

Reconsidering the Notion of Culture in Connection to Language Studies

Bikhtiyar Omar Fattah

English Department, Faculty of Education, University of Koya
Kurdistan Region, Iraq
Bikhtiyar.omar@koyauniversity.org

Abstract

The notion of culture is a very problematic issue. There is no consensus among the scholars, researchers and even the normal people concerning the definition and the scope of culture, because the significance of cultural observance is associated with the value that is given to it by its members. Therefore, all these diversities should be observed while conducting any studies that show the impact of culture on language use. This study aims at reconsidering the notion of culture, determining its elements, identifying its scope, clarifying how it works in association with language studies, and recommending the most appropriate methodology for examining the impact of culture on interactions.

Keywords: Culture, Community of practice, Discursive approach, Context, Authentic interactions.

1. Introduction

Culture and society have a great impact on language use. According to Sherzer (1987: 296), language "is cultural in that it is one form of symbolic organization of the world. It is a social in that it reflexes and expresses group memberships and relationships". There are hundreds of studies across languages to consider the impact of culture and society on the language use. However, a great number of studies that has been conducted in this respect are not accurately examined, because these studies consider the impact of culture in a generalized way. The adopted methodologies of a considerable number of these studies are formulated in a way that the achieved outcomes do not fulfil the objects, because sometimes researchers do not consider the differences of cultural influences within the different communities of practice in the same societies. For instance, the significance of the cultural observance by the interactants may vary from a culture to another, from a community of practice to another, from an occasion to another. Therefore, to conduct any study in this field, researchers need to consider all these differences and specifications into consideration and identify the concept of culture and its impacts authentically.

The notion of culture needs to be reconsidered, because the way that this concept is implemented is very comprehensive. The degree of the influence of culture may vary from a language to another, from a society to another from a community of practice to another, from a family to another, and even from a person to another, because the nature of culture on the one hand, and the observance of cultural norms and their implementations on the other hand may vary across societies, communities, groups, and individuals.

This study aims at identifying how the notion of culture has been defined and how it should be reconsidered, especially in terms of its impact on language. To fulfil this purpose, this study critically considers the notion of culture, the categorization of cultures, the methodology that can manage cultural studies in association with language use.

2. Culture

It is difficult to have an agreed upon definition of culture by linguists because cultures are different from each other, consequently they may result in different definitions. Kroeber and Kluckhohn "found and examined 300 definitions of culture, no two of which were the same" (Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1954, cited by Neuliep, 2012:19). However, there are many attempts to define the notion of culture although they are to some extent comprehensive and generalized that cannot bit the bull's eye. According to Damen (1987: 367), culture is regarded as "learned and shared human patterns or models for living; day- to-day living patterns. These patterns and models pervade all aspects of human social interaction". Each culture has its own particular norms, but the extent of their use and the degree of their influence may vary from one culture to another and from a community of practice to another. For example, a strange visitor to Kurdistan may easily observe that Kurdish enjoy a complex cultural norms in all aspects of life, whereas personally throughout being in the UK I have noticed that the impact of culture on the living style of English people is some extent restricted.

Matsumoto (2007: 1296) defines culture as “the set of ways that emerges when a group uses the basic tools inherent in its members to address the problems presented by the larger ecological context in which the group exists in order to meet biological needs and social motives”. Although culture may involve a set of long-aged norms, it is also the representative of on-going common occurred practices by its members.

Furthermore, Centre for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (2012: NP) defines culture as “the shared patterns of behaviours and interactions, cognitive constructs, and affective understanding that are learned through a process of socialization”. This definition also associates culture with the common socially agreed upon norms and practices in general without taking the recognition, the approval, the denial, and/or the reflections that result from the diversity in the nature, perspectives, commitments and stances of the communities of practice members into consideration. To define the notion of culture, researchers need first to indicate the scope and the boarder of culture (See differences and types of culture); and second to identify the elements of culture (See elements of culture).

All the aforementioned definitions agree on the point that each particular culture results from distinguishing set of norms that may be strange or undesirable to people from other cultures. However, none of them clarifies how to indicate the scope of a culture, and none of them presents that different communities, groups, and individuals from the same culture can have different perspectives towards the significance of observing cultural norms. Thus, differences in the culturally recommended norms on the one hand, and variations in the perspective of people towards the importance of commitment to the observation of these norms on the other hand have resulted in misunderstanding towards the identification and implementation of the notion of culture in language studies.

Culture can be regarded as the representative of the on-going governed practices (e.g., individuals' commitment to the common values) and non-governed practices (e.g. individuals' freedom of practice). However, it may vary from one culture to another. Kurdish culture still employs a number of long-aged behaviours although the majority of these norms are undesirable. For example, the scope of females 'freedom is still narrower than the scope of males' freedom in Kurdish culture although Kurdish people principally, but not practically, stand against this discrimination. Moreover, not only is culture associated with the inherited norms, but also with the rapid adaptation to instant community requirements. One of the obvious examples to prove that is the speed change of the Kurdish culture. After removing Iraqi Regime in (2003), Kurdish people could practice the normal right to establish a good cultural, economic, scientific and political relationship with the worldwide countries. These relationships have made a noticeable change in Kurdish culture, namely in the style of life, in the perspective towards women's right, in social relationship, in business, in the perspective of belongings, in individuals' freedom and in the stances towards all the traditions and conventions. Thus, the cultural norms in 2003 are noticeably different from the current manipulated norms in 2016. These huge differences just in a decade prove that the observance of culture is associated with the perspective and the commitments' degree of its members, the nature of the communities of practice, and the on-going requirements of the society as well as the impact, the nature, the utility, and the type of the inherited norms.

3. Elements of Culture

The identification of the elements that constitute culture helps researchers to understand the nature, the scope and the significance of culture in connection to language studies. Hofstede (2004: 8) argues that “culture is composed of many elements which may be classified into four categories: symbols, heroes, rituals and values”. Symbols are concerned with both spoken and body language; heroes refer to both existed and unsubstantial figures that are considered as samples within communities; *rituals* are performances that are culturally approved; and *values* are personal feelings that people usually adopt out of their control, such as regarding something delicious or not (Hofstede, 2004: 8-9).

However, Minkov and Hofstede (2013) present Norms and Ideology as another element of culture detached from the values as it has been justified by Gelfand, Nishii, & Raver, (2006) that value is associated with the "internal" impact, and norms with “external" impact on interactants behaviour. This rough distinction is not accurate, because values can also be culturally originated. In the other words, not only does the individuals, but also the community can give the value to the concerned things.

The above brief identification about the elements of culture figures out that culture is not only restricted to the socially recommended norms, customs, traditions and utterances, but also to the personal beliefs, feelings, concerns, interesting, and attitudes. The components that take part in constituting culture are associated with human beings and their interactions, feelings, concerns as well as rituals and conventions. This means that what shape culture are both its members' immediate assessment, and perspectives in addition to the common endorsed norms by different societies, groups, and communities of practice. Therefore, examining language in connection to culture is an over ambitious attempt and usually brings about inaccurate results if the boarder of the interactants community is not accurately identified. For example, the degree of using formulaic utterances may vary from a person to another, from a community of practice to another, from an occasion to another, and from a culture to another. Thus, any contrastive studies about formulaic utterances require a rough indication of the scope.

4. Differences and Types of Culture:

Culture differences are associated with diversity in the style of living among different cultural, ethnic, religious and economic groups. Ottaway (1962: 24) states that “a culture is distinguished by the type of response to the same problems which all human beings must solve”. A considerable number of universal principles have found their ways in all cultures, but the factors that result in cultural differences are concerned with varieties in manipulating these principles, degree of their importance and the consequence of their ignorance. For example, all cultures agree on the principle that guests should be respected, but the ways of receiving guests, the norms that are associated with hospitality, and the consequences that result from failing to fulfil this principle may vary from one society to another, from a group to another, and from an occasion to another and from one person to another.

In addition to the communal and personal factors, there are other issues that take part in the constitution of culture, such as religious, politic, geographical and economic factors. Thus, cultural diversity results from diversity in individuals' scope of freedom and differences in community's interests and concerns as well as dissimilarities in political, geographical and historical issues. As a consequence, diversity in cultural norms and observance rolls down from the level of society till the smallest element of society which is individuals.

Many different features are used to distinguish types of cultures. For example, collectivistic and individualistic (Triandis, 1995), (Gudykuns, 1996), and (neuliep,2012); homogeneous and heterogeneous (Stoddard, 1975) and (Jandt, 2012), Conservative (Pang, 2002), and Liberal cultures (George, 2007), Volitional and Discernment (Ide, 1992) and many others to label types of culture. These terms are widely used in different occasions. However, to some extent, all these concepts can be classified into two basic types: group-centred or individual-centred. Generally, to get a deeper insight into the nature of harmony among members of a culture, and to understand how the nature of a culture affects its members interaction this study identifies the characteristics of Collectivistic and individualistic cultures.

4.1 Individualistic vs. Collectivistic Cultures:

Cross-cultural communication studies place emphasis on the impact of cultural differences on language use. Such kinds of studies usually try to find out how the differences between individualistic cultures and collectivistic cultures influence its members' interactions, and to what extent. According to Gudykunst et al.(1996: 511), "cultural individualism-collectivism...has a direct effect on communication because it affects the norms and the rules that guide behaviour in individualistic and collectivistic cultures". Although the nature of culture can have inevitable effect on its members in general, there are many factors that enhance or reduce the degree of the cultural impact on the interactions, such as the setting of interactions, and the interactants' beliefs, status, educational backgrounds and wills. All these differences in the nature of cultures are best to be considered in association with the notions of individualism and collectivism.

Regarding individualism, it is concerned with the notion of individuals' independence, freedom of choice and self-sovereignty (Neuliep, 2012: 48). From the perspective of individualism, people usually think, behave and interact independently without taking his/her backgrounds and belongings into account. Thus, in individualistic cultures "personal goals have the primacy over ingroup goals" (Triandis et al., 1990: 1007). Concerning collectivistic cultures, "people are not seen as isolated individuals" (Neuliep, 2012: 49). Thus, Triandis et al. (1990: 1007) argue that daily interactions, in collectivistic cultures, largely depend on cultural values and common orientations. Consequently, "ingroup goals have the primacy over individual goals"(Triandis et al., 1990: 1007).

These two types of culture are different from one another in terms of individual freedom and goal, language construction, relationship between members, groups' goal and identity. According to Triandis (1993: 156), the main concern of people in individualistic cultures is their freedom, whereas collectivistic cultures focus on the relationship among members in a way that a person attaches his/her concerns with the concerns of the groups/he belongs to, such as "family, tribe, work organisation, consumer group, state, ethnic group, or religious group".

In individualistic cultures, people are the decision makers by themselves, whilst in collectivistic cultures people usually try to agree with the group that they belong to (Triandis, 1993: 158). Triandis et al. (1990: 1007) add that in individualistic cultures individual is the most important element, whereas in collectivistic cultures, the priority is given to groups. Moreover, Triandis et al. (1988: 324) state that “In collectivist cultures the relationship of the individual to the ingroup tends to be stable, and even when the ingroup makes highly costly demands the individual stays with it. On the other hand, in individualist cultures people often drop those ingroups that are inconveniently demanding and form new ingroups”. Individual in collectivistic cultures has more commitment than individual in individualistic cultures towards his/her group; however, individual cannot easily leave a group to join another. For example, individual cannot easily leave family, childhood friends, and others.

Triandis et al. (1988: 325) add that in contrast to collectivistic cultures, in individualistic cultures the collaboration among people is restricted. Thus, the nature of culture considerably affects daily interactions. The tendency of considering the individual as the most sacred element, keeping individual as an independent entity, and encouraging the individual to think apart from the influence of his/her group (family, tribe and culture) which may make people use non culturally recommended expressions more.

However, considering the group as the most important element, adopting the feeling of belonging, and encouraging harmony may make interactants use culturally recommended patterns and formulaic expressions more. This assumption about the differences in the degree of the cultural impact on interactions results from the fact that: people in collectivistic cultures observe each other concerns and needs more than the people do in individualistic cultures. Consequently, people in collectivistic cultures interact more according to cultural norms and use these patterns more that are culturally recommended, such as formulaic expressions.

Although Neuliep (2012: 50) argues that “individualism and collectivism are not mutually exclusive; that is, they can coexist within a person of any culture”, he believes that members of *collectivistic culture* usually “see themselves as interdependent” by following a set of common principles, whereas interactants in individualistic cultures regards their choice and belief as the most sacred element (Neuliep, 2012: 49).

Such tough distinction between these two kinds of culture and their members does not work accurately especially in the field of language studies. Culture and individual can have both individualistic and collectivistic orientations simultaneously although they may be interested in one of them more. People generally tend to defend their personal autonomy; simultaneously they need to observe cultural norms. Thus, sometimes a person may interact as an individualist and sometimes as a collectivist. For example, unlike English culture which is recognised as one of the most individualistic cultures (Hofstede, 1984), Kurdish culture tends to be collectivistic. Kurdish culture is distinguished by a strong harmony among its members that results from the impact of cultural norms, religious principles and the homogeneity among its members as well as the politic, administrative, economic and geographical status that require individual to observe group orientations. However, the context will determine the degree of the cultural impact on the Kurdish interactants.

In brief, such polarization of cultures in connection to language studies does not bring about accurate results, because within a so called collectivistic culture, one can easily come across interactions from different communities of practice and occasions that their interactions are tend to be more volitional and free from the impact of culture and vice versa.

5. Cross cultural communication

Language is a “medium through which we perceive, understand and communicate about other things”(Linell, 2001: 108). Although language is a means of interacting among people, it can also be a source of misunderstanding among interactants. Scollon and Scollon (2001:138) state that human being rather than culture carry out communication; therefore, they propose using “interpersonal communication” instead of “intercultural communication”. However, both the terms can stand for the same meaning which is connected to the study of people’s interaction across cultures.

According to Neuliep (2012: 24), *cross-cultural communication* can be fulfilled “whenever a minimum of two persons from different cultures or microcultures come together and exchange verbal and nonverbal symbols”. The *cross-cultural communication* is a wide spread phenomenon due to the increase of multicultural societies all over the world. This issue result in conducting many studies on *cross-cultural communication*.

Scollon and Scollon (2001:140) argue that cultural differences result from the varieties that exist in terms of people’s “ideology”, the process of “socialisation”, “forms of discourse” that presents the purpose of language use, and “face systems” which regards the process of systemising the nature of relations between “self” with inside and outside community members. All these issues affect the ways of people’s interaction. Consequently peoples with different cultural backgrounds can adopt different ways of communication in general.

Gudykunst (1997) points out that in addition to the cultural differences, both social and personal variables take part in communicational differences across cultures. The nature of these variables may vary from culture to another, consequently their impact across cultures are different. For example, the impact of power on interactional construction is very noticeable in Kurdish culture because: 1) people with higher status like compliments, 2) the political and administrative status of Kurdistan make governmental figures, other than the establishment that they work in, be more important. In the other words, for example, people need to compliment or to comply with a university Chancellor to have a better position in the university. Thus, the impact of power differences on people’s interaction in Kurdish culture may be more than the impact of power in the constitutional organized countries.

Canale (1983: 7) states that “status of participants, purposes of interaction, and norms ... of interactions” should be considered in order to have an appropriate interaction and guarantee an accurate interpretation “in different sociolinguistic contexts”. This means that in order to manage the process of conveying or interpreting messages successfully, interactants need to observe all the related elements and issues that affect interactions. Thus, we can elucidate that although these processes by themselves are a tough task, they are harder to manage among intercultural interactants.

According to Scollon and Scollon (2001: 151), language is a device “to convey information and relationship”, but the significance of these two elements may vary across cultures. Scollon and Scollon attempts to say that people use language to transmit information and to show the nature of kinship among interactants.

However, language can be used for other different purposes. One can easily observe that Kurdish interaction is full of compliments and expressions that enhance interactants’ relationship. When Kurdish people meet, they usually ask about each other’s health conditions, each other’s family members even sometimes without knowing them, wishing them the best, and showing eagerness and happiness to the meeting and many other ways to show familiarity and intimacy.

Moreover, the use of language is not always oriented, because people sometimes use language just to meet a social norm, i.e. they sometimes interact just for the sake of interaction not for conveying /receiving a message or to enhance social relationship. For example, a Kurdish speaker usually lists several questions consequently while doing regards (such as *çony?*, *başy?*, *tendrw:stîtçona?*, *ma:lawaçô:nn? Hamw:la:yakba:şn?*=How are you? Are you fine? How is your health? How is your family? Is everyone fine?), without paying attention to the answers of these questions. However, this style of interacting might be different in other culture.

Furthermore, the differences across cultures in terms of using language can also be found in body language as well. For example, Scollon and Scollon (2001: 156) state that *smile* can have different interpretations across cultures. Smiling to a passer-by with a different gender can have more than one interpretation in Kurdish culture, such as insult, abuse or sometimes it is used among young people to the opposite gender to give a hint for starting relationship, whereas smiling to unknown passer-by in the United Kingdom is generally a matter of showing intimacy. Thus, each culture has its own distinguished perspective in terms of language use and language interpretation.

Concerning the process of conducting studies on cross-cultural communication, Gudykunst (1997: 344) argues that to conduct an adequate study of cross culture communication, researchers need to utilise both etic and emic approaches simultaneously because it helps researchers to make use of universal principles in addition to the observation of cultural and communal specifics.

6. Culture and language

It is evident that culture and language affect each other. Kramsch (1998: 3) argues that “language symbolises cultural reality”. Language is one of the elements that is usually considered when investigating culture, because it is a means that interactants through which can observe the impact cultural differences.

Precisely, the type of a culture can be determined through its members’ verbal interactions. For instance, observers can distinguish volitional, heterogeneous, liberal or secular cultures from discernment, homogeneous, conservative or religious cultures by analysing people’s speech. Moreover, Eliasoph and Lichterman (2003: 735) claim that “culture... structures people’s ability to think”. This means that culture affects individuals’ interactions (verbal and non-verbal). However, the power of culture’s impact may vary from one society to another till from one person to another. For example, in Kurdish culture there is a convention of respecting elder people, so Kurdish young people use the expressions */xa:l/* (*maternal uncle*) or */ma:m/* (*paternal uncle*) to address unknown old men, whereas English people as I have generally observed simply use nothing to address elder

people. These differences in addressing old men are raised is one of the samples of cultural differences between Kurdish and English.

In addition to the cultural differences at the level of language differences, although people that share the same language but belong to different nationalities usually adopt different styles and employ different perspectives in constructing interactions. For example, Scollon and Scollon (2001: 150) state that the English language is used in several different countries but each country has its own distinctive culture and traditions. Thus, people in those countries may have different concerns and interests to observe, consequently they express themselves in dissimilar ways.

According to Jandt (2010: 37), “communication and culture are inseparable” in away that “culture cannot be known without a study of communication, and communication can only be understood with an understanding of the culture it supports”. Thus, Jandt attempt to say that language and culture are two complementary elements that are essential to identify one another, because it is impossible to study culture without shedding light on the contribution of language as an essential component of culture, simultaneously it is also inadequate to examine language without considering the impact of culture on daily interactions. Therefore, to conduct any study in connection to language, researchers should take the differences of culture in terms of influence and observance among various communities of practice of the same language speakers within the same society.

7. Context and Language

It is hard to provide the notion of *context* with an accurate definition (Duranti and Goodwin, 1992: 2) although there are many attempts to present what does the notion of context cover. According to Neuliep (2012: 24), the notion of context is concerned with “the setting, situation, circumstances, background, and overall framework within which communication occurs”. *Setting* involves the place and the time in which the interactions happen. *Situation* and *Circumstances* are concerned with the general atmosphere of interactions, the current mood of interactants, the content of interactions, the nature of relationship among interactants, the previous experience of the interactants, and the educational level of interactants. *Background* is associated with interactants’ cultural, religious, ethnical, ideological, and educational backgrounds. All these issues participate in constructing context.

Concerning the relationship between context and daily interactions, Liu et al. (2011: 40) state that “context influences what we communicate and how we communicate”. However, Duranti (1992:87) argue that “it is no longer context alone (be it the referent’s status/rank or the speech event) that determines the language used”. Duranti deals with interactants as a complementary part of context, whereas Hymes considers interactants as one of the components of context (Hymes, 1967, cited by Lindstrom, 1992: 103). Thus, the notion of context and its scope is a matter of disagreement among linguists.

The interactants need to observe all the contextual elements and issues while interacting. For example, in Kurdish culture if one of the interactants has unusual hair style, the rest interactants try to avoid talking about hair styles in order not to cause offence.

In addition to the topic and the style of communication, context also affects interactants’ perception (Liu et al., 2011: 83). The same expression in the same setting with the same interactants can have

different interpretations. For instance, regarding hard study as an essential method to pass an examination is a fact, but the same view in the same setting may be interpreted as offensive if it is uttered in front of a student who has recently failed. Thus, every element that relates to interactants, culture norms, situation, and setting may affect speakers' interactional constitutions and recipients' interpretations.

Context is another issue that helps us to understand the notion, the scope, and the impact of culture on language use as well as helping researchers in recognizing the significance of cultural observance, and the consequences of its ignorance. Basing on the aforementioned facts, context should be always considered while examining the impact of culture on language use, because it is the context that manages the way that the influences of culture work in various occasions and interactions.

8. Culture and individuals

Culture and individual are two faces of the same coin. It is people that agree upon norms to function as a culture in order to be observed later on, and it is the culture that more or less has a constant impact on its members. This relationship is reciprocal. According to Neuliep (2012: 46), "culture teaches one how to *think*, conditions one how to *feel*, and instructs one how to *act*, especially how to *interact* with others". Although this excessive generalization by Neulip does not show the actual role of culture, it affects all the aspects that relate to human beings. In addition to its impact, culture is also being affected by its members. Individuals play a great role in bringing about diversity in language, because each person has their own different thought, style, and ideology. Although individuals usually follow the stream, they try to reserve their own distinctive personality and defend their favourite style in interaction.

The verification of the reciprocal relationship between culture and individual can be derived from two different complementary claims, one by Gusfield, and the other by Eelen. According to Gusfield (2006: 43), "human behaviour is produced by discrete human cultures", whereas Eelen (2001: 2016) argues that "ultimately the social/cultural relies on the individual for its existence". These two authors look at culture construction from two different perspectives, because both cultural norms and individual behaviours are complementary i.e. people are the founder of all the cultural norms in a period of time, but these norms may determine individuals' behaviour of the same culture.

More precisely, individuals of the same culture can have different stance towards the observance of cultural norms. Triandis (1995: 5) argues that "in every culture there are people who are *allocentric*, who believe, feel, and act very much like collectivists do around the world. There are also people who are *idiocentric*, who believe, feel, and act the way individualists do around the world". Many factors engage in the orientation of people, such as personal ideology, the situation, the impact of culture, and many others. Therefore, the process of interaction constitution generally may vary from a culture to another, from a community to another and from one person to another, as a consequence the degree of the observance of culture and surrounding requirements also vary in the different associations and communities of practice.

9. Cultural Studies and Methodology

Conducting linguistic studies in connection to culture is a very challenging process, because identifying the notion of culture and indicating its approximate scope requires accuracy. For instance, conducting a study about cultural impacts on the degree of using direct and indirect communication in Kurdish is very comprehensive, and probably brings about inaccurate results. In such a kind of study, the researcher cannot take all the diversities that result from differences in the communities of practice, in the settings, in the occasions, in the participants' educational, cultural, and ideological backgrounds, and in their personal interesting into consideration. Therefore, the studies that consider the impact of culture on language use should draw on the qualitative approach. According to Sogunro (2002), the qualitative approach focuses on the objective description, elaboration and analysis of the collected data. Therefore, the researchers' understanding, view, and belief play essential role in determining the nature of the influence of culture on language use. However, discursive theorists, such as Watts (2003), Mills (2009), Culpeper (2011) state that it is the context that determine the influence of culture on daily interactions. Therefore, in order to collect reliable data for conducting such studies, researchers should observe the following diversities: 1) the setting of interactions; 2) the personality, belief, status, and cultural background of the interactants; 3) the nature of relationship between the interactants, and 4) the sort of the occasion.

Concerning the process of data collection, researchers should make sure that the collected data is authentic (normal daily interactions) that is to a great extent free from the awareness of the interactants. For example, recording interactions of a gathered family at dinner can provide authentic data. Although it is a part of the research ethics that the participants are told in advance that their interactions will be recorded, the participants can get used with the situation to interact normally just after several minutes from the recording start.

After the process of data collection, the data analysis should be left to the participants themselves, because according to Bousfield (2008), only the interactants can provide the right interpretation of their intentions and perceptions. Therefore, only interactants can determine the impact of culture on their interactions. In general, the role of the researchers in the process of data analysis in the studies that are related to the impact of culture on language is passive.

Conclusions

1. The nature, the significance, and the impact of culture may vary from a society to another, from a community of practice to another, from a setting to another, and from a person to another.
2. The researchers should examine the impact culture at the level of the community of practice or narrower.
3. The studies that consider the relationships between culture and language should be examined in accordance with the discursive approach.
4. Only authentic data can give the right degree of the influence of culture on interactions.
5. The researchers should engage the interactants themselves in the process of data analyses.

References

Bousfield, Derek (2008) *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Canale, Michael (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In: RICHARDS, Jack C. and SCHMIDT, Richard W. (eds.). *Language and Communication*. London and New York, Longman, 2-27.

CARLA (Centre for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition) (2012). What is Culture? [online]. Last accessed 2 Oct.2012at:<http://www.carla.umn.edu/culture/definitions.html>.

Crowder, George (2007) Two Concepts of Liberal Pluralism. *Politic Theory*, 35 (2), 121-146.

Damen, Louise (1987). *Culture Learning: The Fifth Dimension on the Language Classroom*. Reading, Addison-Wesley.

Duranti, Alessandro (1992) Language in context and language as context: the Samoan respect vocabulary. In Duranti, Alessandro and Goodwin, Charles (eds.). *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, 77-100, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eliasophi, Nina and Lichterman I, Paul (2003). Culture in Interaction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108 (4), pp. 735-794.

Erickson, Frederick (2001). Co-membership and wiggle room: Some implications of the study of talk for the development of social theory, pp. 152-181, in Coupland, Nikolas, Sarangi, Srikant and Candlin, Christopher N. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Social theory*. London and New York. Longman.

Gelfand, Michele J; Nishii, Lisa Hisae; and Raver Jana L. (2006) On the nature and importance of cultural tightness-looseness. *Applied psychology*. 91(6), 1225-44.

Gudykunst, William B.; Matsumoto, Yuko; Ting-Toomy, Nishida, Tsukasa; Kim, Kwangsu; Heyman, Sam (1996) The Influence of Cultural Individualism-Collectivism, Self Construal, and Individual Values on Communication Styles Across Cultures. *Human Communication Research*. 22 (4), 510-543.

Gudykunst, William B. (1997). Cultural Variability in Communication : An Introduction. *Communication research*, 24 (4), 327-348.

Guesfield, Joseph R. (2006). *Culture.Context*, 5 (1), 43-44.

Ide, Sachiko (1992b). On the Notion of Wakimae: Toward an Integrated Framework of Linguistic Politeness. *Mejiro Linguistic Society (MLS)*, 293-305.

Hofstede, Geert (1984). *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values*. California and London, Sage

....., Geert (2004). Business Culture. In: JANDT, Fred E. (ed.). *Intercultural communication: A Global Reader*. London, Sage Publication , 12-16.

Jandt, Fred E. (2010). *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community*. 6th ed., Los Angeles and London, Sage.

Kramsch, Claire (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindstorm, Lamont (1992) Context contests: debatable truth statements on Tanna (Vanuatu). In Duranti, Alessandro and Goodwin, Charles (eds.). *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, 101-124, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linell, Per (2001). Dynamics of discourse or stability of structure: Sociolinguistics and the legacy from linguistics, pp. 107-126, in Coupland, Nikolas, Sarangi, Srikant and Candlin, Christopher N. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Social theory*. London and New York. Longman.

Liu, Shuang; Voločič, Zala; Gallios, Cindy (2011). *Introducing Intercultural Communication: Global Cultures and Contexts*. London and California, Sage.

Matsumoto, David (2007). Culture, Context, and Behaviour. *Journal of Personality*, 75(6), 1285-1319.

Mills, Sara (2003) *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mills, Sara (2009) Impoliteness in a cultural context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 1047-1060.

Minkov, Michael, and Hofstede, Geert (2013) *Cross-Cultural Analysis: The Science and Art of Comparing the World's Modern Societies and Their Culture*. Los Angeles and London, Sage

Neuliep, James W. (2012). *Intercultural Communication: A contextual Approach*. 5th ed., Los Angeles and London, Sage.

Pang, Terence T. (2002) Orientalism and English as Social Capital: Early Colonial Education Policies in Hong Kong. *Australian Language Matters*, 10(4), 4-7.

Scollon, Ron and Scollon, Suzanne Wong (2001). *Intercultural Communication*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Blackwell.

Sherzer, Joel (1987) A Discourse-Centered Approach to Language and Culture. *American anthropologist*, 89 (2), pp. 295-309.

Sogunro, Olusegun A (2002) Selecting a Quantitative or Qualitative Research Methodology: An Experience. *Educational Research Quarterly*. 26(1), 3-10

Stoddard, Ellwyn R (1975) The Status of Borderlands Studies: Sociology and Anthropology. *The Social Science Journal*, 12 (3), 29-54

Triandis, Harry C., BONTEMPO, Robert; Villareal, Marcelo J.; ASAI, Masaaki & LUCCA, Nydia (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-in-group relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (2), 323-338.

Triandis, Harry C. ; Mccusker, Christopher; Hui, C. Harry (1990). Multimethod problems of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (5), 1006-1375.

Triandis, Harry C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder and San Francisco, Westview.

Watts, Richard J. (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press