

## A Dialogue Proposal for Intercultural Communication

D. Ray HEISEY  
Kent State University, USA

### Introduction

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was originally a section titled “A Dialogue Proposal” of the article “Advances in Communication and Culture”, published in *ICS 11(2)*, 1-20. The subtitles have been added. (Ed.)

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 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 10<sup>th</sup> 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.

### **Dialogue in Research**

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 *In Search of Boundaries* (2002) and the Chen/Starosta book *Global Society* (2000) 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 "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 they should 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.

### Conclusion

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 (2002) 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.

## References

- Buber, Martin. (1958). *I and Thou* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). New York: Scribner.
- Chan, Joseph M. & McIntyre, Bryce T. (2002). *In search of boundaries: Communication, nation-states, and cultural identities*. Stamford, CT: Ablex/Greenwood.
- Chang, Hui-Ching & Holt, G. Richard (1997a). Intercultural training for expatriates: Reconsidering power and politics. In Alberto Gonzalez & Dolores V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 207-230). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Chang, Hui-Ching & Holt, G. Richard. (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, Guo-Ming & Starosta, William J. (Eds.) (2000). *Communication and global society*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Craig, Robert T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9, 119-161.
- Craig, Robert T. (2001). Minding my metamodel, mending Myers. *Communication Theory*, 11, 231-240.
- Dace, Karen L. & McPhail, Mark Lawrence. (1997). Complicity and coherence in intra/intercultural communication: A dialogue. In Alberto Gonzalez & Dolores V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 27-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foeman, Anita K. (1997). The problem with power: Reflections on Chang and Holt. In Alberto Gonzalez & Dolores V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 237-242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hammond, Scott C. & Gao, Hongmei. (2002). Pan Gu's paradigm: Chinese education's return to holistic communication in learning. In Jia, Wenshan; Lu, Xing & D. Ray Heisey (Eds.), *Chinese communication studies: Contexts and comparisons*. (pp. 227-243). Westport, CT: Ablex/Greenwood.
- Heisey, D. Ray. (1968). An honors course in argumentation. *The Speech Teacher*, 17 (3), 202-204.
- Heisey, D. Ray. (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.
- Heisey, D. Ray. (2001). *A bit of history*. In 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration of the Guangming Daily-Kent State University Exchange Program. CDROM.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, Wendy. (1997). Introducing power, context, and theory to intercultural training: A response to Chang and Holt. In Alberto Gonzalez & Dolores V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 231-236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, Judith & Nakayama, Thomas. (1997). *Intercultural communication in contexts*. Mt. View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Myers, David. (2001). A pox on all compromises: Reply to Craig (1999). *Communication Theory*, 11, 218-230.
- Qiu, Linchuan & Heisey, D. Ray. (1997, November). *American-Chinese serendipity dialogues in*



*intercultural communication*. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

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