Advances in Communication and Culture

D. Ray Heisey *

Kent State University

INTRODUCTION

Greetings to the International Conference on Cross-Cultural Communication of the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies. It is an honor to be here in Hong Kong at the Hong Kong Baptist University, one of the advanced universities in communication studies in Asia. I was so delighted to see in the preliminary program that scholars are here from about 30 countries and from every continent except Antarctica. I also see that the conference has represented many different disciplines, showing that intercultural communication is a highly regarded discipline in a broad range of academic areas. My job is to help set the tone for the conference and I would like to do that by presenting advances in research and in teaching, as our conference theme is "Communication and Cultural (Ex)Change." You will be exposed to many theories and research findings at this conference. I choose not to present to you an elaborate theory or new model of research. I want to offer some inspiration that will motivate and encourage us to go further than we have ever gone before.

The term "advances" means that much has gone before us but now new steps are being taken to go where we need to go in this discipline. The river keeps flowing. We can never step into it at the same place again. Advances make big news in medicine, in technology, in political affairs, in conflict resolution, and in all areas of human life. The impact of communication on culture and of culture on communication keeps bringing us all to the realization that this emerging field has nothing but growth and great potential ahead. Unlike the stock market that can sputter and burst and fall back, intercultural communication in research and in teaching is on an upward spiral.

Professional conferences and academic meetings are typically the places where we hear reports of research that is on the cutting edge, where we meet new people, new ideas, and new developments. As I looked at the preliminary program, I saw very exciting topics, unusual areas of investigation, re-

examination of traditional concepts, and challenges to our thinking. What I would like to do in the allotted time I have is to tell you about some of the research soon to be published that has gone through the crucible of review and examination and will take its place on the table in the public sphere and also tell you about a proposal I have for how we might conduct ourselves as teachers in this field. So, my presentation has two sections—one on new research that will soon be published and one on a new proposal for dialogic teaching, both advances in communication and cultural exchange.

NEW RESEARCH

I didn't make up this topic, Advances in Communication and Culture, as a title for this presentation. It comes from an established title that I proposed a couple years ago to the Westport Publishing Corporation, now part of the Greenwood Publishing Group in Stamford, CT. My idea was to begin a series of books that would advance the newest research in communication and culture and explore the impact of their interconnection. The idea was adopted and the series now has five books in its publishing sequence for the years 2000, 2001, and 2002, with more volumes to be added following the third year.

I would like to share with you the directions of these five volumes to give you a preview of what is coming. As series editor, I am in a unique position to know what the latest research is and announce it at a conference such as this so that you can see what to expect. The first volume, which I edited, which some of you have seen, was published last year under the title, *Chinese Perspectives in Rhetoric and Communication*. In this volume, I attempted to pick up where Professor Robert T. Oliver of Penn State left off when he published his book, *Communication and Culture in Ancient India and China* (1971), close to the year in which our field of intercultural communication, as we know it, began to emerge. "In this groundbreaking work," I argued, "Oliver acknowledged that his book was a 'pioneering inquiry' and one that 'will lead to further and more definitive investigations' (p. ix)…. He stated an assumption that is evidenced over and over again in the present volume by these Chinese authors, 'Rhetoric always is authentic only in its cultural matrix' (p. ix). The present cultural perspectives in rhetoric and communication by authentic Chinese researchers may be considered advances beyond the interpretation offered by Professor Oliver… ." (Heisey, 2000, p. 6).

My purpose in the volume was not only to advance the work of Oliver by putting into the public sphere current approaches as to how the Chinese scholars are looking at the basics of rhetoric and communication, but to ask "for more mainstream scholars to take notice of the research in Chinese communication so that an intercultural dialogue can take place that will advance a mutual understanding of communication in the East and the West" (Heisey, 2000, p. 10). In this way, I argued in the introduction, we might "advance our own Western

thinking and understanding of these aspects of rhetoric and communication from the Eastern perspective. For too long we in the West have been satisfied to settle for our own interpretation of rhetorical and communication reality" (p. 14).

The first volume, then, begins with the examination of selected aspects of communication theory as found in the Chinese context and in political rhetoric, in order to bring into the dialogue, or more accurately to continue the dialogue with, a Chinese perspective, because the year before, in 1999, Randy Kluver and John Powers edited the award-winning book, *Civic Discourse, Civil Society, and Chinese Communities.*

The second volume, to come out in January 2002, is edited by Joseph Chan and Bryce McIntyre, both of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, who put together a book that is on the cutting edge. Its title, *In Search of Boundaries: Communication, Nation-States, and Cultural Identities*, suggests how its contents are pushing us at many different edges. Its chapters take up the concept of how boundaries are dissolving at cultural levels, in films, in marketing, in on-line relationships and in personal and political arenas. Then it presents chapters on how boundaries are also being reasserted as nations attempt to give answers, satellite broadcasting domesticates, media and national identities redesign boundaries, and finally, chapters on the crossing of boundaries in the media, in popular culture and in globalization at many levels.

In the introductory chapter by Chan and Ma, the authors set the tone for the whole book when they describe what they mean by "transculturating modernity" as "a reinterpretation of cultural globalization." Let me share with you a quotation from this chapter that describes well what they are about.

This chapter proposes a transcultural perspective that, as a synthesis of the liberal and critical perspectives, views cultural globalization more as an extension and adaptation of modernity on a world scale. Transculturation is the process by which one culture is transformed by another for self-aggrandizement when they come into contact with each other. From a transcultural perspective, cultural boundaries are always in a state of flux, subject to forces from within and without. Cultural sovereignty is rendered less relevant as the world becomes more integrated technologically, economically and politically. But as a result of mediation by the nation-state, local interests and the needs for local identity, foreign culture is not imposed but indigenized. What is absorbed and retained is what matches the needs of the receiving culture at a given time. Our proposition of "transculturating modernity" represents an attempt to capture the push and pull, the mix and break, of global cultural encounters, while at the same time highlighting the forceful and directional nature of cultural formation. It is not the simple, linear "diffusionist thesis" of early modernization theories, since we

propose that instead of diffusion from the West to the rest, what we are now experiencing is a give-and-take among encountering cultures. This is not a general, catch-all "globalization thesis," since we are tracking the power vector of modernization in uneven hybridization. This is not another form of the "imperialism thesis" because we are analyzing the multifaceted and dialectic consequences of modernity" (Chan & Ma, 2002, p.4).

In stating the purpose of the book, the editors say, "There is a plethora of books on globalization, and the same may be said of treatises on nation-states, but our work goes beyond them in the sense that it attempts to synthesize the interactions among nation-states and cultural identities under the force of globalization. In this age of global communication, boundaries, be they cultural, political or economic, are in a state of flux. This book aims to examine the dissolution and re-formation of boundaries at many levels of the human experience. To achieve this, we have brought together scholars with both critical and analytical perspectives, scholars from both East and West" (Book Proposal, 2000, p. 1).

This book extends the excellent work of Guo-Ming Chen and William J. Starosta in their volume published in 2000 entitled, *Communication and Global Society.* In the introduction, Chen and Starosta state, "It is then obligatory for scholars to investigate human interactions in the process of forming a new sense of community that reflects the dialectical relationship between identity and diversity in the global context. The exercise of the faculties we describe may lead in unexpected directions wherein nation becomes obsolete and identities shift with each new context. The changes we anticipate will occur in a context where some persons with substantial power may not recognize the need to build a sense of global community. Interactions leading to globalization will steer a course between dialogue and debate, nationality and ethnicity, self and community, geographic proximity and virtual community, legal constitution and experience subjectivity" (p. 7).

If you have not seen the Chen and Starosta book, you should get it soon. The forthcoming Chan and McIntyre book will make a good companion volume for it.

The third volume in the Ablex series is entitled, *Chinese Conflict Management and Resolution*, (2002) edited by Guo-Ming Chen (University of Rhode Island) and Ringo Ma (SUNY at Fredonia). The purpose of this volume is to bring together some of the latest research on conflict management and its resolution from the Chinese perspective. With the WTO taking in the greatest nation on Earth in terms of its potential market, and with the economic reform movement in China moving headlong into the 21st Century, there is unparalleled interest in understanding how conflict can be managed from an Eastern

viewpoint. Chen and Ma have gathered mostly Chinese scholars for this task, with a few Western scholars who have studied the Chinese situation. The book begins with cultural and philosophical foundations of Chinese conflict management, emphasizing the concepts of harmony, yuan, propriety, and negotiation. Then it moves into how the Chinese manage conflict in the interpersonal context, in the organizational context, in the political context, and in the negotiation context by investigating case studies in each of these contexts. It breaks into the future in bringing to us understanding and assessment of how the inscrutable Chinese mind works its way through conflict situations in many different contexts. Watch for it this winter.

The fourth volume in the series is *Chinese Communication Studies: Advances*, *Challenges, and Prospects*, edited by Wenshan Jia, Lucy Lu, and D. Ray Heisey. This volume continues the focus of volume number 3 on Chinese communication with an emphasis on describing the state of the art in Chinese theory and research. One of the chief contributions of this volume is the metatheoretical critique it provides. An example of this is the Rueyling Chuang and Claudia Hale critical examination of the Eurocentric representation of Chinese communication that pervades so much of the literature. Further chapters focus on John Powers' tier-based perspective of Chinese communication, on Lucy Lu's research in terms of how Western and Chinese rhetorics compare, on Xiaosui Xiao's argument on how Western learning was assimilated into Chinese education, the strength and weakness of Chinese communication campaigns by Wang, and how development, health, negotiation, and advertising communication in China today are taking shape under economic reform.

The closing section of the book has Ringo Ma's chapter on the interface between culture and technology in Chinese communication, the challenges CMC provides by Shen, and the essential role of the Chinese language as the world's leading logographic writing system in global communication by Mansfield-Richardson. The volume, as described by the lead editor, Wenshan Jia, establishes the significance of Chinese communication theory and research in a globalizing world as it attempts to establish Chinese theoretical innovations and methodology.

The fifth volume that will also come out in this series next year is a companion volume to number 4 and is titled, *Chinese Communication Studies: Contexts and Comparisons,* edited by Lucy Lu, Wenshan Jia, and D. Ray Heisey. The lead editor of this volume, Lucy Lu, says, "It examines multiple factors that contribute to the dynamics of Chinese communication in different regions (Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan), across time (historical and contemporary), and through various means (e.g., media, political expediency, appropriation of traditional Chinese cultural values). The authors engage their studies through diverse approaches: historical, rhetorical, critical, ethnographic, and comparative." She further explains, "In developing this volume, the editors

believe that the dynamics and intricacies of Chinese communication cannot be understood without examining the social/political, cultural, media, linguistic, and cross-cultural contexts. Further, the editors share the view that Chinese communication behavior is shaped by multiple factors such as Chinese philosophical and cultural traditions, and by political and economic needs. Moreover, comparative studies between Chinese and Western minds and traditions will help identify barriers as well as common ground in cross-cultural communication. More importantly, these studies can provide insights on building a multicultural perspective of rhetoric and human communication" (Lu, 2000, Book Proposal).

I will mention just a few of the chapter topics that continue to plough new ground in this field. Xiaosui Xiao's research on "the rhetorical processes in which fundamental concepts in the West such as struggle, revolution, democracy, and science passed through international and linguistic boundaries and made their way into contemporary Chinese discourse," shows us "how the traditional strategies of Chinese rhetoric play a crucial role in mediating Western ideas in the Chinese context" (quoted in Lu, 2000). Two other chapters that bring to light an examination of Chinese discourse are the ones by Yanrong Chang, which examines the interactions in three provincial courtroom trials to demonstrate "how the Confucian notion of morality has been widely and elaborately invoked in Chinese court arguments," and by Lin-Lee Lee, which analyzes Nushuan discourse, a thousand-year-old female language recently discovered in Hunan, to argue "that pure persuasion embedded in Nushuan discourse enables these village women to voice and to cry out against the marriage system and the Confucian cult of womanhood that condemns Chinese women to inferiority, ignorance, and dependence" (quoted in Lu, 2000).

In the final section of the book, which focuses on comparative studies between East and West, chapters explore the differences and similarities on such concepts as humanism, human rights, the self, competency models, and dialogic learning.

As the impact of communication on culture and of culture on communication continues to fascinate scholars in our field, this series of five volumes, in the process of being published now, should offer us fertile soil for dialogue and reflection and for building theory that may have uniquely Chinese characteristics as well as universal elements. One of the strong characteristics of these volumes is the implicit, if not explicit, way in which they serve as response in a cultural dialogue between West and East, between traditional perspectives and different perspectives. Just as individuals engage in intercultural communication at the micro level, so cultures engage each other in intercultural communication at the macro level. This series highlights dialogue and conforms to the rule of transparency—acknowledging that our sources are Western, or Eastern, or otherwise.

These different perspectives in the new research mean that we have the substance for a real dialogue in intercultural communication. This brings me to the second section of my paper, which is a proposal for more dialogue in intercultural communication, both in teaching and in research. Let me take each of these areas and suggest how this might be done.

A DIALOGUE PROPOSAL

I believe that if the intercultural communication field is to grow as it should, there must be more dialogue both in teaching our students and in our research. It always fills me with greater confidence when I see the authorship of an intercultural communication research paper or chapter or book consists of an Eastern name and a Western name. It tells me that at least the possibility of dialogue is there, if it is not there in fact. In substance, our concepts in teaching and in research ought to have the benefit of being examined by two different minds from two different backgrounds, using two different methodologies. The word 'dialogue' itself means through the words of persons. Words are symbols of reality as perceived by human beings who construct them from different viewpoints and from different experiences. We say that dialogue allows us to get at the truth and to determine the ground of being as we search for meaning in life. I want to look at the substance and the process of teaching by means of dialogue.

First, how can dialogue be used in the substance of teaching intercultural communication? We obtain our materials from this text or that text, or from this journal article or from that journal article, on selected issues or topics, such as nonverbal, cultural identity, cultural adaptation and language codes. I am proposing in the dialogic approach that we purposefully select those texts that present differing views and interpretations of the data so that students can see that scholars differ and disagree on certain findings. Have the students read those journal dialogues where editors select opinions that are argued vigorously on the printed page. Take the case of cultural identity. How do the Western scholars approach this concept and how do the Eastern scholars use the term? What about the debate over the use of individualism vs. collectivism? Ever since Hofstede published his work on these categories, some scholars have argued their limitations and inapplicability to certain societies. We should by design prepare our course readings so that our students can see the dialogue over substance. Students should be able to read the views and perspectives that directly confront each other in the interpretation of these intercultural concepts.

In the process of teaching, as well as in the substance of teaching, we should engage in dialogue. We can do this at two levels. We can invite in a colleague from another department who may have a different perspective as an anthropologist or sociologist or psychologist, who can help create a real encounter of ideas, demonstrating to the student how ideas grow and develop in

confrontational dialogue, where we question each other's premises, methods, sources, data interpretation, and findings. We have all seen situations where, when one on one, the dialoguers were seen to improve in their clarity of thought and in their expression of language when challenged.

Another level of dialogue would be to invite in a colleague from another institution or campus who has a different perspective on the issue. We all have other institutions in our extended area or region where we could call on colleagues for a given topic or concept in order to engage in a rousing dialogue that evokes strong thinking and speaking. It is not easy to do this. It takes much effort to make such arrangements, but if we are serious about teaching intercultural communication with modeling what our discipline is all about - diversity and dialectical holism - then we should take the risk.

Of course, an ideal approach, which I admit is more problematic in implementing, is to have a course that is team-taught by two instructors who have differing points of view. This would be a luxury in a department. But I did it when Professor Shijie Guan from Peking University came to our School at Kent State University in the fall semester of 1997 as part of our exchange program between Kent State and Peking University. We team taught a workshop or short course on Chinese Culture and Communication in which we both were there together for each class while he shared the Chinese perspective and I supplied some of the questions and data from the Western perspective in order to contrast and to compare. We had an on-going dialogue on issues, which made the learning process more dynamic, interesting and holistic.

Still another approach to dialogic teaching is to engage students in the process. We know from our own experience that more learning takes place when both student and teacher are actively involved. Very early in my teaching career I mounted an honors course in argumentation that was based on the Socratic method of dialogue, with question and answer, advancing and defending students' ideas among themselves and with the professor. My purpose was "the development of an informed and critical mind in the investigation, analysis, and evaluation of controversial issues both in the academic community and in society at large" so that students could experience what it means to be "truth-seeking citizens in a free society" under the guidance of a tutor (Heisey, 1968, p. 202).

Just recently, following my retirement, when I had an opportunity to teach at Peking University, I followed the dialogic approach in the classroom. On one occasion, I asked the students to tell me why the people outside the campus would not queue up at the bus stop, like they did at the bank on the campus. One of my students, Qiu Linchuan, took me to task by answering my question along with 6 other questions during the course of the semester that had to do with their cultural behavior. He followed the dialogic principle by writing me an essay in answer to my questions, brought them one by one over the weeks to our

apartment, and used the essay as a springboard for dialogue and further discussion.

The essays were so good that I put them together into a paper that was presented at the NCA convention in Chicago in 1997. We called the paper, "American-Chinese Serendipity Dialogues in Intercultural Communication" (Qiu & Heisey, 1997), which explored such questions as why are the Chinese students reticent, what is behind the current nationalism in China, and if they could get together, how would Confucius and Aristotle go about communicating? These dialogues were highly interactive, instructive, and productive. In the process of these dialogues, my student, Qiu Linchuan, who came here to Hong Kong for his Master's degree and is now a doctoral student at USC, became my teacher of Chinese culture and I, his Western professor, became his student.

When I returned to Beida last fall semester to teach again, I approached my students in dialogic fashion in the intercultural course in order to learn how they were thinking and reacting to what they were learning. On one occasion, one of my students in one of the evening open discussions in our apartment that we had every weekend, asked me what my favorite movies were. I replied that I don't watch American movies because I consider them a waste. She directly confronted that conclusion and argued that as a professor of intercultural communication I should watch movies as examples of the intercultural process. She mentioned a Chinese movie, "Before the Rain," that she thought so highly of as an intercultural experience, that she gave me the CD so I could watch it on my computer. As a result of this dialogue, she chose to write her research paper for the course on this movie as an intercultural experience. She did such a good job with the analysis that I submitted it to the Rochester Institute of Technology in New York for their intercultural communication conference and I presented it for her just last week, before coming here. I want to share with you what I wrote in the preface of that paper:

The professor—the second author of the paper—encouraged the student's effort to prove him wrong and later acknowledged that she had argued her point well. He believes that three good things came out of this experience. First, the student is to be commended for choosing an idea out of her own experience as the subject for an academic paper. Students in intercultural communication should be encouraged to look to themselves for opportunities of reflection and examination as worthy objects of analysis.

Second, this case study is an excellent example of a creative mind at work, which grew out of an intellectual dialogue where there was a disagreement between her and the professor's position on a subject. The argument took on the form of a creative and artistic and intellectual answer instead of the usual form arguments take with propositions,

supporting arguments, evidence from well-established sources, and references from the literature…

Third, this case study serves as an example of a very useful tool for teaching intercultural communication to students who may not have had much opportunity experiencing other cultures (Zhang & Heisey, 2001 pp. 3,4).

I might add to this case example that I recently received an email from this student, Zhang Jie, who said that my encouraging her to challenge me in the classroom has made a change in her approach to issues and assumptions generally. She said that it has changed her life in certain ways. I consider this part of the payoff in using dialogue.

Let me tell you about another one of my students, Wang Xiaotian, who is at this conference presenting her own paper (which is also based on her experience as her family went through the adaptation process within China, from one part of the country to another). She engaged one of her classmates in a dialogue on how the Chinese government might or might not behave in a potential conflict with the US. I had sparked the dialogue with a question that elicited different answers from different students. They eagerly grabbed the issue and ran with it to my great delight.

I also used the dialogic method to ask my students what the Chinese word was for certain intercultural terms, such as identity, or culture, or context, and many good discussions resulted from these question and answer formats. One hot discussion was whether, in China, tolerance or motivation is the more important quality for effective intercultural communication. Another dialogue that resulted was from a discussion of conflict in intercultural communication settings. When I asked my students how the Chinese respond to conflict, they said they have a proverb which goes like this: "*Ren yi shi, Feng Ping lang Jing; Tui yi bu, hai kuo tian kong*," or "If you tolerate for a while, the situation will be like a calm sea; Step back one step, Then you will have a bigger vision." The stepping back, they told me, was for the purpose of avoiding conflict, but the result in doing so was to obtain a broader vision of the situation. As a result of this dialogue I learned more of the Chinese culture and language and my students learned the important lesson in dialogical teaching that a teacher is also another learner who may be further down the road in one area but not as far along as they in another.

One final example of the result of dialogic teaching is the attitude I instilled in the students toward the textbook. I had asked the publisher of the Martin/Nakayama text on *Intercultural Communication in Contexts* (1997) to give me a free copy for each of my students and they did without any hesitation. So each student had his/her own copy to read and study but I emphasized that this book was just one perspective and that they should be critical and tell me

10

where it needed to be more inclusive from their point of view as Chinese students, instead of American students for whom it was written. They were very free to offer suggestions about what was missing, such as more dimensions to the dialectics in the book, more coverage of why study intercultural communication, and more emphasis on the fact that all humans are engaged in cultural adaptation, not just those who have intercultural encounters. It should be seen as on a continuum.

In an attempt to encourage the students to be dialogical in their learning, I asked them to construct a visual model for the concepts of communication, culture, context, and power and the relationships these variables have to each other. This kind of assignment helps to put them in a frame of mind to think back to the text and not just accept the author's way as the only way to visualize the material.

Let me give some additional concrete suggestions as to how we might implement dialogic teaching. On one of my 7 trips to China, I arranged with Professor Song of the International Politics Department of Renmin University in Beijing an exchange program whereby I would invite a retired professor from my school at Kent to go to Renmin to teach communication for just one month as a way to expose his students to Western ideas and to a Western teacher. When I had used the retired professors from my own school, I turned to retired colleagues at other universities to offer the experience, and a third pool I used from was professors who could go to teach for the month at the end of May immediately following their spring semester at home while the Chinese semester was still in progress. They all found it exhilarating and enriching in expanding their views. One of my colleagues came back and said that it had changed his perception of China completely.

The exchange program I developed with Peking University, at which I had the privilege of teaching twice since my retirement from Kent, allowed Prof. Guan from their department to come to Kent during the fall semester the year after I was in Beijing. As I mentioned above, we team-taught together and I arranged for him to give lectures on Chinese culture and communication at nearby universities, as a way of enlarging the dialogue beyond my own university.

If you say you can't get off for a semester, then I would suggest another plan that I also have implemented. A Chinese scholar/journalist, Zhang Ming, whom I invited to my department for a couple months, ended up asking me if we would like to have an exchange program with his *Guangming Daily* newspaper, whereby 4 of our professors would be their guests in China for two weeks and 4 of their journalists would later be our guests for two weeks in the US. We could learn more about each other's culture and have discussions with colleagues about common interests in research and teaching. We started that exchange in 1992 and just a couple months ago celebrated the 10th anniversary (Heisey,

2001). Some of the Kent State professors, who come from many different departments, have told me that it has changed their lives and has enriched their teaching in ways they never could have imagined.

All of us as university teachers are expected to teach, to do research, and to do university and community service as part of our professional responsibilities. We know we can't get ahead if we don't publish. I am suggesting that as intercultural communication scholars we should take upon ourselves the requirement that we will invite another colleague from a nearby institution to come and dialogue with us for several class sessions, for starters, then work on inviting someone from another culture who has a different perspective, then ask a colleague in another country to invite us to a teaching/dialogue at their institution. If we can take off up to a week to attend a conference, why not ask to be off a week to go teach/dialogue and begin a collaborative research project while there at a sister university or a foreign university for the purpose of putting into practice what we say in theory is an essential part of our discipline—intercultural communication consists of diverse perspectives in a genuine encountering interaction. I think one of the pools of teachers you could invite would be retired professors of communication. There are many of us out there who would be delighted to come to your university for a week to engage you in dialogue with your classes and let them see how encountering ideas in genuine dialogue allow those ideas to grow.

In summary on this point, I think that we don't use dialogue enough in our teaching of the substance of intercultural communication and in the process of teaching it in the classroom. I am proposing that as teachers of intercultural communication we each take on the responsibility of creating our own personal approach to dialogic teaching and do it this next semester, as a commitment to the central concept of our discipline that diversity and identity are two sides of the same coin.

Finally, let me say a word about dialogue in research. Again, in terms of both the substance and the process of research, we should engage in more dialogue. Let's try to engage a colleague who has a different perspective or is from a different culture to sound out our research questions, our research objectives, our research issues. We should make our efforts truly collaborative, not with someone who agrees with us, or has the same perspective, but someone who disagrees with us or who doesn't share our assumptions. Some of the books I have mentioned above have editors or authors who are collaborating and who come from different cultures. The Chan/McIntyre book on *In Search of Boundaries* and the Chen/Starosta book on *Global Society* are two good examples of editors who are from an Eastern and a Western culture. This provides a perspective that has a balance to it in the formation of a volume and in the structuring of ideas in the proper context.

Dialogue in research should also include the give and take of building the concept right from the beginning in a dialectical fashion. The visiting scholar/journalist who came to my school for a few months and I developed a regular meeting schedule in which we had a dialogue on what we called the characteristics of each one's culture. We sat down together and talked out our ideas, verbalized what we each thought were the primary characteristics of the Chinese culture as he saw them and as I saw them, and then we did the same for the characteristics of American culture. Each conversation helped us think through with clarity and precision how we wanted to characterize these elements in comparison to each other. We had some disagreements, as well. This dialogue formed a basis for proceeding with other possibilities in searching the literature for the research findings on the issue. In this particular case, our dialogic efforts were put into a paper (Heisey, 1993) that was presented at a conference in Haikou, Hainan Island.

A good example of dialogue at work in research is the chapter by and the actual dialogue between Karen Dace and Mark McPhail (1997) in which they provide an intellectual intersection on "how theories of complicity and coherence might be brought to an analysis of how culture is treated in the study and practice of political communication in the United States" (p. 33). In this same volume, a new feature was introduced into the International and Intercultural Annual of the National Communication Association with the publishing of the "Forum: Politics in Intercultural Training Programs." In this dialogue, Chang and Holt (1997a) reconsider the role of power and politics in intercultural training. They argue that power is not simply another variable, but "plays a pivotal role in shaping interactions of people such as expatriates" (p. 208). Following a presentation of their model, Leeds-Hurwitz (1997) responds by cautioning "against stepping too far back from the specifics of intercultural interactions" (p. 231), and says their argument on power "overstates the case" (p. 233). Then Foeman (1997) reflects on Chang and Holt by concluding "their suggestions do little to ensure that the actual treatment of power in the training situation will be any less static" than the "static cultural styles" they are denouncing (p. 241). The Forum ends with "A Rejoinder" by Chang and Holt (1997b) in which they address four issues raised in the intellectual dialogue on power. The ideas that emerge from such a dialogue are transformative in nature and thus advance our understanding of the issues such as power and context.

One other good example is from the current issue of *Communication Theory*. In this issue David Myers (2001) replies to Robert Craig's earlier essay (1999) in which he had argued that the central problem in our field is "a proliferation of distinct communication theories and no consensus among them" (Craig, 1999, p. 119), but that the good thing about this is that we can have "productive argumentation" (p. 120) that could result in "theoretical diversity, argument, debate…" (p. 124). Myers responded by claiming that the strategy Craig offers

13

"is misrepresented and misguided—simply wrongheaded" (Myers, 2001, p. 219). Myers says that the problem is that Craig has no mechanism for judging among competing theories as to their truthfulness. Craig answers Myers in the same issue of *CT* (Craig, 2001, p. 231) by reminding Myers that Craig's working hypothesis is that "all theories about communication, whatever their disciplinary origins or underlying assumptions, do have practical implications and therefore are potentially relevant to such a field." Craig concludes by saying that "While expanding the range of criteria for adjudicating among theories, it makes possible a field of communication theory that can inform the practice of communication in society" (p. 238) and "So united, we are obligated to read each other carefully, interpret each other charitably, and argue vigorously over differences that matter" (p. 239). I think the scholarly dialogue between Myers and Craig in this issue of *Communication Theory* is an excellent example of the kind of exchange we should have more of in our intercultural communication outlets.

One of the unusual programs that has been scheduled for the NCA convention in Atlanta in November is a dialogue between black and white scholars on the rhetoric of racial transformation. There will be 7 sets of dialogues between a black scholar and a white scholar from different universities interacting on the issue of what are the social and symbolic dimensions of racial difference and how should they be redefined in order to effect fundamental changes in existing institutional and social contexts. I cite this as an excellent example of researchers opening up dialogues with each other on issues that matter.

With the availability of the Internet worldwide, we can engage in such dialogues now without ever traveling anywhere. I continue to engage my Chinese students in Beijing in dialogue about issues in intercultural communication via the Internet, and it increases the possibilities for all of us in pursuing our questions and in sharing our perspectives. I could give many more examples of these email dialogues about issues in intercultural communication.

Dialogic learning is as ancient as Plato and Confucius and as modern as the Internet. Hammond and Gao (in press) argue, "The dialogic perspective of communication and learning is more holistic, cooperative and interactive. If the ancient Chinese and modern Western perspectives of dialogue create a more holistic learning model, then they should be explored, developed and adopted by the Chinese educational system. We argue that dialogic learning will help move China into the information age and from test-oriented to quality-oriented, from competition-geared to cooperation-geared, and from knowledge-transferring to knowledge creation."

Martin Buber (1958) has focused on the "I-Thou" relationship that true dialogue creates where the individuals, in confronting each other, respect each other with mutuality, openness, and understanding, whatever the differences that

are represented in the Other. The intercultural person possesses these qualities and this is why we, as intercultural teachers and researchers, should be the first to demonstrate the qualities of establishing the "I-Thou" relationships with our students and with our colleagues in dialogic teaching and research in both substance and process.

CONCLUSION

Let me summarize the two points of my talk by putting them in the form of two rules: the rule of transparency and the rule of interconnectedness. The rule of transparency says that all new research should make clear its presuppositions, sources, and methods. The new research does make clear its sources and perspectives. Whereas we in the West had not done a good job of acknowledging that our perspective was Western, Eastern scholars began pointing out that this was so and argued that intercultural communication from a Chinese perspective, for example, would be different from what was considered the accepted theory. The advances in research are coming from scholars who have different perspectives, such as the Chinese or Japanese or Native American or African or Hispanic, not the traditionally Western views of intercultural communication. When these researchers make clear their sources and perspectives as coming from non-traditional data bases, we have the rule of transparency functioning.

When we acknowledge the rule of transparency, we reach the conclusion of multidimensionality of intercultural communication. When we see the multidimensions of intercultural communication, we are confronted with the second rule, which is interconnectedness. The many dimensions of intercultural communication lead us to the conclusion that all these intercultural dimensions are related and connected and are interdependent. Positive interconnectedness is a hallmark of the postmodern era. Global economics and global information technology are creating a world-wide web of massive and infinite proportions such that more and more people are going to be faced with the necessity of intercommunication with all peoples and all places all the time.

The new perspectives that researchers are bringing to our attention require a dialogue among scholars and teachers of intercultural communication so that students are prepared for the new era of multiple perspectives and dialogical encounters. Perhaps the Eastern perspective in the ying-yang circle will enable us to see the dialogue between the traditional, Western perspective and the newly emerging Eastern perspective, as a global ying-yang holistic viewpoint. It raises the question as to whether, maybe, like Einstein's unified field theory in the physical universe, there is a unified field theory of intercultural communication that includes some form of the ying-yang concept of a moving, rhythmic, balanced reality of communication principles. If the Western perspective is the previous dominant yang, perhaps the Eastern perspective is the

newly responding, complementary, and balancing ying in the intercultural theory cycle.

In addition to the ying-yang metaphor, there is the voice metaphor. Xiao and Heisey refer to the famous Chinese opera/film, Tian Xian Pei, as an example of a Taoist voice for women, that has been marginalized by the dominant Confucian voice, as coming forward in articulation and freedom (Xiao & Heisey, in press). This produces oppositional discourse "*in order* to create dialogical discourse and thereby eventually a cohering integration" (Heisey, 1997, p. 26), instead of fragmentation among multiple voices. Putnam (2001) uses the same metaphor in her 2000 ICA Presidential Address when she talks about "multiple and shifting voices" (p. 42) as "the movement of concepts and ideas to and from the center and extremes of the field" (p. 43) and parallels this with Bakhtin's "notion of a cacophony of voices as the forces that pull continually at extremes through their intersection in an utterance" (p. 43). She also uses the term, "oppositional discourse," which she says is "embracing the tensions that arise from difference and probing the contradictions and paradoxes between and within them, ones that point to shifts in voices and new understandings" (p. 43).

Arnett and Arneson (1999) use the term, "dialogic civility," which Hicks abstracts as "a commitment to invite unusual voices to participate in the conversation and the ability to really listen to those voices and find meaning in the cacophony that may result; the ability to save the face of those who disagree with you or those whom you don't understand and, thus, to keep the conversation going; and, finally, the commitment to find within received traditions and public covenants the seeds of revision and reform" (Hicks, 2001, p. 131). This interpretation of dialogue from the communication discipline may be compared to that coming from the political world of a Third-World country, specifically, Iran. In a recent article, "Globalizaton and Different Perspectives," the Iranian author says that globalization "is a positive force for all the people of the world" if it does not "push any nation to the margin on the basis of culture, economic, and political system" and if it creates "a discourse based not on power but love and spiritualism" and promotes "mutual respect among cultures, civilizations and spiritual traditions" (Sehhat, 2000, p. 13).

If the view from the West, and from the East, and from the Middle East, sees the need for a dialogue not only of cultures but of civilizations, perhaps the Dutch scholar, J. P. van Oudenhoven, has a point when he argues the need for "a cultura franca," or "the formation of a common culture" that promotes "integration" without losing "identities" (van Oudenhoven & Willemsen, 1989, p. 250.)"

Enriched by the new research and invigorated by our new dialogue, let us continue the task and the opportunity of transforming our own minds, the minds of our students, and the communities in which we live, as exemplars of

intercultural communication. Let us make this conference a marketplace of new ideas and a building of new relationships by encounters that will produce continuous ripples in the lake. New ideas and new relationships form the substance of a ying-yang movement in an I-Thou dialogue, which produces ADVANCES IN COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE.

   *D. Ray Heisey (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1964) is President of the International Association for Intercultural Communication Studies, Chair of the International and Intercultural Communication Division of the National Communication Association, and Fellow in the International Academy for Intercultural Research.

REFERENCES
Arnett, R. C., & Arneson, P.
   1999   *Dialogic civility in a cynical age: Community, hope*, *and interpersonal relationships*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Buber, M.
   1958   *I and Thou* (2nd Edition). New York: Scribner.
Chan, J. M., & McIntyre, B.
   2002   *In search of boundaries: Communication*, *nation-states, and cultural identities*. Stamford, CT: Ablex/Greenwood.
Chang, H.-C., & Holt, G. R.
   1997a   Intercultural training for expatriates: Reconsidering power and politics. In A. Gonzalez & D. V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 207-230). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
Chang, H.-C., & Holt, G. R.
   1997b   Reconsidering power and politics: A rejoinder. In A. Gonzalez & D. V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 243-248).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Chen, G.-M., & Ma, R. (Eds.)
   2002   *Chinese conflict management and resolution*. Westport, CT: Ablex/Greenwood.
Chen, G.-M., & Starosta, W. J. (Eds.)
   2000   *Communication and global society*. New York: Peter Lang.

Craig, R. T.

1999   Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory, 9*, 119-161.

2001   Minding my metamodel, mending Myers. *Communication Theory, 11*, 231-240.

Dace, K. L., & McPhail, M. L.

1997   Complicity and coherence in intra/intercultural communication: A dialogue. In A. Gonzalez & D. V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 27-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foeman, A. K.

1997   The problem with power: Reflections on Chang and Holt. In A. Gonzalez & D. V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 237-242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gonzalez, A., & Tanno, D. V. (Eds.)

1997   *Politics, communication, and culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Hammond, S., & Gao, H.

In press   Pan Gu's paradigm: A critical comparison of Chinese and Western concepts of holistic dialogic learning. In W. Jia, L. Lu, & D. R. Heisey (Eds.), *Chinese communication studies: Advances, challenges and prospects.* Westport, CT: Ablex/Greenwood.

Heisey, D. R.

1968   An honors course in argumentation. *The Speech Teacher*, XVII (3), 202-204.

1993   Contemporary Chinese cultural characteristics: A communication Perspective. Paper presented at the International Colloquium on Contemporary Chinese Culture, sponsored by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Hainan University, Haikou, China.

1997   Cultural influences in political communication. In A. Gonzalez &D. V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 9-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

2001   A bit of history. In 10th Anniversary Celebration of the Guangming Daily-Kent State University Exchange Program. CDROM.

Heisey, D. R. (Ed.)

2000   *Chinese perspectives in rhetoric and communication*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Hicks, D.

2001   Book review of Arnett & Arneson. *Communication Theory*, 11, 124-135.

Jia, W., Lu, L., & Heisey, D. R. (Eds.)

In press   *Chinese communication studies*: *advances, challenges, and prospects*. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Kluver, R. & Powers, J. (Eds.)

1999   Civic discourse, civil society, and Chinese communities. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W.
1997   Introducing power, context, and theory to intercultural training: A response to Chang and Holt. In A. Gonzalez & D. V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 231-236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lu, L.
2000   Book proposal for *Chinese communication studies*.

Lu, L., Jia, W., & Heisey, D. R. (Eds.)
In press   *Chinese communication studies: Contexts and comparisons.* Westport, CT: Ablex/Greenwood.

Martin, J., & Nakayama, T.
1997   *Intercultural communication in contexts*. Mt. View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Myers, D.
2001   A pox on all compromises: Reply to Craig (1999). *Communication Theory, 11*, 218-230.

Oliver, R. T.
1971   *Communication and culture in ancient India and China.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Putnam, L. L.
2001   2000 ICA presidential address: Shifting voices, oppositional discourse, and new visions for communication studies. *Journal of Communication*, *51*, 38-51.

Qiu, L. C., & Heisey, D. R.
1997   American-Chinese serendipity dialogues in intercultural communication. Paper presented at the National Communication Association convenetion, Chicago, November.

Sehhat, S. H.
2000   Globalization and different perspectives. *Echo of Islam*, No. 193 (November), 9-13.

van Oudenhoven, J.P. & Willemsen, T.M. (Eds.)
1989   Ethnic minorities: Social psychological perspectives. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Xiao, X., & Heisey, D. R.
In press   Shifting the performance characteristics of opera and the status quo for women in China. In L. B. Lengel (Ed.), *Intercultural communication and creative practice: Women and performance in global contexts*. Westport, CT: Ablex/Greenwood.

19

Zhang, V., & Heisey, D. R.
 2001 A movie, I, and intercultural communication. Paper presented at the
   Rochester Institute of Technology Intercultural Communication
   Conference, Rochester, NY, July 19-21.