

Part I Linking Themes, Paradigms, and Methods

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

1 Identifying Research Paradigms

Zhu Hua

Summary

This chapter starts with an overview of the multidisciplinary nature of Intercultural Communication as a field of enquiry. It then discusses what a paradigm is and why it is essential to understand paradigms before embarking on research designs. It introduces five key paradigms in Intercultural Communication studies: positivist, interpretative, critical, constructivist, and realist paradigms, in terms of their main assumptions, research themes, and disciplinary connections. Some general questions regarding paradigms are discussed in the last section.

Introduction

Intercultural Communication as a field of enquiry is concerned with how people from different “cultural” backgrounds interact with each other and negotiate “cultural” or linguistic differences perceived or made relevant through interactions, as well as the impact such interactions have on group relations and on individuals’ identities, attitudes and behaviors. Although, historically, terms such as “cross-cultural communication,” “inter-ethnic communication,” “inter-racial communication,” and, more recently, “international communication” have been used, more and more people now use Intercultural Communication as an umbrella term to include studies of interactions between people of different cultures, comparative studies of

Research Methods in Intercultural Communication: A Practical Guide, First Edition. Edited by Zhu Hua.
© 2016 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2016 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

communication patterns across cultures and studies of discursive construction and negotiation of cultural differences.

The field of Intercultural Communication (abbreviated as IC) has a distinctive, multidisciplinary background. Its main concerns have been researched extensively, and largely separately, across a number of established disciplinary and theoretical perspectives including the following:

- The disciplines that examine linguistic and interactional aspects of communication between different groups, such as interactional sociolinguistics, pragmatics, cross-cultural / intercultural pragmatics, discourse studies, translation studies, ELF (English as Lingua Franca) and bi- / multilingualism studies.
- The disciplines that are concerned with the development and learning of skills to communicate interculturally, such as intercultural education, language learning and teaching.
- The disciplines that study cultural practices or seek to identify cultural variations in communication patterns, such as cultural and linguistic anthropology, ethnicity studies, gender studies.
- The disciplines that regard Intercultural Communication as a special case of communication, such as communication studies and interpersonal communication.
- The disciplines that study human behavior and mental process including both their variability and common trends under diverse cultural conditions, such as cross-cultural psychology.
- The disciplines which critically examine the relationships between culture, communication and power (e.g. global politics of cultural prejudice), such as critical discourse studies and critical cultural studies.
- The (sub)disciplines and models that look at contributions that society makes to individual development through interactions between people and the culture in which they live in, such as sociocultural theory of learning in second language acquisition.

As a consequence of its multidisciplinary nature and the inherent complexity of the phenomenon under study (e.g. debates on what culture is, Holliday, 2011, 2013, Chapter 2, this volume), IC studies encompass many different paradigms. While different paradigms complement each other and potentially bring a rich understanding of the phenomenon under study, they can also be a source of confusion for newcomers to the field. In this chapter, I shall first outline what a paradigm is and then introduce five key paradigms in the field of Intercultural Communication in terms of their main assumptions and research themes and disciplinary connections. Some general questions regarding paradigms are discussed in the last section.

What is a Paradigm?

A paradigm is the overarching constructive framework and meta-thinking behind a piece of research. It is “a way of examining social phenomenon from which particular understandings of these phenomena can be gained and explanations attempted”

Identifying Research Paradigms

5

(Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2007, p. 112). It represents “a general philosophical orientation about the world and the nature of research that a researcher brings to a study” (Creswell, 2014, p. 6). Admittedly, the term is difficult to grasp. A paradigm is often presented as a philosophical debate with many big, unfriendly, abstract terms thrown into the mix. People often have their own interpretation of what a paradigm is and what differences there are between research paradigm, approach, design, and method (cf. the figure on the interconnection of worldviews, designs, and research methods in Creswell, 2014, p. 5). In practice, paradigms do not get much attention in research method training: they are often treated as something added on, rather than introduced as an essential consideration. The lack of translation equivalent in many languages also makes it difficult for students to fully embrace the concept.

Putting aside these difficulties, I cannot but stress the essential role of paradigms in research design. Paradigms determine research design and data collection method(s) and analysis and not the other way around. De Vaus (2001) once compared the role and purpose of a research design in a project to knowing what sort of building (such as an office building, a factory for manufacturing machinery, a school, etc.) is being constructed before ordering materials or setting critical dates for completion of the project stages. Following this analogy, paradigms would be equivalent to architectural styles, i.e., whether it is going to be gothic, baroque, modern, postmodern, oriental, etc. In the context of IC studies, the issue of paradigms is even more relevant, given its connections with multiple disciplines, since each discipline has different takes on what culture is, what Intercultural Communication is about, and the role culture plays in everyday life. Awareness of differences or tensions between different paradigms would help researchers find a “path” through the vast amount of literature available in the field and appreciate the different perspectives and insights that are offered by different paradigms.

So, what are the key paradigms out there? You may have come across many terms ending with “-ism,” such as positivism, postpositivism, constructivism, interpretivism, pragmatism, etc. They are, indeed, some examples of paradigms often mentioned in the literature. To tell them apart from each other, scholars (e.g. Guba & Lincoln, 1994) often ask the following questions:

- 1 What are the form and the nature of reality? Does the “reality” under study exist and operate independently? Or is it subject to perceptions and actions of individuals or social actors who inhabit it? These questions are often described as researchers’ “ontological” positions.
- 2 What is the nature of acceptable knowledge and findings and what is the nature of the relationship between the researchers and their findings? What counts as data and findings? Are they regarded as truth or facts waiting to be discovered or are they subject to the researcher’s interpretation or mediation? These questions are sometimes referred to as “epistemological” concerns.

Answers to these two sets of questions differentiate each research paradigm. In the following section, I shall introduce five identifiable research paradigms in the field of Intercultural Communication with illustrative examples. The boundaries of paradigms are not set in stone. Scholars may have different interpretations of what has made a paradigm interpretive, critical or constructivist. There are cross-overs in conceptualizations and agendas between different paradigms, in particular, among the last four paradigms.

Amid the literature aiming to compare and explain various research paradigms generically, I find two publications particularly useful. One is Guba & Lincoln's book chapter (1994) which compares the four paradigms – positivism, postpositivism, critical theory, and constructivism – in terms of their positions with regard to the sets of questions discussed above. The other is John Creswell's book (2014) on research design, in which he highlights differences between positivist, constructivist, transformative, and pragmatism paradigms in a less terminology-laden manner. The discussion on the key generic features of each paradigm in IC studies below is largely based on Guba & Lincoln (1994) and Creswell (2014). The discussion on how these features manifest themselves in IC studies is informed by Martin, Nakayama, & Flores' work (2002) and the overview and the scope represented in various published handbooks and readers available in the field.

What are the Significant Paradigms in Intercultural Communication studies?

First of all, what are the key paradigm questions to be asked in IC studies? Translating the general ontological and epistemological questions discussed above to the context of IC research, these are:

- Reality (ontological) questions:
 - What is culture and what is not culture?
 - Is there such a thing as a cultural norm?
 - How does culture influence individuals' communication behaviors or practice? Is there a cause-and-effect relationship between culture and individuals' communication behaviors or practice?
 - What role do individuals, power or ideology play in constructing culture?
- Knowledge and researcher (epistemological) questions:
 - Is it possible to isolate culture or cultural norms for research purposes?
 - What do researchers do with culture or cultural norms? Do researchers seek to discover and describe them; use them as an explanatory factor; use them to predict what is going to happen in Intercultural Communication; interpret them in relation to other factors such as power, ideology; or apply them to inform or improve practice?
 - How do researchers account for problems in Intercultural Communication?

Based on these questions, there are five main paradigms in IC studies. These are positivist, interpretive, critical, constructivist, and realist paradigms. The first three have been discussed in some detail in Martin et al. (2002).

The Positivist Paradigm

Typically, studies following this paradigm set out to identify patterns and the causal effect of culture on communicative behaviors and practices. They treat cultural

Identifying Research Paradigms

7

values, cultural norms, and communicative behaviors as variables and seek to make generalizations based on a set of measurements.

Their main assumptions are:

- Culture is (relatively) stable and fixed and, therefore, can be isolated for research purpose.
- Cultural norms exist and can be identified through measurement.
- Culture values determine communication behaviors.
- Misunderstandings in Intercultural Communication can be accounted for in terms of differences in cultural values.
- Researchers can generalize cultural patterns, compare different cultures and use cultural values as an explanatory variable.

This paradigm has many followers in IC studies, in particular, studies carried out in the traditions of psychology and communication studies. The best known examples in psychology are cultural value studies in the 1970s and 1980s which attempted to categorize national cultures in terms of cultural values and dimensions. For example, the Dutch psychologist Geert Hofstede collected questionnaires from more than 100,000 IBM employees in 40 countries and identified four cultural dimensions, termed individualism vs. collectivism, high vs. low power distance, masculinity vs. femininity, high vs. low uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1991, 2001). Other scholars following a similar approach include Fons Trompenaars & Charles Hampden-Turner (1998), Shalom Schwartz (1992, 1994), and Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961). Their work is further extended by the cross-cultural psychologist Harry Triandis (1990, 1995) who reconceptualized the dichotomy of individualism vs. collectivism. Over the years, cultural value studies have been criticized for their essentialist and over-generalized view of culture, i.e. members of a cultural group are treated as the same, sharing definable characteristics whatever the context may be (e.g. McSweeney, 2002). Nevertheless, the classification systems proposed by various scholars do act as a convenient, albeit rather simplistic, tool in revealing cultural differences in values and beliefs. Studies following this particular line of enquiry are still widely cited in business and organization management studies and applied in intercultural training.

In communication studies, a group of scholars turned their attention to the process of intercultural communication and brought general communication theories into the study of interactions between people of different cultures. The bulk of this work was done in the 1980s, and the leading researchers included William Gudykunst, Stella Ting-Toomey, Young Yun Kim, and Guo-Ming Chen (see Gudykunst, 2005 for a review of their work), to give a few examples. A number of models and theoretical accounts were proposed, such as cultural adaptation, communicative effectiveness and competence, conflict management, anxiety/uncertainty management, communication accommodation theory, and identity negotiation and management (e.g. Chen & Starosta, 1998; Gudykunst, 2005; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Ting-Toomey, 1999).

Within Applied Linguistics, cross-cultural/intercultural pragmatics, the study of speech acts by language users from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, shares many assumptions of this positivist paradigm. These studies investigate how speech acts of request, apology, greeting, etc., are realized in different languages and to what extent a speaker's choice of linguistic politeness strategies is influenced by

factors such as relative power, social distance and degree of imposition in a given culture.

Case in Point: An example of the positivist paradigm in action

Matsumoto et al. (2008). Mapping expressive differences around the world: The relationship between emotional display rules and individualism versus collectivism. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 39, 55–74.

The study follows the positivist paradigm and sets out to measure and compare different cultural norms on emotion display rules. It proposes five hypotheses concerning the relationship between display rules and a country's individualism–collectivism scores under the assumption that display rules are culture-specific. It administers a questionnaire called the Display Rule Assessment Inventory with more than 5000 respondents in 32 countries. Some universal and culture-specific patterns which have been identified are:

- There is a relatively small variation between participants from different countries in overall expression endorsement.
- There is a tendency to give greater expression display endorsement towards members of their own groups than towards members of other groups.
- Participants from individualistic cultures have higher scores of expressivity endorsement compared with those from collectivistic cultures.

The Interpretative Paradigm

Studies following this paradigm seek to uncover and interpret culture through the context where it exists, and are very often carried out in the tradition of ethnographic study of culture. A proponent of this paradigm was the American anthropologist Clifford Geertz. He was not interested in analyzing culture as “an experimental science in search of law” (1973, p. 5), but was keen to inspect events through “thick description,” i.e. describing and observing behaviors in detail and in their contexts as opposed to the practice of merely recording what happened. The main assumptions shared by these studies are:

- Culture cannot be reduced as abstract entities. It exists and emerges through details, actions, meaning and relationship.
- Culture and cultural norms can be captured through detailed observation and description.
- Communicative behaviors, along with their meaning, constitute culture, while at the same time, are informed by culture.
- The researcher's role is not to identify rules and the causal link between culture and communicative behaviors, but to try to interpret culture in its entirety.

There are many fruitful ethnographic studies of cultures. The earliest well-cited works were Edward Hall's works on time and space (1959/1973, 1966/1990). Hall,

Identifying Research Paradigms

9

widely regarded as the founder of the field of Intercultural Communication, made the strong claim that “culture is communication and communication is culture” (1959/1973, p. 191). Other studies include Carbaugh (2005), which investigates discursive practices in several cultures; Katriel (1986), which examines the Dugri talk, also known as “Israeli directness of style”; and Scollon & Scollon (1990), which identifies differences in language use by Athabaskan (an indigenous language of North America) and English speakers.

Within Applied Linguistics, the line of investigation that is close to this interpretive paradigm is the work on ethnography of speaking (also known as the ethnography of communication) by Dell Hymes (1962, 1964) and his followers. As an analytical framework, ethnography of speaking offers a checklist known as SPEAKING (S for setting, P for participants, E for Ends, A for Act Sequence; K for Key; I for Instrumentalities; N for Norms; and G for Genre) in describing ways of speaking in a speech community. In the example shown in Table 1.1, Scott Kiesling (2012) compares ways of speaking in a gathering between the Kuna community in Panama and a male undergraduate social club in a college in Northern Virginia, USA.

By using the SPEAKING grid, similarities and differences between the events are drawn out. For example, both events have certain routines and expectations of the role of participants. Both endorse a “one speaker at a time” style of turn-taking. However, the Kuna gathering comes through as a staged performance with only chiefs and spokespersons speaking or chanting to each other. For the social club, there is more interaction with ordinary members, who are allowed to challenge previous speakers.

Recently, the interpretive paradigm has been used in studies examining local practices in organizational contexts such as business communication. Below is an example.

Case in Point: An example of the interpretive paradigm in action

Ehrenreich, S. (2009). English as a lingua franca in multinational corporations – exploring business communities of practice. In A. Mauranen, & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca. Studies and findings* (pp. 126–151). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

In this article, the author sets out to investigate how English is used as a lingua franca in German multinational corporations, and how English lingua franca users perceive and manage intercultural issues in their daily business communications. Using an ethnographic multimethod and an interpretive paradigm, the author collects interview data and observational and recorded data of business activities, including meetings, phone conferences, and dinners, from two participating companies. She finds a number of salient features of the communicative practices among the company employees. For example, although 70% of communication is carried out in English, communication is very much multilingual in nature, with English used as lingua franca alongside other languages for various functional purposes. Efficiency rather than appropriateness is the key goal and concern of communication. The employees are confident about their language use and there are many instances of creativity in mobilizing linguistic resources. While communicating in

Table 1.1 SPEAKING grid (adapted from Kiesling, 2012, pp. 86–87)

	<i>Kuna</i>	<i>Male undergraduate club</i>
Situation	Evening. Round house with “chiefs” in center, then men, then women.	Sunday evening. Classroom with officers at front and younger men to the left.
Participants	Chiefs (minimum two), spokesmen, policemen, villagers.	Full members of the club.
Ends/purpose	Social connection and cohesion. Build status, settle dispute in favor, teach/learn about culture.	Conduct club business (planning, decision-making); social cohesion and connection; build status, get elected, have certain policies adopted.
Act Sequence	Pre-meeting talk: informal talk or public discussion of important issues Form: the points of chief’s chanting are indirect; reformulation/interpretation by “spokesman”; set sequence of acts Content: historical, mythical-cosmological-historical; local history; Kuna versions of the Bible; chief’s personal experience, dreams; stories.	Pre-meeting talk: chatting about social events over the weekend Form: direct and often confrontational Content: set sequence of topics: reports, old business, new business.
Key	Usually serious but can be lightened.	Serious but with lots of intermittent joking. Often adversarial and confrontational.
Instrumentalities	Channel: oral Mode: chanting, speaking Forms of speech: chief language (chiefs), ordinary Kuna (spokesmen and others).	Channel: oral Mode: speaking Forms of speech: American English, with varying levels of standardness.
Norms	Interaction: two chiefs, one chanting, the other responding. Spokesperson speaks when chief is finished Interpretation: interpreted as lessons or entertainment (or both), fitting into the cosmology and social structure of Kuna.	Interaction: one speaker at a time determined by the president or other presiding officer. Short unratified responses are OK. Challenges to previous speakers are OK. Interpretation: interpreted as contributions to the club. Many utterances in response to others will be seen as challenges to the first speaker, but are interpreted as part of the debate and an important ideology in the governing.
Genres	Meeting	Meeting

English, employees are aware of the need to negotiate the norms or rules for intercultural interactions and show greater tolerance and preference for cultural hybridity in communication.

The Critical Paradigm

Martin & Nakayama (2000, cited in Halualani & Nakayama, 2010, p. 2) defined the critical paradigm in IC studies as one that addresses issues of macro contexts (historical, social, and political levels), power, and the hidden and destabilizing aspects of culture. Influenced by cultural, critical and feminist studies, critical communication pedagogy, organizational communication, media studies, performance studies, and race and ethnic studies, among others, studies following this paradigm position culture as a part of macro social practice contributing to, and at the same time influenced by, power and ideological struggle. In their interpretation of intercultural contact, they take into account social, political, economic and linguistic power differences between and within groups, with the ultimate goal of bringing in social change. By doing so, they bring a critical perspective to the understanding of cultural differences, which they believe is a product of reification by those in power (i.e. ascribed cultural differences) or subordinate cultural groups themselves (i.e. (re)claimed cultural differences).

The paradigm is not new. According to Halualani & Nakayama (2010), as a response to the positivist and interpretative paradigms dominant in the 1980s and 1990s, a number of scholars (e.g. Collier, 1998; Drzewiecka, 1999; Gonzalez, Houston, & Chen, 1994; Hall, 1992; to give just a few examples cited in Halualani & Nakayama, 2010) have raised questions about the lack of attention to the way larger structures of power impact on intercultural communication. They critically examined the relationship between culture, communication, and politics, in the following aspects (Halualani & Nakayama, 2010, p. 3):

- situated power interests,
- historical contextualization,
- global shifts and economic conditions,
- different politicized identities in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, region, socioeconomic class, generation, and diasporic positions.

The publication of *The handbook of critical intercultural communication* edited by Nakayama & Halualani (2010) and *Intercultural communication: A critical introduction* by Ingrid Piller (2011) represents the most recent scholarly attempt to position Critical Intercultural Communication studies as a paradigm that provides new opportunities of understanding the inner workings of intercultural relations and communication. The main assumptions in these critical paradigms include (see Halualani & Nakayama, 2010):

- Culture is an ideological and power struggle.
- Understanding and researching culture differences cannot be achieved without paying attention to macro contexts in which differences are ascribed, reified or glossed over.

- Communication is not just a process of encoding and decoding, but a process of “the creation, constitution, and intertwining of situated meanings, social practices, structures, discourses and the nondiscursive” (p. 7).
- The “inter” component in Intercultural Communication represents an intersecting methodology through which the relationship between culture, identity, and power can be investigated.
- The researcher’s role is to unpack the relationship between power, culture and communication and, in doing so, to achieve social justice and equality.

Case in Point: An example of the critical paradigm in action

Thurlow, C. (2010). Speaking of difference: Language inequality and interculturality. In T. Nakayama & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical Intercultural Communication* (pp. 227–247). Oxford: Blackwell.

As part of his attempt to unpack the role of language in the production of difference, Crispin Thurlow (2010) examines three areas in which linguistic ideologies (i.e. people’s perception and belief about language use) come into play. One such area is tourist discourse, which constitutes a major site of intercultural exchange. Through a detailed analysis of the representation of local, non-English languages in British television shows, Thurlow demonstrates that in these shows, the use of local languages was very much tokenistic. They are reduced to basic formulaic phrases such as “hello” or “thank you” and frequently employed as resources for relating “foreignness” to audiences, sometimes as objects of fun. Therefore, he concluded that these highly staged and stylized exchanges can only serve to reify a “neocolonial vision / spectacle of Other and of intercultural exchange” (p. 235). This type of critical analysis, as Thurlow explains, enables researchers to demonstrate that “even the smallest, quickest, most trivial moments of language use reveal the effects of power” (p. 236).

The Constructivist Paradigm

Whilst the critical paradigm emphasizes the impact of macro structure on intercultural communication, the constructivist paradigm pays attention to the subjective nature of meaning-making and argues that intercultural differences and cultural memberships are socially constructed. A number of clarifications are in order here. In the literature, constructivism sometimes refers to Piagetian learning theory. As a paradigm, however, the term stands for a school of thoughts competing with the positivist paradigm in that it regards the person as actively engaged in the creation of their own world (Burr, 2003). In some works (e.g. Mertens, 1998, cited in Creswell, 2009), constructivism combines with interpretivism into a single paradigm, drawing on their shared position on subjectivity and agency of the person. This usage is echoed by Holliday when he talks about an interpretive constructivist approach in Chapter 2 of this volume. In others (e.g. Silverman, 2006), the term constructionism, instead of constructivism, is used along with other paradigms. Despite sometimes

interchangeable use of the two terms in the research method literature, there are differences between constructivism and constructionism: for the former the focus is on internal, cognitive process of individuals, while the latter, often referred to as social constructionism, pays attention to the joint social activities and their impact on meaning construction (Burr, 2003; McNamee, 2004). In this chapter, constructivism is used in a more inclusive sense, taking account of those studies with a strong emphasis on social construction of meaning (cf. constructionism in Angouri, Chapter 3 of this volume).

Many discourse studies that appeared in the late 1980s and 1990s followed this line of approach. An example is a special issue of *Pragmatics* (edited by Michael Meeuwis, 1994a) which includes works by Day (1994), Meeuwis (1994b), Sarangi (1994), Shea (1994) and Shi-xu (1994), on the role of discourse and interaction in constructing a speaker's cultural or ethnic memberships. The main assumptions are:

- Culture and intercultural differences are socially constructed.
- Understanding of culture and intercultural differences is subjective and emerges through discourse and interaction.
- The researcher's role is to understand culture and intercultural differences as discursive and emergent, and contingent on participants' meaning-making. They do not prescribe what culture is or is not, nor attribute problems in intercultural communication to cultural factors.
- The focus is on the process of interaction and what the participants achieve out of the experience in terms of new values, identities and practices.

A line of enquiry that follows the constructivist paradigm in recent years is interculturality studies, in which scholars seek to interpret how participants make aspects of their identities, in particular their cultural identities, relevant or irrelevant to interactions through interactional resources (e.g. Higgins, 2007; Mori, 2003; Nishizaka, 1995; Sercombe & Young, 2010; Zhu Hua, 2014). These studies take intercultural encounters as instances of "talk-in-interaction" and "being intercultural" as a socially constructed phenomenon. They believe that cultural memberships (e.g. Japanese vs. American) are not always relevant to intercultural interactions. Instead, the relevance of identities is contingent on the participants' orientation. It restores speakers or participants' agency to the central role in social construction; a factor which is very often neglected in the earlier studies of Intercultural Communication. In "doing" cultural memberships, Participants employ a range of interactional work and discursive practices. They can, on the one hand, ascribe or cast cultural memberships to others, and, on the other hand, accept, avow, display, ignore, reject, or disavow cultural memberships assigned by others. They can also claim or appropriate memberships of groups to which they do not normally belong. The following is an example of an interculturality study.

Case in Point: An example of the constructivism paradigm in action

Day, D. (1998). Being ascribed, and resisting. Membership of an ethnic group. In C. Antaki, & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 151–170). London: Sage.

In this article, the author, starting from the view that ethnic identity is a situated accomplishment of conversation participants, examines the “ethnification” processes whereby conversation participants ascribe other participants to a cultural or ethnic group. The following conversation is an example in which a participant resists others’ ascription of a cultural identity. The participants in the conversation were workers in a Swedish factory whose workforce has a high percentage of immigrants. They were planning a party.

Example

51 Lars: don’t we have something that, one can eat
 52 that, China or
 53 Rita: Chinese food is really pretty good
 54 Xi: haha () it doesn’t matter, I’ll eat anything
 55 Rita: ah (that’s [what I that)
 56 Lars: [yeah, but this concerns everyone
 57 doesn’t it?
 (Day, 1998, p. 162; transcription conventions: (): unclear speech; [: overlap)

In the conversation, Lars suggested Chinese food for the party they were planning. Rita took the next turn and made a comment about Chinese food. Since it was not clear from the data how the following turn was allocated, we could only speculate that Xi, an ethnic Chinese, felt obliged to take up the floor when her cultural expertise was made relevant. She faced two choices: either dismissing the potential relevance of the category of being a Chinese or continuing the flow of the discussion by commenting on Chinese food as a cultural insider. She opted for the first by suggesting that she was fine with any type of food, thus presenting herself as an individual rather than a cultural expert on Chinese food. Her subtle resistance to making her Chinese background salient in the conversation, however, encountered admonishment from Lars, who was quick to point out that this was not just about Xi herself.

The Realist Paradigm

Contrary to the constructivist paradigm, the realism paradigm calls for a “realist” view of the relationship between structure and agency. Emerging out of dissatisfaction with the “inherent explanatory limitations of constructivism paradigm” (Reed, 2005, p. 1629), the realism paradigm acknowledges both agency of individuals and constraints of social and historical conditions. It accepts that individuals’ behavior is constrained by the parameters of broad societal norms and inherited structures of belief, power, opportunity and so on (Holms, Marra, & Vine 2011, p. 13). Specifically, its main assumptions are (based on Holmes et al., 2011; Kumaravadivelu, 2008; Reed, 2005):

- Culture, as one component of underlying deeper macro structures or mechanisms, shapes events and regularities including individuals’ behaviors at a surface level.
- There is a reflexive relationship between the underlying structures and mechanisms and human activity. As Lopez and Potter eloquently put it, “social structure is, of course, dependent upon human activity. Without that it would not exist.

Identifying Research Paradigms

15

However, it does have an independence as well. ... it pre-exists us. We are shaped and affected by social structures. Social forces act on us. Social structures limit our range of possible choices of action ... We do not create social structure. We reproduce and transform it. But it too causally affects us.” (Lopez & Potter, 2001, p. 15)

- The underlying structures and mechanism including culture norms do not exist as discrete facts or statistically generalized patterns. They can be inferred through a process described as “retroduction,” whereby researchers can reason backwards from the phenomenon under investigation and ask the question “What, if it existed, would account for this phenomenon?” (Reed, 2005, p. 1631).
- The focus of the realist paradigm is, therefore, very much on explanation, rather than seeking to describe and predict using cause-and-effect logic (as in the positivist paradigm), to interpret culture in its entirety (as in the interpretative paradigm), to transform (as in the critical paradigm), or to foreground subjective nature of social behavior (as in the constructivist paradigm).

The realist paradigm is a relatively newly recognized paradigm. There are some book-length publications explaining its main positions as a research paradigm, e.g. Lopez & Potter (2001) and Danermark, Ekstrom, Jakobsen, & Karlsson (2002). While some of its main assumptions and assertions have been articulated in various forms in IC studies, there are still very few empirical works aligned with the realist paradigms. Nevertheless, they have brought interesting insights to two key issues in IC studies. One is the intersectionality of cultural norms with other norms or forces that may be in operation. Arguments are made that cultural norms are enmeshed with norms of different types and at different levels including societal norms, organizational norms, community of practice / team norms, and interactional norms (e.g. Holmes et al., 2011). Therefore, sometimes when things go wrong, it is not “*ethnicity per se*,” but other factors such as familiarity with the system, that cause the problem (Roberts, Campbell, & Robinson, 2008). The other is the issue of cultural identities. Scholars following the realist paradigm have made the case that individuals can assert their agency through identity work, but there are limits to it. Such limitations have several sources. One is the constraints of “culturally available, sense-making frameworks or ‘discourses’” (Ehrlich, 2008, p. 160) which individuals buy into or use without questioning. Individuals carry important cultural identities and structures with them even when they “cross intercultural lines” (Holliday, 2013, p. 168). There are also competing forces of global, national, social and individual realities in the era of globalization which both unite people by facilitating global flow of culture and interactions and, at the same time, divide people through “an increase in ethnic, racial, religious, and national consciousness” (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 158).

Case in Point: An example of the realist paradigm in action

Holmes, J. (2013). Exploring evidence of socio-cultural norms in face-to-face interaction. Conference presentation in IALIC 2013 Annual Conference (Language and Intercultural Communication in the Workplace: Critical Approaches to Theory and Practice) December 2013, Hong Kong.

Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2011). *Leadership, discourse and ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

As an example, Holmes et al. (2011) and Holmes (2013) illustrate how a realist paradigm helps with the interpretation of Maori leadership style at work. She demonstrates how Yvonne, a managing director of a Maori organization orients to both Pākehā (the Māori term for a white New-Zealander) and Māori conceptions of leadership in her reports in a monthly staff meeting.

Pākehā leadership style	Māori leadership style
What we've what we've done is made a commitment (just) to clients or to director or whoever (you're) doing the work for that this is what we're going to provide we're going to provide a quality product and we're going to provide it on time and within budget	Yesterday I talked, I had to give a presentation I was invited by [name of prestigious person]... I felt the presentation wasn't that good because my briefing was about a two second phone [laughs] call [laughter] and so I had no idea who was going to be at the conference and () what's it about I had no programme beforehand so I was a bit unprepared

According to Holmes et al. (2011), while Māori and Pākehā both value strong, authoritative and decisive leadership styles, Māori leaders place high value on modesty and humility. In the first example, Yvonne has positioned herself as a leader who provides the rationale for working towards a common goal, which is matched in her discourse style. There are no hedges or mitigating devices to modify the force of her statement. The use of the phrase “we’re going to provide” reinforces her message. The repeated use of the inclusive pronoun *we* serves as a marker of solidarity. In the second example, Yvonne, the same person, was giving an update about a promotional presentation she has made in a self-deprecating way, conforming to the Māori value of *whakaiti*, i.e. being humble and modest. In doing so, she constructed herself as responding positively to an opportunity to promote the company while at the same time being able to critically evaluate her own performance. Holmes (2013) argued that differences in her leadership discourse are influenced by social-cultural expectations on leadership, the organizational culture and gender norms. The most important message from her study is that one speaker brings different norms into focus in different contexts.

Some General Questions about Paradigms

I have identified five key paradigms in Intercultural Communication studies above. These paradigms represent different kinds of philosophical worldviews and research orientations that researchers may endorse. In this final section, I would like to discuss several general issues regarding these paradigms.

Identifying Research Paradigms

17

The first one is a question raised in Saunders et al. (2007, p. 116): Which research paradigm is better? This is perhaps the most frequently asked question about paradigms. But as Saunders et al. have eloquently argued, the question in fact misses the point. It is not the question of whether one is better than the others. The question should be which paradigm is more suitable for some types of research questions than others. Some examples of the IC research questions that a paradigm is capable of answering are:

- The positivist paradigm: What are culture-specific patterns? How to account for culture-specific patterns in terms of cultural values?
- The interpretive paradigm: How to describe and interpret communicative behaviors in context? What do these communicative behaviors tell about the culture shared by individuals?
- The critical paradigm: What role do power and ideology play in shaping the reality? How are cultural differences reified by those in power?
- The constructivist paradigm: How are intercultural differences socially or discursively constructed?
- The realist paradigm: To what extent can culture account for problems in interactions? How to acknowledge both individuals' agency and the role of deeper structures and mechanisms, of which culture is one component, in understanding the phenomenon under investigation?

The second question: Do paradigms come and go? Some paradigms may be more dominant than others at certain times and promoted by some research groups to meet their research priorities. In the available accounts of paradigms in IC (e.g. Martin, Nakayama, & Carbaugh, 2014), the links between some particular paradigms and geographical areas and periods of time are established. As an example of diversity in paradigms, Holliday (Chapter 2, this volume) provides an account of an interpretive constructivist paradigm and critical cosmopolitan approach. Some journals prefer certain paradigms than others, because of their disciplinary connections and aims and scopes. For example, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, as stated on its website, is primarily interested in topics such as acculturation; Intercultural Communication; intergroup perceptions, contact, and interactions; intercultural training; and cultural diversity in education, organizations and society. It aims to engage with scholars from fields of psychology, communication, education, management, sociology, and related disciplines. Its articles generally adopt a positivist paradigm, as evident in the January issue of 2014, for instance. In contrast, *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* takes a critical stance on issues of language and communication in globalization, transnationalism, migration, and mobility across time and space, and affiliates itself with critical sociolinguistics. A quick browse of the topics covered in the articles published in the journal shows a mixture of constructivist, critical, interpretive and realist paradigms, but the absence of the positivist paradigm is noticeable.

Understanding Your Own Positions

A PhD doctoral student once said to me, "It took me a long time to learn what the terms such as ontological or epistemological really mean, but once I have understood

them, I can see how much it would have guided me if I were aware of these issues right from the beginning.” Indeed, one’s orientation to a particular paradigm makes a significant difference to research approaches, designs, and data collection methods and analysis. The following questions, I hope, are helpful in understanding your own orientation in approaching your research.

- 1 What is the aim or purpose of your research? Is it primarily finding facts or patterns, identifying the links between variables, seeking an explanation, understanding the process of meaning-making, unpicking the relationship between power structure and human behaviors, or solving a problem?
- 2 What is the nature of findings in your research? Are they facts, and therefore relatively objective, or opinions / argument, and therefore subjective?
- 3 What criteria do you use in assessing the quality of your research? Do you use the terms “validity,” “reliability,” “representativeness,” “holistic,” “transformative” (i.e. bringing changes), or “situatedness” (i.e. taking account of macro factors such as social, political, cultural, and economic factors, as well as local factors such as location of interactions, participants involved, how something is said to whom, etc.)?
- 4 Are you encouraged to bring in your “voice” in your research? Do you go about your research as a “natural scientist,” one who does not “interfere” with the data and remains extrinsic to the data? Or, is your voice integral to the process of data collection, analysis and interpretation?

Key Terms

Epistemology A term that describes researchers’ beliefs about the nature of knowledge and findings as well as the relationship between the researcher and the research in a field of study. Examples of the issues concerned are: what counts as data and findings? Are findings regarded as truth or facts waiting to be discovered or are they subject to researchers’ interpretation?

Intercultural Communication As a field of study, it is concerned with how people from different cultural backgrounds interact with each other and negotiate cultural or linguistic differences which may be perceived or made relevant through interactions, as well as what impact such interactions have on group relations and on individuals’ identities, attitudes and behaviors. It is abbreviated as IC in this volume.

Ontology A term that describes researchers’ beliefs about the form and the nature of reality. Examples of the issues concerned are: does the reality under study exist and operate independently? Is the reality subject to perceptions and actions of individuals or “social actors” who inhabit it?

Paradigm The overarching constructive framework and meta-thinking behind a piece of research. It reflects the researcher’s general orientation towards the form and nature of the reality under study, the nature of knowledge and the role of the researcher.

Research approaches Research plans and procedures that “span the steps from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection, analysis, and interpretation” (Creswell, 2014, p. 3).

References

- Bennett, M. J. (2005). *Paradigmatic assumption of Intercultural Communication*. Hillsboro: IDR Institute [www.idrinstitute.org](http://www.idrinstitute.org/allegati/IDRI_t_Pubblicazioni/3/FILE_Documento.pdf). Retrieved June 10, 2015 from: http://www.idrinstitute.org/allegati/IDRI_t_Pubblicazioni/3/FILE_Documento.pdf
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism*. East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chen, G-M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). *Foundations of Intercultural Communication*. Needham Height, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Danermark, B., Ekstrom, M., Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. (2002). *Explaining society: Critical realism in the social sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Day, D. (1994). Tang's dilemma and other problems: Ethnification processes at some multicultural workplaces. *Pragmatics*, 4, 315–336.
- Day, D. (1998). Being ascribed, and resisting. Membership of an ethnic group. In C. Antaki, & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 151–170). London: Sage.
- de Vaus, D. (2001). *Research design in social research*. London: Sage.
- Ehrenreich, S. (2009). English as a lingua franca in multinational corporations – exploring business communities of practice. In A. Mauranen, & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca. Studies and findings* (pp. 126–151). Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Ehrlich, S. (2008). Sexual assault trials, discursive identities and institutional change. In R. Dolon, & J. Todoli (Eds.), *Analysing identities in discourse* (pp. 159–177). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. London: Hutchinson.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. (Ed.) (2005). *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers. An approach to Intercultural Communication* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hall, E. T. (1959/1973). *The silent language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1966/1990). *Hidden dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Halualani, R. T., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). Critical Intercultural Communication Studies: At a crossroads. In T. K. Nakayama, & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical Intercultural Communication* (pp. 1–16). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Higgins, C. (Ed.). (2007). *A closer look at cultural difference: “Interculturality” in talk-in-interaction*. A special issue of *Pragmatics*, 17(1).
- Hofstede, H. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, H. (2001). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural Communication and ideology*. London: Sage.
- Holliday, A. (2013). *Understanding Intercultural Communication. Negotiating a grammar of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (2013). Exploring evidence of socio-cultural norms in face-to-face interaction. Conference presentation in IALIC 2013 Annual Conference (Language and Intercultural Communication in the Workplace: Critical Approaches to Theory and Practice) December 2013, Hong Kong.
- Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2011). *Leadership, discourse and ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin, & W. C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13–53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Hymes, D. (Ed.). (1964). *Language in culture and society*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Katriel, T. (1986). *Talking straight: Dugri speech in Israeli Sabra culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. A selection is reprinted in Zhu Hua (Ed.) (2011), *The language and Intercultural Communication reader* (pp. 152–164). London: Routledge.
- Kiesling, S. (2012). Ethnography of speaking. In C. B. Paulston, S. F. Kiesling & E. S. Rangel (Eds.), *The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication* (pp. 77–89). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. New York: Row, Petersen.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lopez, J., & Potter, G. (Eds.) (2001). *After postmodernism: An introduction to critical realism*. London: Athlone Press.
- Martin, J., & Nakayama, T. K. (2000). *Intercultural Communication in contexts* (2nd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Martin, J. Nakayama, T. K., & Flores, L. A. (2002). A dialectal approach to Intercultural Communication. In J. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in Intercultural Communication. Experiences and context* (pp. 3–12). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Martin, J., Nakayama, T. K., & Carbaugh, D. (2014). The history and development of the study of Intercultural Communication and applied linguistics. In J. Jackson (Ed.): *The Routledge handbook of language and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 17–36). London: Routledge.
- Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., Fontaine, J., Anguas-Wong, A., Arriola, M., Ataca, B., et al. (2008). Mapping expressive differences around the world: The relationship between emotional display rules and individualism versus collectivism. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 39, 55–74.
- McNamee, S. (2004). Relational bridges between constructionism and constructivism. In J. D. Raskin, & S. K. Bridges (Eds.), *Studies in meaning 2: Bridging the personal and the social* (pp. 37–50). New York: Pace University Press.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 89–118.
- Meeuwis, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Critical perspectives on Intercultural Communication*. A special issue of *Pragmatics*, 4(3).
- Meeuwis, M. (1994b). Leniency and testiness in Intercultural Communication: Remarks on ideology and context in interactional sociolinguistics. *Pragmatics*, 4, 391–408.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mori, J. (2003). The construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36(2), 143–184.

Identifying Research Paradigms

21

- Nishizaka, A. (1995). The interactive constitution of interculturality: How to be a Japanese with words. *Human Studies*, 18, 301–326.
- Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural Communication: A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Reed, M. (2005). Reflections on the “realist turn” in organization and management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(8), 1621–1644.
- Roberts, C., Campbell, S., & Robinson, Y. (2008). *Talking like a manager: Promotion interviews, language and ethnicity*. Research report for Department of Work and Pensions. Retrieved 11 June, 2015 from: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130128102031/http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/rports2007-2008/rrep510.pdf>
- Sarangi, S. (1994). Intercultural or not? Beyond celebration of cultural differences in miscommunication analysis. *Pragmatics*, 4, 409–427.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research methods for business students*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25) (pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4), 19–45.
- Scollon, R., & Wong-Scollon, S. (1990). Athabaskan–English interethnic communication. In D. Carbaugh (Ed.), *Cultural communication and intercultural contact* (pp. 259–287). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sercombe, P., & Young, T. (Eds.). (2010). *Communication, discourses and interculturality*. A Special issue of *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 181–272.
- Shea, D. P. (1994). Perspective and production: Structuring conversational participation across cultural borders. *Pragmatics*, 4, 357–390.
- Shi-xu (1994). Discursive attributions and cross-cultural communication. *Pragmatics*, 4, 337–356.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thurlow, C. (2010). Speaking of difference: Language inequality and interculturality. In T. Nakayama, & R. T. Halualani (Eds.), *The handbook of critical Intercultural Communication* (pp. 227–247). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York: Guilford.
- Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989*, vol. 37 (pp. 41–133). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Zhu, Hua (ed.) (2011). *The Language and Intercultural Communication Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Zhu, Hua (2014). *Exploring Intercultural Communication: Language in action*. London: Routledge.

Further Reading and Resources

On general discussion on paradigms:

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Chapter 1, The selection of a research approach). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research methods for business students* (Chapter 4, Understanding research philosophies and approaches). Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- On discussion on paradigms in IC studies:*
- Martin, J., Nakayama, T. K., & Flores, L. A. (2002). A dialectal approach to Intercultural Communication. In J. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in Intercultural Communication. Experiences and context* (pp. 3–12). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Martin, J., Nakayama, T. K., & Carbaugh, D. (2014). The history and development of the study of Intercultural Communication and applied linguistics. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 17–36). London: Routledge.