

Wichter, Sigurd und Gerd Antos (Hg.)

2001 *Wissenstransfer zwischen Experten und Laien. Umriss einer Transferwissenschaft.*
Frankfurt a. M./Berlin/New York: Lang.

Wolf-Andreas Liebert, Koblenz (Deutschland)

63. Intercultural communication

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Defining intercultural communication | 6. Transfer approaches: intercultural |
| 2. Contrastive approaches | competencies |
| 3. Imagological approaches | 7. Conclusion |
| 4. Inter- and multilingual approaches | 8. Selected references |
| 5. Interactive approaches | |

1. Defining intercultural communication

Intercultural communication is an interdisciplinary field of research that integrates insights from linguistics, ethnography, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, cultural psychology and management, translation and literary studies. The notion of intercultural communication was first mentioned by the American anthropologist Edward Hall (1959) in his book *The Silent Language*. By elaborating on the importance of nonverbal communication for communicative success, he tried to improve the intercultural competencies of his fellow Americans in the competitive worldwide economic and political environment in the fifties of the previous century. Since then, intercultural communication research has spread all over the world and reflects ongoing international developments such as globalisation, migration, mobility, economic and political cooperation, supranational developments (e.g. European Union integration) and linguistic and cultural diversity in societies. The impact of intercultural communication is also increased by immense technological developments in the field of communication media. Intercultural research is relevant in many sectors of society including education, healthcare, the courts, diplomacy, military intelligence, advertising, marketing, management, public communication (where it is applied through mediation and interpretation), training, counselling, diversity management and language policies.

Nowadays, three different definitions describing the field of intercultural research can be discerned. Traditionally, intercultural communication has been defined as communication between people with different linguistic and/or cultural backgrounds (e.g. Jandt 1995). This definition covers the common sense understanding of intercultural communication, but is not unproblematic, because the distinction between culture and nationality is easily overseen and factors such as institutional, legal and gender determinations, relevant for the interpretation of communication, are neglected. Therefore, a second definition has been proposed, restricting intercultural communication to communication in which linguistic and/or cultural differences are made relevant for processing the out-

comes of interlingual communication. For instance, Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2009: 3) give the following definition: “An intercultural situation is one in which cultural distance between participants is significant enough to have an effect on interaction/communication that is noticeable to at least one of the parties.” This definition has been elaborated upon in studies in the field of discourse analysis and conversational analyses (e.g. Di Luzio, Günthner and Orletti 2001; Hinnenkamp 1989; Knapp 2004). The most restricted definition has been offered by Jochen Rehbein (2006) based on studies of multilingual interaction. He states that one can only speak of intercultural communication whenever at least one of the participants *critically* reflects on the representations, value orientations and action dispositions held by his group. In actual fact, the essence of intercultural communication is characterised here by the *transformation* of thinking and acting as a consequence of interaction.

In sum, these definitions represent a scale from a very broad, self-evident understanding of intercultural communication as every contact between people belonging to different cultural and linguistic groups, via the concept of communicative relevance of cultural and linguistic differences, to the change of interactional and mental behaviour as a consequence of multilingual interaction. We will come back to the consequences of this determining scale as we discuss five different scientific approaches that emphasize the interdisciplinary character of intercultural communication studies.

2. Contrastive approaches

The contrastive approach towards intercultural communication (in the USA one also refers to ‘cross-cultural communication’) corresponds to the broad definition of the field. In order to investigate the effect of cultural and linguistic differences on intercultural understanding, contrastive studies started by comparing two or more languages and cultures. Lado (1957) is considered to be one of the first researchers adopting this approach. According to his *contrastive hypothesis*, difficulties of language learning could be predicted from a systematic comparison with regard to the language learner’s first and second languages. As a consequence, these studies (cf. Fisiak 1983) compare native discourse across cultures and aim at developing not only practical solutions for language teaching, but also *universal* categories describing correspondences and differences between cultures and languages. In this sense, this approach also stands in the tradition of comparative historical linguistics.

The paradigmatic switch within linguistics in the 1970s, from a formal (cf. Chomsky) to a functional paradigm (cf. Hymes), has also influenced the scope of contrastive studies. Whereas previously solely syntactic, morphological, semantic and lexical features were investigated, the scope of comparison has integrated more and more pragmatic and discursive characteristics of languages. An influential research project has been the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989). Speech acts such as complaining, apologising and inviting were analysed across languages. For instance, differences in *downgraders* and *upgraders* changing the (in)directness of speech acts were investigated. The CCSARP comparison is based on what is called *functional equivalence* which is described as “the presupposition for achieving a comparable function of a text or discourse in another cultural context” (Bührig, House and ten Thije 2007: 1).

The notion of *functional equivalence* relates to a central methodological issue of the contrastive approach, namely the determination of a comprehensive criterion of measurement. The selection of this criterion depends on the level of comparison. In the case of a formal linguistic comparison (e.g. *formal equivalence*), grammatical features function as a point of reference. In the case of a pragmatic comparison, the illocutionary force of speech acts functions as the measurement criterion. The point of reference is called *tertium comparationis*. The adequacy and reliability of contrastive studies depend on the proper account of their *tertium comparationis*. For instance, Connor and Moreno (2005) have developed a multilevel model for rhetoric contrastive studies regarding text and discourse genres in which textual units, genre, purpose and other functional text characteristics are addressed.

From the field of intercultural management studies, the work of Geert Hofstede (1984) should be discussed in this respect. He chose the company IBM as *tertium comparationis* in order to investigate how values in the workplace are determined by national cultures. By interviewing workers in IBM offices in 52 countries he developed a set of five dimensions with which national cultures can be compared mutually on a numeric scale. These dimensions are *power distance*, *individualism versus collectivism*, *masculinity versus femininity*, *uncertainty avoidance*, and *short and long term orientation*. Bell Ross and Faulkner (1998) discuss critically the reception of Hofstede's work in the field of intercultural communication. His set of dimensions is an example of a one-level model that equates *cultures* with *nation states*. Other levels of comparison such as social income, educational training, regional cultural differences and gender are not included. Although Hofstede (1984) does not investigate intercultural communication himself, his work has been applied in strong support of the first definition of intercultural communication (e.g. every contact between people with a different linguistic and cultural background is intercultural). In actual fact, his dimensions are used as an *essentialist* explanatory framework to clarify intercultural misunderstandings (Leerssen 2007: 25).

In the field of translation studies, contrastive research has resulted in the notion of the *cultural filter* (House 1997). This concept reformulates the Hofstede dimensions in a very restricted mode. Based on a comparison of German and English academic and literary texts and their corresponding translations, House detected recurrent adaptations of translations according to conventions in the other culture. She systematised these adaptations in a set of five dimensions of Cross-Cultural Differences that she designated as a *cultural filter*. These dimensions are *Directness versus Indirectness*, *Orientation towards Self versus Orientation towards Other*, *Orientation towards Content versus Orientation towards Persons*, *Explicitness versus Implicitness*, and *Ad-hoc Formulation versus Use of Verbal Routines*. The first pole of the opposition refers to German and the second to English conventions. Her supposition is that translators unconsciously apply this cultural filter in their translation work. Correspondingly, Tempel and ten Thije (2010) investigated whether or not German and English museum visitors, in listening to multilingual audio tours, appreciated the application of the cultural filter. Where such a comparison also leads to the formulation of other dimensions, these dimensions are culture specific and can only be applied to the contact between two (or more) specific cultures.

In conclusion, one of the fundamental issues of intercultural studies that goes beyond the scope of contrastive studies, is the question of *universalism* versus *relativism*. Can the framework that has been developed be used for all cultural groups or is every cultural

group in need of a framework of its own? An answer to this question can be found by referring to the distinction between *etic* and *emic frameworks*. Triandis (1994: 67) summarises as follows: “Emics, roughly speaking, are ideas, behaviours, items, and concepts that are culture specific. Etics, roughly speaking, are culture general – i.e. universal.” Emics are studied within the cultural and linguistic system and etics are studied from outside the system. Hofstede’s (ibid.) dimensions are a clear example of an etic framework, whereas House’s cultural filter is an example of an emic framework, since her dimensions concern only a German-English comparison. We will encounter more emic frameworks in the interactive approach (see section 5). In the field of intercultural communication research, *etic* and *emic* frameworks are not considered to be contradictory, but rather as complementary. In actual fact, the *etic-emic distinction* can be considered as a basic fundamental characteristic that constitutes intercultural research itself.

3. Imagological approaches

Imagological approaches are aimed at the “critical study of national characterization” (Leerssen 2007: 21) and, consequently, pursue theories of cultural or national representations and stereotypes. Coupland (2001: 3) specifies the notion of *representation* as follows: “Representations are the totality of semiotic means by which items and categories, individuals and social groups, along with their attributes and values, are identified, thematised, focused, shaped and made intelligible. In this sense, representing a class of items or people is more than ‘merely referring to’ them. It is the generalised set of processes by which collectivities, including human identities and attributes, are symbolically forged, confirmed or challenged.” The roots of this approach originate in comparative literary studies that, since the Enlightenment, have investigated “patterns of behaviour in which ‘nations’ articulated their own, mutually different, responses to their diverse living conditions and collective experiences, and which in turn defined each nation’s individual identity” (Leerssen 2007: 18). This approach also underpins the first definition of intercultural communication. Recent studies investigate cultural representation in films, documentaries, literature, advertisements and all kind of images and texts in public media. We will not discuss the broad range of national characterisations or archetypes that have been described regarding people and countries all over the world (see Beller and Leerssen 2007), but will focus on the theoretical notions used as the backbone of this approach.

Imagologists study the dynamics between the images that characterise the *Other* (e.g. *hetero-images*) and the images that characterise one’s own national identity (e.g. *self-image* or *auto-images*). These images are derived from texts and discourses and represent recurrent and historical features of different national identities. Although these images include *archetypes* and *national clichés*, these are not completely fixed. The dynamics of the self- and hetero-images reflect historical changes in the political or economic relationship between countries involved. Edward Said’s study on Orientalism (1978) exemplifies this approach in the framework of *post-colonial studies*. His concept of ‘*othering*’ refers to the process in which the weakness of a marginalised group (the colonised) is used to reinforce the position of groups in power (the coloniser).

In the field of intercultural communication studies (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman 2010), the notion of otherising is presented as the central notion to deconstruct the

question of how the “Foreign Other is reduced to less than they are” (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman 2010: 24). Four notions are proposed as the constituents of this procedure: Stereotyping concerns the “ideal characterization of the Foreign Other” (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman 2010: 24), Prejudice concerns “judgements made on the basis of interest rather than emergent evidence” (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman 2010: 24), Culturism refers to “reducing the members of a group to the pre-defined characteristics of a cultural label” (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman 2010: 24) and Essentialism, finally, refers to a homogeneous view of culture in which people belong exclusively to one culture, speak one language and the world is divided into mutually exclusive national cultures (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman 2010: 4). The deconstruction of otherisation aims at a change of attitude in communication with someone who is foreign or different. Instead of the obligation “to understand the details or the stereotypes of the foreign culture” (Holliday, Hyde and Kullman 2010: 4) we should try to understand the complexity of cultures of other human beings who belong to groups with whom we are unfamiliar.

In the field of cultural studies, Stuart Hall (1997) developed a semiotic theory of cultural representation of groups and nations that includes identity and ethnicity and showed the link between racial prejudice and media discourse. Hall’s notion of representation has been influential in the field of intercultural communication. In a study on the representation of otherness in advertisements and cultural mediation, Zarate (1994) is quoted as follows: “Representation of the Other refers back to the identity of the group that produces them [...] they organise the relationship between the group and the Other and contribute to naming the alien according to the group’s internal system of references” (Zarate 1994: 19, cit. in Gautheron-Boutchatsky et al. 2004: 165). The analysis of advertisements in different countries illustrates how the representation of otherness is perceived differently in different contexts.

These postmodern and semiotic theories regarding *self-* and *hetero-images*, including the issue of how these images determine the process of *othering*, have predecessors with parallel findings in other disciplines. For instance, within social psychology, Tajfel (1974) discusses the consequences of *in-group* and *out-group* communication for the construction of social identity. In general, his theory states that people describe the *in-group* by using more positive terms than they use when describing an *out-group*. In sum, we claim that the question of *dealing with the Foreign Other* is the second fundamental characteristic that constitutes the field of intercultural communication research.

4. Inter- and multilingual approaches

Interlanguage is used to refer to learner language as a system in its own right and having its own rules. This set of rules is considered as a continuum between L1 and L2. The learner gradually takes over L2 norms. These stages have been described as coherent linguistic structures. Learners may stick to a certain stage and *fossilise* the corresponding structures. In the 1960s and 1970s, analyses focused on phonological, morpho-syntactical and semantic interference (cf. Selinker 1972). Afterwards, the trans- and interference of pragmatic and discourse phenomena were analysed (cf. Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989). The *discourse completion test (DCT)* is the method used to investigate the interlanguage stages of learners and compare their structures with the corresponding native

speaker structures. The DCT comprises a questionnaire (or a written role play) in which respondents have to fill in scripted speech acts in every day communicative situations such as complaining, refusing and inviting. In the descriptions of the communication situations, the relationships between communicators are systematically differentiated taking into account central elements from politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1978) such as *social distance*, *social dominance* and *degree of imposition*. The method is also used by the contrastive studies of the CCSARP project. Indeed, the DCT accounts for learners' stages of pragmatic knowledge based on self-assessment.

In a recent historical retrospective of interlanguage research, Selinker (2012: 227) indicates the importance of "noticing the gap between one's current state of interlanguage knowledge and the target" and refers to the idea of cognitive space between two languages that has been developed in terms of *intercultural awareness* (e.g. Kramsch 1998). Zhu (2014, 149) elaborates this idea by stating: "When there is communication breakdown in interactions involving non-native speakers, people tend to attribute difficulties in communication to inadequate linguistic abilities on non-native speakers' part. However, sometimes it is not linguistic ability, but a lack of knowledge of how the system works that leads to the undesirable outcome of an interaction." This corresponds to the distinction between *pragma-linguistic* and *socio-pragmatic failure* (Thomas 1993). Where the first represents the speakers' *limited linguistic resources*, the latter highlights the *appropriateness* of language use in the respective culture. This exemplifies the impact of an interlanguage approach for intercultural communication in its support of diagnosing intercultural understanding problems.

Moreover, there is another important contribution of the Interlanguage approach to intercultural communication research. This concerns the status of the *native speaker* as the ultimate norm for assessing linguistic and communicative competence. By describing learners' stages between L1 and L2 during which speakers may fulfil communicative aims and reach (partial) understanding, these studies have paved the way for analysing the characteristic of *efficient intercultural communication* that does not presuppose native linguistic competences (Backus et al. 2013).

English as Lingua Franca (ELF) is one important communicative mode for efficient intercultural communication all over the world. In the 1970s ELF was considered to be a learner language and an interlanguage (House 2010: 365), but soon this mode of multilingual communication was defined in its own right. Firth (1996: 26) states: "ELF is a contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common national culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication." ELF may also include native speakers; however, the native norm is no longer standard and decisive for mutual understanding. In fact, in ELF, *communication efficiency* is more important than *linguistic accuracy* and it is characterised by its *cooperative feature* (Zhu 2014: 137). This cooperative nature is explained by a shared *incompetence* of its speakers (Meierkord 1996). As characteristics for intercultural communication by ELF speakers, Meierkord (1996) reports discourse strategies such as shorter turns than those produced by native speakers and frequent use of nonverbal support by laughter and hearer activities (e.g. feedback signals). Apparently, non-native speakers of English all over the world modify their speech acts and develop their own genre and communicative styles. According to Meierkord (1996), the linguistic use of English does not necessarily reflect interferences of the L1, i.e. with the speaker's mother tongue, but instead displays structures that are typical of learner language, characterised by reduction

and compensation due to learners' deficits. She furthermore suggests that ELF conversations can be seen as the reflection of an "Inter"-culture (Meierkord 1996). Recent studies focus on the problems of English native speakers trying to make themselves understandable in ELF (Sweeney and Zhu 2010: fc.). By using DCT the authors found as striking "the imbalance between native speakers' understanding of issues of intercultural communication and the inability to effectively accommodate to non-native speakers" (Sweeney and Zhu 2010).

The second mode of effective multilingual communication concerns *Lingua Receptiva* (LaRa). This notion refers to multilingual communication in which both speakers stick to the language they are most comfortable in within a given intercultural situation, which is generally their mother tongue. They understand each other on the basis of receptive capacities in the *other's* language. Rehbein, ten Thije and Verschik (2012: 249) define LaRa as follows: "*Lingua receptiva* is the ensemble of those *linguistic, mental, interactional* as well as *intercultural competencies* which are *creatively* activated when interlocutors listen to linguistic actions in their 'passive' language or variety." This mode is also known as intercomprehension, receptive multilingualism or mutual intelligibility, taking into account the influence of typological distance of the languages involved. From the perspective of intercultural communication, LaRa can be considered as a potential optimum mode for effective intercultural understanding, since *others* are allowed to speak their own language as they respond. Bahtina (2013) investigates the *meta-communicative devices* supporting intercultural understanding and demonstrates that languages that are not typologically close (cf. Estonian and Russian) can also successfully be applied in a LaRa mode.

The studies within this approach bring forward a third fundamental issue that constitutes intercultural communication research, namely the question of how speakers and hearers cope with linguistic norms and how the maintenance of these norms determines mutual understanding. Interestingly the studies within this approach illustrate a historical development away from *error analysis* towards *creativity* and *locality* in the handling of norms in achieving intercultural understanding (Hülmbauer 2014). These studies demonstrate that research into language learning is no longer solely focused on linguistic capacities and a native speaker norm, but increasingly on linguistic *effectiveness*, also taking into account pragmatic and cultural aspects of language learning, as well as the ability to communicate effectively across cultures regardless of the chosen language of communication.

5. Interactive approaches

The interactive approach originates from the sociolinguistic (*ethnography of speaking*) and discourse analytical studies on language contact, and focuses on multilingual interaction. The work of John Gumperz (1982) has been ground-breaking for the analysis of intercultural breakdown and misunderstanding. His theory on *contextualisation cues* offers an explanatory framework to relate specific linguistic structures to presupposed cultural knowledge in a given context. Another influential work in this approach concerns Clyne's (1994) investigation of the Australian intercultural workplace. His work leads to a revision of the *conversational maxims of Grice* (1975). These maxims were

claimed to be universal. Clyne (1994), however, integrates cultural core values in their formulation in order to maintain their universal validity. Consequently he adds a fifth maxim of manner: “In your contribution, take into account anything you know or can predict about the interlocutor’s communication expectations” (Clyne 1994: 195). A third important contribution to this approach concerns Rehbein’s (2006) theory on the *cultural apparatus* as the shared cultural capability of members of a certain cultural group to cope with misunderstandings. This apparatus is at work when interaction problems in critical situations are being solved. Participants have two possibilities. They can either preserve their existing opinions, representations and action dispositions or they can reflect critically on the action dispositions and representations and eventually transform them. The *cultural apparatus* concept underlies the most restricted definition of intercultural communication discussed previously, as it focuses only on how misunderstandings occur in interlingual communication. Interactive studies (see also Rehbein 1985; Hinnenkamp 1989; Agar 1994; Di Luzio, Günthner and Orletti 2001; Knapp 2004) illustrate that interaction analysis not only demonstrates how communication with the Foreign Other (e.g. the *stranger*) can be problematic, but equally how it can be successful.

The publication *Beyond Misunderstanding* (Bührig and ten Thije 2007) exemplifies a change in research focus, moving away from intercultural misunderstanding towards the reconstruction of *successful intercultural understanding*. Several theoretical concepts have been proposed to facilitate the analysis. A *discursive interculture* (Koole and ten Thije 1994) refers to a collection of common discourse structures that interactants have developed in long-standing cooperation in multicultural teams, including structures that do not belong to their respective native languages and cultures. The concept refers to culture that is creatively built in cultural contact. This concept relates to the concept of *community of practice* (Lave and Wenger 1991). Initially, the latter concept was considered a common learning environment. However, in the field of multilingual and intercultural communication, it has evolved into a unit of analysis on its own to reconstruct recurrent structures of local multilingual communities. Corder and Meyerhoff (2007: 444) summarise three main characteristics: “mutual engagement of members”, “jointly negotiated enterprise” and a “shared repertoire”. The concept of *community of practice* might replace the traditional unit of *linguistic and cultural background* as an explanatory framework for intercultural (mis)understanding. Similarly, Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2009) propose the concept of *rapport* and *rapport management* in order to create an alternative to essentialist explanatory frameworks connected to the first definition of intercultural communication. *Rapport* refers to “people’s subjective perceptions of (dis)harmony, smoothness-turbulence and warmth-antagonism in interpersonal relations” whereas *rapport management* refers to “the ways in which (dis)harmony is (mis)managed” (Spencer-Oatey and Franklin 2009: 102). These competences are the subject of the next section.

In sum, the studies in the interactive approach have in common that they address a fourth fundamental issue that constitutes intercultural communication research, namely the question of how to conceptualise the common construction of success in intercultural communication bound to specific cultural collectives or communities.

6. Transfer approaches: intercultural competencies

The final approach summarises studies on *intercultural competencies* that originate from cultural psychology, communication studies and education. In this transfer approach the question is to determine which aspects that have been raised by other approaches are important for *intercultural competence*, and how these aspects can be transferred to others. Intercultural competence is described by Deardorff (2004: 194, 2006: 248) as “the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one’s intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes”. According to Knapp-Potthoff (1997) intercultural competence consists of four components: 1. knowledge of language and culture, 2. insight into general communicative principles, 3. strategies of interaction for engaging in intercultural situations, and 4. (cap)abilities to learn in and through intercultural situations.

Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) discuss five different types of models of intercultural competence. *Compositional models* provide lists of relevant abilities, skills and traits (e.g. Spitzberg and Changnon 2009). Although useful in defining the components of competence, these models do not specify relations among said components, nor do they provide criteria or levels of competence (Spitzberg and Changnon 2009). *Co-orientational models* have a stronger focus on criteria of competence. These models contain interactional achievements of intercultural understanding (e.g. Byram 1997) and are more concerned with “the achievement of some base level of co-orientation toward the common referential world” (Spitzberg and Changnon 2009: 15). *Developmental models* comprise specific stages of progression, such as the Bennett scale (1986), which describes six stages of increasing sensitivity to difference, ranging from *ethnocentrism* to *ethnorelativism*. Where *adaptational models* also focus on intercultural progression, these models are more specifically aimed at describing the interdependence of participants in the process of cultural learning, including accommodation (Zhu 2014: 157). One example is the acculturation model (Berry 2005), describing four different outcomes of adapting to a host culture in relation to maintaining one’s own cultural identity: *integration*, *assimilation*, *separation/segregation* and *marginalization* (Spitzberg and Changnon 2009: 26). Correspondingly, Kim claims that individuals with cumulative intercultural experiences undergo an “*intercultural evolution*”, which is characterised by processes of acculturation and deculturation (Kim 2008: 360–363). Finally, causal process models sketch the interrelationships among components. Deardorff (2004, 2006) proposes such a model which, in addition to the more frequently mentioned knowledge, skills and attitudes, also focuses on desired internal and external outcomes. Although these models differ with respect to disciplinary orientation and specific objectives, they all aim to measure the success of appropriate and effective intercultural communication and relationship maintenance. Furthermore, a basic assumption underlying the above models is the ability to learn and change through *intercultural contact*.

Actually, the fundamental issue that all transfer studies share is the question of how *self-reflection* can be learned and integrated in intercultural research so that ethnocentric observations and assessments can be prevented. Self-reflection, or reflective learning, is key to many approaches on teaching and learning intercultural competence, which also includes cultural self-awareness. Pedagogical materials such as *critical incidents*, *reflective learning* and *ethnographic participation* are all based on the assumption that reflection is the key to learning (Zhu 2014: 160).

Interestingly, the third definition of intercultural communication mentioned previously is the central focus of intercultural competence. In accordance with this definition, the essence of intercultural communication is characterised by the *transformation* of thinking and acting of at least one participant as a consequence of interaction. This *critical reflection* is exactly what the various models of intercultural competence have in common. Consequently, studies on intercultural competence could profit from reconstructions of what actually is taking place when interactants transform their activity in intercultural communication. Finally, more coherence in all the models of intercultural competence would be possible.

The importance of intercultural competence, and therewith of transfer studies, is increasingly acknowledged both in politics and (global) business. For example, the internationalisation of higher education is increasingly promoted as it enables students to gain intercultural competences, crucial for working in globalised societies (Messelink, Van Maele and Spencer-Oatey 2015). As such, all approaches to intercultural communication, as discussed in this lemma, can ultimately feed into a better understanding of successful intercultural communication and into the question of how the corresponding required skills can be learned and stimulated through education, training and diversity management.

7. Conclusion

In the presentation of approaches we discussed five fundamental issues that constitute the field of intercultural research. In conclusion we summarise these issues.

1. Intercultural communication research combines etic (universal) and emic (culture specific) frameworks to develop explanatory models (e.g. *tertium comparationis*) for contrasting and comparing languages and cultures.
2. From the Imagological approaches we examine the question of how in discourse and text (e.g. self-images and hetero-images) people deal with the *Foreign Other* (which includes processes of inclusion and exclusion).
3. The Interlanguage and Multilingual approaches yield the question as to how speakers and hearers cope with different *linguistic norms* and how maintaining these norms determine mutual understanding (including the management of cultural and linguistic diversity).
4. The Interactive approaches focus on the fundamental question of how intercultural understanding can be conceptualised in interaction itself (including the question of how effective communication can be assessed within a specific collective or community).
5. The Transfer approaches focus on the integration of knowledge, attitudes, capacities and motivation in learnable intercultural competency (including the question of how self-reflection can be guaranteed).

The strength of intercultural communication research is its interdisciplinary character, which connects and integrates these issues to create a maximum impact on scientific and societal developments.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Annelies Messelink for her contributions in preparing this text.

8. Selected references

- Agar, Michael
 1994 *Language Shock. Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Backus, Ad, Durk Gorter, Karlfried Knapp, Rosita Schjerve-Rindler (†), Jos Swanenberg, Jan D. ten Thije and Eva Vetter
 2013 Inclusive Multilingualism. Concept, Modes and Implications. In: *European Journal for Applied Linguistics* 1(2), 179–215.
- Bathina, Daria
 2013 *Mind Your Languages. Lingua Receptiva in Estonian-Russian Communication*. Utrecht University.
- Bell Ross, Roberta and Sandra L. Faulkner
 1998 Hofstede's Dimensions. An Examination and Critical Analysis. In: K. S. Sitaram and Michael H. Prosser (eds.), *Civic Discourse. Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Global Communication*, 31–40. London: Ablex.
- Beller, Manfred and Joep Leerssen (eds.)
 2007 *The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters. A Critical Survey*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bennett, Milton J.
 1986 A Developmental Approach to Training Intercultural Sensitivity. In: *Journal of Intercultural Relations* 10(2), 179–186.
- Berry, John W.
 2005 Acculturation. Living Successfully in Two Cultures. In: *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29, 697–712.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House and Gabriele Kasper (eds.)
 1989 *Cross-cultural Pragmatics. Requests and Apologies*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson
 1987 *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bührig, Kristin and Jan D. ten Thije (eds.)
 2006 *Beyond Misunderstanding. The Linguistic Analysis of Intercultural Communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bührig, Kristin, Juliane House and Jan D. ten Thije (eds.)
 2009 Introduction. In: Kristin Bührig, Juliane House and Jan D. ten Thije (eds.), *Translatory Action and Intercultural Communication*, 1–7. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Byram, Michael
 1997 *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Clyne, Michael
 1994 *Inter-cultural Communication at Work. Cultural Values in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, Ulla M. and Ana I. Moreno
 2005 Tertium Comparationis. A Vital Component in Contrastive Research Methodology. In: Paul Bruthiaux, Dwight Atkinson, William G. Eggington, William Grabe and Vaidehi

- Ramanathan (eds.), *Directions in Applied Linguistics. Essays in Honor of Robert B. Kaplan*, 153–164. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Coupland, Nikolas
2001 'Other' Representation. In: Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman, Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics. 1999 Installment*, 1–24. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Deardorff, Darla K.
2004 *The Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as Student Outcome of Internationalization*. Unpublished dissertation. Raleigh: North Carolina State University.
- Deardorff, Darla K.
2006 Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization. In: *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10(3), 241–266.
- Di Luzio, Aldo, Susanne Günthner and Franca Orletti (eds.)
2001 *Culture in Communication. Analyses of Intercultural Situations*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Firth, Alan
1996 The Discursive Accomplishment of Normality. On "Lingua Franca" English and Conversation Analysis. In: *Journal of Pragmatics* 26, 237–259.
- Fisiak, Jacek (ed.)
1983 *Contrastive Linguistics. Prospects and Problems*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Gautheron-Boutchatsky, Christina, Marie-Christine Kok Escalle, Georges Androulakis and Karl Rieder
2004 Representations of the Concept of Otherness in Advertising and Cultural Mediation. In: Geneviève Zarate, Aline Gohard-Radenkovic, Denise Lussier, Hermine Penz (eds.), *Cultural Mediation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 155–179. Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages.
- Grice, Paul
1975 Logic and Conversation. In: Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, John J.
1982 *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Edward T.
1959 *The Silent Language*. New York et al.: Doubleday.
- Hall, Stuart
1997 *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London/Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hinnenkamp, Volker
1989 *Interaktionale Soziolinguistik und interkulturelle Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hofstede, Geert
1984 *Culture's Consequences. International Differences in Work-Related Values*. 2nd ed. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Holliday, Adrian, Martin Hyde and John Kullman
2010 *Intercultural Communication*. New York/Oxon: Routledge.
- House, Juliane
1997 *Translation Quality Assessment. A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr.
- House, Juliane
2010 The Pragmatics of English as a Lingua Franca. In: Anna Trosborg (ed.), *Pragmatics across Languages and Cultures*, 363–390. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia
2014 A Matter of Reception. ELF and LaRa Compared. In: *Applied Linguistics Review* 5(1), 273–295.

- Jandt, Fred E.
1995 *Intercultural Communication. An Introduction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kim, Young Yun
2008 Intercultural Personhood. Globalization and a Way of Being In: *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 32, 359–368.
- Knapp, Karlfried
2004 Interkulturelle Kommunikation. In: Karlfried Knapp, Gerd Antos, Michael Becker-Mrotzek, Arnulf Deppermann, Susanne Göpferich, Joachim Grabowski, Michael Klemm und Claudia Villinger (Hg.), *Angewandte Linguistik. Ein Lehrbuch*, 409–431. Tübingen: Francke.
- Knapp-Potthoff, Annelie
1997 Interkulturelle Kommunikationsfähigkeit als Lernziel. In: Annelie Knapp-Potthoff und Martina Liedke (Hg.), *Aspekte interkultureller Kommunikationsfähigkeit*, 125–155. München: Iudicium.
- Koole, Tom and Jan D. ten Thije
1994 *The Construction of Intercultural Discourse. Team Discussions of Educational Advisers*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Kramsch, Claire
1998 *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lado, Robert
1957 *Linguistics across Cultures. Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger
1991 *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leerssen, Joep
2007 Imagology. History and Methods. In: Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen (eds.), *The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters. A Critical Survey*, 17–32. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Meierkord, Christiane
1996 *Englisch als Medium der interkulturellen Kommunikation. Untersuchungen zum non-native-/non-native-speaker-Diskurs*. Frankfurt a. M. u. a.: Lang.
- Messelink, Annelies, Jan Van Maele and Helen Spencer-Oatey
2015 Intercultural Competencies. What Students in Study and Placement Mobility Should Be Learning. In: *Intercultural Education* 26(1), 62–72.
- Rehbein, Jochen (Hg.)
1985 *Interkulturelle Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Rehbein, Jochen
2006 The Cultural Apparatus. Thoughts on the Relationship between Language, Culture and Society. In: Kristin Bührig and Jan D. ten Thije (eds.), *Beyond Misunderstanding. The Linguistic Analysis of Intercultural Communication*, 43–96. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rehbein, Jochen, Jan D. ten Thije and Anna Verschik
2012 Lingua Receptiva (LaRa) – The Quintessence of Receptive Multilingualism. In: *International Journal for Bilingualism* 16, 248–264.
- Said, Edward W.
1978 *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Selinker, Larry
1972 Interlanguage. In: *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10, 209–241.
- Selinker, Larry
2012 Interlanguage 40 Years on. Three Themes from here. In: Zhao Hong Han and Elaine Tarone (eds.), *Interlanguage. Forty Years Later*, 221–246. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Spencer-Oatey, Helen and Peter Franklin
 2009 *Intercultural Interaction. A Multidisciplinary Approach to Intercultural Communication*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spitzberg Brian H. and Gabrielle Changnon
 2009 Conceptualizing Intercultural Competence. In: Darla Kay Deardorff (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, 2–52. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Sweeney, Emmy and Zhu Hua
 2010 Accommodation Toward Your Audience. Do Native Speakers of English Know How to Accommodate Their Communication Strategies Toward Nonnative Speakers of English? In: *Journal of Business Communication* 47(4), 477–504.
- Tajfel, Henri
 1974 *Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tempel, Marisa and Jan D. ten Thije
 2010 The Appreciation of Cultural and Linguistic Adjustments in Multilingual Museum Audio Tours by International Tourists. In: *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33(7), 643–664.
- Thomas, Jenny
 1983 Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure. In: *Applied Linguistics* 4(2), 91–112.
- Triandis, Harry C.
 1994 *Culture and Social Behaviour*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Zhu, Hua
 2014 *Exploring Intercultural Communication. Language in Action*. London: Routledge.

Jan D. ten Thije, Utrecht (Netherlands)

64. Genderdiskurse

1. Die ‚Karriere‘ der Analysekategorie *gender*
2. Geschlecht als Effekt diskursiver Praktiken und Prozesse
3. Geschlecht und Performativität
4. Gender Studies und die neuen Biowissenschaften
5. Literatur (in Auswahl)

Für eine Linguistik, die sich als Kulturwissenschaft versteht, sind die weitreichenden Debatten um Genderdiskurse absolut zentral. Gleichzeitig stellen diese Diskurse, das haben die *gender studies* gezeigt, eine Dimension jedweder kultureller, politischer und ökonomischer Prozesse dar; auch deshalb ist *gender* zu einer transdisziplinären Analysekategorie avanciert. Genderdiskurse markieren somit ein weites Feld, das im Kontext dieser Publikation notwendigerweise eingegrenzt werden muss. Im Folgenden wird der Begriff „Genderdiskurse“ daher vornehmlich in zweierlei Weise ausgedeutet, umschreibt er doch sowohl die Diskurse der *gender studies* über deren zentrale Analysekategorie als auch die Diskurse, mittels derer Geschlecht konstruiert und de- und rekonstruiert wird. Dieser Beitrag legt zuallererst die Bedeutung des Poststrukturalismus und der Diskursanalyse für das Potenzial und die Grenzen der *gender studies* Butlerscher Provenienz und ihre zentralen Begriffe – vornehmlich den der Performanz – dar und