Democracy's act sequence. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42: 68–89.
Wilkins, R.J. 1999. "Assia" (matter-of-fact) communication: A Finnish cultural term for talk in educational scenes. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
Wilkins, R. 2005. The optimal form: Inadequacies and excessiveness within the "asiallinen" [matter-of-fact] nonverbal style in public and civic settings in Finland. *Journal of Communication* 55: 383–401.
Wilkins, R. 2009. The asiasta puhuminen event. In *Speech culture in Finland*, ed. R. Wilkins and P. Isotalus, 63–84. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Wilkins, R., and P. Isotalus. 2009. *Speech culture in Finland*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Witteborn, S., and L. Sprain. 2009. Grouping processes in a public meeting from an ethnography of communication and cultural discourse analysis perspective. *International Journal of Public Participation* 3, no. 2: 14–35.
Wolf, K. 1998. Communicating culture: Public discourse and ritualized action in a Jewish community. PhD diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.