

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1080/0141192042000237239

## The Researcher/Interviewer in Intercultural Context: A Social Intruder!.

— [Source link](#) 

Saeeda Shah

**Institutions:** University of Leicester

**Published on:** 01 Aug 2004 - British Educational Research Journal (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd)

**Topics:** Intercultural communication and Internationalization

Related papers:

- [Research Methods in Education](#)
- [The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas](#)
- [Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge](#)
- [Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook](#)
- [Case Study Research: Design and Methods](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/the-researcher-interviewer-in-intercultural-context-a-social-1wx88esa1j>

## **Researcher/ Interviewer in intercultural context: a social intruder!**

‘You just don’t understand’ writes Deborah Tannen (1992) referring to women and men in conversation, across the gender divide but in a shared socio-cultural context. The question raised in this paper is how do people understand each other when they do not share common cultural experience?

This query gains significance in the backdrop of growing emphasis on cross-cultural research in diverse fields of activity. The research imperatives and compulsions are changing. The research approach is changing from researching *upon* the other - ‘the insignificant deviant’, to researching *with* the significant ‘different’ to add to existing knowledge. The research needs are increasingly becoming outcome driven. For example, the educationists in the West would like to understand why and how learners in the East perform better in Maths as compared to their Western counterparts. The governments in multi-ethnic societies seek to enhance inclusion and participation of ethnic groups in education for national progress. The Americans need to find out how Japanese system produces cost-effective motorcars (Torrington 1994) and why their successful quality control (QC) circles fail to work in USA (Furukawa 1989). The multi-national enterprises are faced with internationalisation of policy and practices, and require explanations and resolutions of related issues in local contexts (Warner and Joynt 2003). The capitalist economies are astounded at the growth rate of the Chinese economy and wish to penetrate the secret. The need to gain knowledge of diverse phenomenon in other cultures is growing because of globalisation (Giddens 1993; Reeves 1995), communication explosion (Braun and Warner 2003), internationalisation of technology and economic universalism (Child 2003). This search for improved understanding in cross-cultural contexts has resulted in a corresponding high increase in cross-cultural studies. There is an abundance of cross-cultural research particularly in disciplines like communication studies (Bennet 1998) and business management (Warner and Joynt 2003). However, cross-cultural research in education is scarce (Dimmock 2002), particularly lacking in studies focusing on education policies, practices and management in poor and developing countries, which in majority of the cases happen to be non-Western countries. This introduces a cultural dimension in educational research.

Qualitative methodology, despite all the critiques, has emerged as the most commonly used approach in cross-cultural studies, particularly for exploring issues concerning education, sociology of education, and educational management and leadership. Interviewing, due to its ontological and epistemological relevance to the nature of cross-cultural inquiries, is used extensively for data collection. There is abundant literature on interviewing (Ball 1994; Bhatti 1995; Burgess 1984; Deem 1994, Delamont 1992; Denzin and Lincoln 1994; Dingwall 1997; Finch 1984; Flick 1998; Foster 1994; Gubrium and Holstein 2001; Hammersley 1995; Harding 1987; Laine 2000; Lamphere 1994; Marshall and Rossman 1989; Mirza 1995; Oakley 1981; Opie 1992; Powney and Watts 1987; Shotter 1993; Silverman 1997; Spradley 1979; Stanley 1990; Ozga and Gewirtz 1993) amounting to overkill, but what it generally lacks is a specific focus on cross-cultural interviewing and its implications for data collection *and* data interpretation. This

paper is an effort to highlight the related interacting issues for the interviewers/researchers involved in this area of research.

In view of the growing need to engage with other cultures, it is vital to reconsider and refine the tools used for accessing knowledge across cultures. The first section discusses interviewing as a tool for data collection in cross-cultural contexts in the backdrop of the growing need to understand education, related concepts, and practices across cultures. A brief discussion of the term culture is provided in the next section to present the context for the conduct of cross-cultural interviewing, followed by an explanation of the issues involved in doing these interviews and in the interpretation of interview data. The remaining sections explore what implications an intercultural interactional situation and cross-cultural positioning of the interactants has for research. How do the interviewees respond to cultural difference? How far does it fit into the insider/outsider debate? How is the meaning made across cultural difference? How can making meaning in cross-cultural interviewing be managed for research purposes?

### **Education and cross-cultural research**

The need to explore education globally is increasing. Education is perceived as having a strong impact on national development in both developed and developing countries (Aftab 1994; Brown and Lauder 1996; Faraj 1988; Friere 1972; Garman 1995; Marginson 1995; Salter 1994). The globalisation tendencies and the spread of technology are drawing the world closer in its pursuit of knowledge through sharing of information and communication. Paradoxically, this drawing closer is increasing an awareness of differences (Pugh and Hickson 2003), particularly across the historical and eco-political divides of East/West and developed/undeveloped societies. The similarities assumed from distance often get pushed to the background by perceived differences in the context of closer proximity. This entails a need to know more about the differences rather than concentrating on similarities as the concepts and practices in education are embedded in relevant philosophies and social systems.

Secondly, economic, social and political forces are accelerating international mobility, immigration and relocation, introducing changes in societal structures in many countries. The emerging societies tend to be multi-ethnic multi-cultural, necessitating subsequent changes in the organisation and management of their educational institutions (Brah 1996; Brah et al 1999; Castles and Miller 1998). Problems and difficulties in the leadership/management of multiethnic institutions across board to the learning of multiethnic students, all point to the need for cross-cultural research to fill in the gaps in existing knowledge.

Thirdly, one impact of globalisation on education is universalisation of educational institutions through distance learning, and through courses and learning programmes offered on multi-national sites. This huge exposure of educational practices to cross-cultural contexts has opened up a whole field of research. The current concepts and practices in education and its management, like in many other areas of recent knowledge are theorised and developed in 'Western/developed' contexts. Their applicability and usefulness in non-Western and underdeveloped societies is emerging as problematic

(Dimmock 2002). The 'cultural diversity' and the 'cultural-mix' in these emerging contexts needs to be explored for informed policy and practices in education.

A way forward in the emerging societal structures is to engage in cross-cultural research for enhanced understanding on multi-ethnic and cross-cultural educational sites in intra-national and international contexts. Ann Edwards maintains that 'being an educational researcher demands a very different set of relationships with the field and with other researchers. The relationships have at their core a set of value-laden concerns about individual, community and societal well-being' (2002:157). This places huge responsibilities on educational researchers in doing research and interpreting research findings, which can have far reaching implications for social stability and development.

### **Interviewing Across cultures**

There is an increasing use of interviewing in qualitative studies. This essentially requires more caution and understanding in its applications. Interviewing derives its specifications from the research purposes and theoretical underpinnings. It is used as a tool for eliciting information (structured/discrete-point interviews) in quantitative approach, or as a means of participative knowledge construction (unstructured/in-depth interviews) in qualitative approach. In qualitative research, interviewing is perceived as a participative activity to generate knowledge, a two-way learning process, where the subjectivities of the research participants influence data collection, and the process of 'making meaning'. Cultural differences have significance for both phases.

The 'human-as-instrument' role of the qualitative researcher is perceived appropriate 'to capture the complexity, subtlety, and constantly changing situation that is the human experience' (Lincoln and Guba 1985: 193). An interview is a 'social event' (Hammersley and Atkinson:1983:126), and 'displays cultural particulars' (Silverman:1985:174). It is determined by discursive relations and situatedness. Who is doing research (Griffiths 1998) has effects on data collection and analysis. The researcher and the interviewee/s participate in this knowledge building activity, informed by a knowledge of social sub-systems operative in that culture, and by constant adaptations of the interview process to suit each individual situation in awareness of the participants' subjectivities. Objectivity, implying neutrality and detachment, is not possible (Guba and Lincoln: 1985,1989) on the part of the interviewer as well as the interviewee. Both respond to specific perceived subjectivities. There are possibilities of misunderstanding, error and bias in every interview situation, which increase with additional variants like culture.

Qualitative researchers study phenomena in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret it in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin and Lincoln 1994). What the interviewee wishes to convey, what the interviewer learns, and how it is interpreted are influenced by the respective subjectivities of the participants and the complex forces present within that context. Face to face responses are not simply given to the questions, but to the researcher who poses those questions, in interplay with how the participants perceive the researcher and themselves in that social context. Understandably, the implications of the participants' (interviewee/interviewer)

subjectivities in intercultural interviewing gain more complexity because of this additional factor of ‘communicating across cultures’ (Kim 1991).

Communication competence studies claim that mono cultural communications, despite all the differences, are ‘*similarity-based*’ (Bennet 1998), allowing for shared assumptions about the nature of reality resulting from known behaviour patterns and shared values, which facilitate understanding. Conversely, cross-cultural communication is perceived as *difference based* (Barna 1998). It renders any easy assumptions of similarity as inappropriate because of different patterns of perception and behaviour in cross-cultural situations (Bennet 1998; Dimmock 2000; Hofstede 1984). Many studies draw attention to differences in experiences and perceptions, which influence how meaning is made of conversations and social behaviour.

There is abundant literature emphasising the interplay of different factors on interviewing, and pointing to the issues of gender, personal experience, age, social status, race, ethnicity (Burgess 1991:105; also Ball 1994; Bhatti 1995; Deem 1994; Delamont 1984; Flick 1998; Harding 1987; Lamphere 1994; Mirza 1995; Oakley 1981; Opie 1992; Stanley and Wise 1990;), shared background (Finch 1984), shared identity (Foster 1994), social class/elite (Marshall and Rossman 1989), peer group (Ozga and Gewirtz 1993) and many others. Significantly, the complexity of these interactions increases in cross-cultural contexts as the interacting factors are perceived and experienced differently in diverse cultures. For example, certain topic areas are taboo in certain cultures for male/female interaction; there are particular codes of conversation and patterns of behaviour regarding age, gender, social background and knowledge status, among others, in different cultures; there are culture related codes of distribution of power in interactional contexts which may not fit the Western concept of power differential between the initiator of the conversation (interviewer) and the respondent (interviewee); and, there are culture-specific modes of relating with the ‘cultural outsiders’.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss all of these variants individually. Rather, the focus is on the relatively unexplored phenomenon of cross-cultural interviewing; other interacting issues will be touched upon briefly to develop the main argument. The next section discusses culture as an analytical framework for critically examining the insider/outsider debate, and to locate the researcher/interviewer as cultural intruder.

### **Culture: an explanation**

Cultural diversity and culture-specific variations have been emphasised in diverse disciplines such as anthropology (Mead 1928), sociology (Giddens 1993; Bourdieu 1977), social interaction (Goffman 1967), ethnography (Carspecken 1996; Kincheloe 1997; Spindler 1963), ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1984), phenomenology (Husserl et al 1964), and, more recently, cultural studies. This paper argues to recognise and to respond to cultural diversity in cross-cultural interviewing.

Two main approaches towards the application of culture in organisational settings are explained as convergence/divergence (emic/etic) approaches. The convergence perspective suggests that as the societies are steadily moving closer therefore, the

similarities in social characteristics will gradually dominate the differences (Kerr et al 1962). The divergence theory assumes that elements such as differing values and behaviours, differing stages of economic development and unevenly distributed global resources will guarantee global diversity. In spite of a contention regarding assimilation and absorption of social characteristics resulting from interacting factors, both approaches admit to the existence of cultural diversity. The debate is between 'high-context' and 'low-context' perspectives.

Child (2003) describes 'high-context' perspectives as the ones that 'grant theoretical primacy to national cultures, or national institutional systems, when accounting for national differences in organisations', while 'low-context' perspectives 'do not grant national context any analytical significance over and above the configuration of universals' (2003:28). He mentions cultural theory, cultural information theory and institutional theory as 'high-context' perspectives, which emphasise cultural influence. He further uses the Weberian framework of formal rationality and substantive rationality to explain the impact of ideational systems (cultural, religious and political) on social institutions, placing education on the top (2003a:42). This description of education as a 'deeply cultural institution' (Pogh and Hickson 2003:11) highlights the need to acknowledge and respond to cultural diversity in educational research and to break out of the boundaries of cultural parochialism.

Culture is a term elusive to definitions and yet loaded with an unlimited number of explanations. Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) compiled a list of 164 definitions of culture. Spencer-Oatey (2000) quotes Apte (1994: 2001) emphasising lack of agreement among anthropologists regarding its nature. Jenks (1993) maintains that the concept of culture implies a relationship with the accumulated shared symbols representative of and significant within a particular community. He (1993: 11-12) presents four categories of culture:

- Cognitive - which he explains as a general state of mind, indicative of superiority of mankind.
- Collective - a category that invokes a state of intellectual and/or moral development in a society, and is linked with the idea of civilization and collective life.
- Descriptive – which is viewed as the collective body of arts and intellectual works in one society. And,
- Social – a category where culture is regarded as the whole way of life of a people.

It is this social category of culture, which has significance as a variant in interviewing. But, even within this broad categorisation, culture emerges as a contested concept, dynamic and heterogeneous, and accordingly difficult to define. It is hard to determine cultural bounds in this age of communication explosion and globalisation. Culture has been defined by nation, region, language, faith, and others, or a mix of some or all of these, at different times and in diverse contexts. Then, there are factors like class, gender, relative status, and many others which impact on the inner dynamics of a cultural group. However, for the purposes of cross-cultural interviewing, the explanation that fits the

concept is that culture is some sort of ‘social glue’, which holds people together and makes people perceive and define themselves (in spite of all other variations) as a cultural group in opposition to another cultural group or a perceived member of another group, and which determines their interactional codes and patterns of behaviour.

Spencer-Oatey explains culture as ‘a fuzzy set of attitudes, beliefs, behavioural conventions, and basic assumptions and values that are shared by a group of people, and that influence each member’s behaviour and each member’s interpretation of the ‘meaning’ of the other people’s behaviour’ (2000: 4). However, there is considerable vagueness around what values, attitudes and conventions are involved, at what levels, and to what extent. Jenks calls culture a way of life and in his opinion, it is ‘*transmitted, learned, shared*’ (1993: 59)

The underlying assumption is that cultural knowledge is the unwritten document transmitted from generation to generation and learned through living and sharing with a cultural group as its member. Bourdieu explains it in sociology as ‘habitus’, with an emphasis on country influence on people. This country of origin influence can be evidenced in studies of immigrant groups, and is discussed later in this paper. Hofstede (2003) maintains that the way people ‘think, feel, and act in many different kinds of situations is somehow affected by the country they are from’, although he admits that country is ‘not the only factor’. He refers to cultural influences as ‘collective mental programming’ and argues that

‘Mental programmes do change, but slowly and not according to anyone’s master plan. Changes take decades, if not centuries. If the inheritance of the Roman Empire still separates Belgium from the Netherlands, two countries in intimate contact for over 2000 years, one should not believe one can change the minds of Serbs, Russians or Albanians within a few years. ... we better take mental programmes as given facts.’ (2003:101)

These mental programmes determine cultural identities. Culture is an intertwined system of values, attitudes, beliefs and norms that give meaning and significance to both individual and collective identity (Adler 1998: 236). Adler argues that, “cultural identity is the symbol of one’s essential experience of oneself as it incorporates the world view, value system, attitudes and beliefs of a group with which such elements are shared” (1998: 230). It is not just dress or food or festivals, easy to notice and flag or bookmark. It is ‘a system of shared assumptions, beliefs, values, and behaviour in a given group, community, or nation’ (Cheng 2000:209). This requires ‘indwelling’ and tacit knowledge (Polanyi 1967) for understanding and absorbing, and consequently there may be many aspects that escape the notice of an outsider. Culture can be understood as a pattern of taken for granted assumptions about how ‘a given collection of people should think, act, and feel as they go about their daily affairs. It is this understanding of shared culture that enfolds the lives of its members and produces what Bennet ascribes as ‘*similarity-based*’ (1998) patterns. Every culture or system has its own internal coherence, integrity and logic, which differentiate it from another culture and which may not make sense to those who are not members of the same group. It is the insider’s knowledge (Polanyi 1967) of

the experience of living within a group that facilitates and develops the ‘shared cultural perspectives and communicative codes’ (Barnlund 1998).

Participants in a social situation draw upon this tacit knowledge of culture as a frame of reference. The risk in cross-cultural interviewing is that any effort to explain or understand culture related phenomena, especially that which does not fit within a known frame of reference, may lead researchers either to make false assumptions, or to perceive difference as an oddity, both of which can misdirect the research interview, the nature of the data, and the interpretations.

### **Insider/Outsider**

The insider/outsider debate is multi-dimensional, continuous and inconclusive. Two aspects relevant to the present discussion are: who is a social insider/outsider? and second, what implications does this hold for interviewing?

Morwenna Griffiths argues that insider-outsider might simply mean being black or white, male or female – categories themselves heterogeneous (1998:138). We are all insiders and outsiders in different ways and settings. Even members of the same speech and cultural community are differentiated by other equally important characteristics that make the researcher ‘both an insider as well as an outsider’ (Foster 1994: 131-32). However, cultural studies recognise the social insider as a core category and highlight its usefulness in ‘recognition of verbal and non verbal codes and behaviours and interpretations of the hidden assumptions underlying those behaviours’ (Kim 1991: 266).

Interviewing is a multi phase activity, and involves interacting in many ways. An understanding of the interviewee’s culture by the interviewer has great significance for all phases of interviewing including access, conducting interview/s, and making meaning. The argument is that a social insider is better positioned as a researcher because of her/his knowledge of the relevant patterns of social interaction required for gaining access and making meaning. However, this nearness can ‘blunt criticality’ (Haw 1998), blinding the insider-researcher to familiar, taken-for-granted phenomena. This aspect is explored further in the section ‘A Social Intruder!’.

### **Gaining Access**

Being a social insider can hold many advantages for gaining access. Getting access for interviewing is significant not simply because it is a permit to go into a situation, but also because, first, the issues of power between those seeking the interview and those agreeing to grant it, raise problems about the ethics of gaining access, and are also affected by different cultural perceptions of a research interview, cooperation with outsider/s, and associated perceptions. Second, access has to be negotiated within the cultural conventions and constraints. For example, the journalist Christina Lamb can be accepted in Afghan society to interview Afghan men but a male researcher will have definite problems of access to interview an Afghan female. Third, how access has been gained and granted influences the relationship and rapport as well as the nature of the data collected in the subsequent interview situation. For example, the nature of the factors influencing the interviewee’s consent to be interviewed such as to oblige, to obey some



one, personal interest in the research focus, transactional element, and others, impact on the interview process and the data. Access is not just the question of ‘getting in’ (physical access), its sets the tone for ‘getting on’ (social access) as well.

### *Physical access*

Getting in or gaining physical access for interviewing can be problematic depending on the interviewee/s and their perceptions of the research and the researcher/s. The gatekeepers or the participants themselves can deny access, erecting discouraging barriers to physical or social access in mono-cultural as well as in cross-cultural contexts. Interviewee/s can have assumptions regarding gender, age, status, personal characteristics etc about the interviewer, which might obstruct access and research (Fine and Sandstrom 1988; Wax 1971). Studies have unveiled multiple factors like interviewing being perceived as threatening, time consuming, lacking a transactional element, and relative status of the participants. There can also be a wish to ignore on the part of the interviewees, wondering ‘why us’ (Bogdan and Biklen 1992), and resisting any scrutiny ‘by anyone not on their side’ (Whitty and Edwards 1994). Getting access to highly positioned people or ‘elite interviewing’ has additional constraints of ‘time, access, and control’, (Marshall and Rossman 1989:94-95, because powerful people and institutions are frequently able to deny access because they may not wish themselves or their decision-making processes to be studied (Hornby-Smith 1992).

However, these factors, in cross-cultural contexts acquire ‘*difference-based*’ dimensions. For example, status can be linked to age (i.e. in tribal societies), to knowledge (i.e. in traditional Chinese culture), to religious knowledge (in traditional Muslim societies), to socio-economic positioning (in feudal/capitalist cultures), and to many other factors or mixes of factors. Again, an interplay of factors like age and gender regarding young/old, male/female can have differential claims to status and patterns of behaviour in diverse mixes, which can have pertinence for gaining access – both physical and social. Besides, not only cultures respond differently to these perceived factors, there might be other culture-specific aspects influencing access, for example, issue of maintaining appropriateness in gender relations in keeping with the cultural norms and social positioning in segregated societies (Ganesh 1993; Shah 1998<sup>1</sup>).

In addition to the difference in norms, customs and patterns of behaviour, there are historically loaded divides and fissures formulating parts of cultural heritages discouraging access and erecting ‘barriers’, particularly in cross-cultural interaction. Subaltern’s refusal to speak<sup>2</sup> (Spivak 1992), and imperialistic constructions of

---

<sup>1</sup> Both discuss the ‘problem of suitable space for interviewing men’ and the issue of ‘interviewing men alone’ - one in a Muslim society and the other in a non-Muslim context in the Indian sub-continent, pointing to regional cultural norms.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Subaltern’ was the term used in British India for indigeneous soilders, and it was the dividing line between the rulers and the ruled. Spivak defines it "as difference from the elite" (1988:285), "a category . . . heterogeneous in its composition" (1988:284). She explores the 'epistemic violence', which prevented this subject from being heard, a subject silenced multiply. The hegemonic discourses silencing subalterns were the creation of political needs in the colonial context, and Edward Said (1978) argues that the histories continue to impact on subject positions.

‘orientalism’<sup>3</sup> (Said 1978) are some other dimensions to *difference-based* issues of access and communication in such contexts.

Researchers have also highlighted factors useful in gaining access, such as a prestigious research grant, keeping a low profile, gender, links with those with power in the relative context/organization, and many others (Davies 1984; Fitz and Halpin 1994; Gewirtz and Ozga 1994; Kogan 1994). Burgess draws attention to the ‘relationships’, which influence data collection and analysis (1984; 1991). Bogdan and Biklen (1992) discuss formal and informal systems, drawing attention to the significance of informal systems in gaining access, such as, using a friend, or somebody who is helpful. However, the frame of reference in these discussions is often a mono-cultural context. In cross-cultural contexts, the factors facilitating access might be very different from these. For example, a prestigious research grant may not influence access in tribal societies or in cultures high on relationships, and gender may generate different responses in segregated societies. But, on the other hand, contacts may be more effective in collective communities and extended family net-works (Dimmock 2002). **Miller** (1991) explains that collective cultures (Hindu) as compared to individualistic (USA) have a perspective of interpersonal responsibility and moral duty to individuals and thus are more anxious to oblige individuals who are seen as part of the community.

Gaining access is a culture-specific phenomenon. A cultural affinity or at least sensitivity and awareness of difference in choice of strategy and its use are required in attempting cross-cultural access. Hofstede’s landmark study and more recently Walker and Dimmock’s (2002) six-dimensional model of national/societal cultures can be sensitively applied as indicators for understanding *difference-based* patterns requiring reciprocative adjustments of behaviour. For example, in cultures such as feudal, patriarchal, tribal, power-centred, collective, or hierarchial, access might be easier to manage with contacts in the right places. An interviewee may participate to oblige or obey an elder, or to oblige a friend. For example, a colleague from a British university who had received very few responses to a questionnaire sent to school teachers in Pakistan, went to Pakistan as my guest to do her research (Haw 1998). I arranged a large number of individual and group interviews with teachers and students for her during her four-week stay, sometimes at the notice of less than an hour to the participants. It was the collective social network in a particular cultural context that made this possible.

Social obligations, and cultural patterns and conventions facilitate access in collective cultures for ‘insiders’, and can be more useful than the shared professional status or gender. During the interviews that I conducted in Pakistan involving men and women senior managers in higher education (Shah 1998), the interviewees made implicit and explicit references to my family background (and none to shared professional position) making it obvious that they had agreed to be interviewed, and in some cases had made long difficult journeys to come to be interviewed because of who my father was. This

---

<sup>3</sup> Edward Said (1978) argues that a scholar cannot be detached from the circumstances and context of his/her production. His caveat is that colonial/imperial divide has historical, political and philosophical significations for research. He discusses ‘orientalism’ as a production of the imperial perceptions of the colonised and unveils assumptions behind this construction of the ‘other’, and its impact on research.

was in the cultural tradition of obliging a person of certain socio-religious status by doing a perceived favour to one of his family in a culture high on relationships. And it was the gender of a specifically positioned interviewer, which posed the social demand of making inconvenient journeys. Research studies emphasise creating a comfortable interview situation but there are cultural contexts where a 'comfortable' interview situation has to be culturally acceptable for making the interviewee or both the participants feel 'comfortable'. It may involve aspects considered as inconveniences in other cultures amounting to 'discomfort'. This supports the argument that theorising on the basis of practices drawing from specific cultural norms can be problematic when applied in cross-cultural contexts.

### *Social access*

Studies emphasise an understanding of the particular culture (Dimmock 2002: 37) and the need to draw from lived knowledge of the socio-cultural norms to construct appropriate patterns of behaviour (Coulin 1995: 16). Relevant contacts may be helpful in 'getting in' or gaining access, but the quality of responses considerably depend upon 'getting on' with the respondents or achieving social access. Agreeing to be interviewed is an initial phase which can be manoeuvred through personal efforts, contacts or negotiations; 'getting on' in an interview is a more complex phase which demands relevant knowledge and skills. Different cultural precepts can be used by an interviewer to gain access, but s/he also needs to know how to play the system.

Discussing the issue of access in ethnography and case study, Burgess (1991) argues that access is not just an issue concerning the gate-keepers or the participants' consent, but there are "multiple points of entry that require a continuous process of negotiation and re-negotiation" (1991:49). In interviewing, this can be applied to issues in social access with regard to 'getting on', requiring 'a continuous process of negotiation' even if (or when) the interaction may be a single sitting activity.

In *difference-based* contexts, this 'process of negotiation' necessitates a cultural knowledge. In spite of the researcher being in a position of power through knowledge of research process and direction, researchers admit to access problems in cross-cultural interviewing. An interesting example is Pollard (1984), who, when doing a project to study a complete year group of students, the researcher decided to interview the white children first:

"because the white children showed particular interest in my activities (a necessity for my interviewing strategy), and secondly because I judged the problem of the teacher-as-researcher role to be easier to resolve with the white children than with the Asians because of my greater awareness of their cultural forms" (1984: 223).

Later, the researcher admits to never being able to interview enough Asians due to time constraints. This indirect admission by the researcher of lacking awareness of the Asian students' 'cultural forms' in a British school where the researcher was a teacher, and subsequent exclusion of these British Asian students from research due to *difference-*

*based*-parent-culture background unveils serious issues in cross-cultural research. This particularly points to culture being perceived as a barrier in interviewing which has implications for research in inter-cultural contexts, but more serious implications for research in multi-cultural contexts in view of the emerging multi-cultural societies, raising issues of social justice and equality in educational research.

It is understandable that a shared knowledge of social norms and conventions is conducive to a non-threatening participative interactional environment even in mono-cultural situations, and “unfamiliarity with local norms can cause access problems” (Hammersley and Atkinson 1987:54). Basch, researching health education, emphasizes insider’s knowledge to ensure a friendly atmosphere, “a good setting that will encourage a trusting, comfortable and secure climate” (1987:433). Scott argues that ‘when people thought the interviewer less threatening they ‘often felt more open about what they felt’ (1984: 122).

Shared cultural knowledge facilitates social access by creating an environment where ‘people are at ease and talk freely’, a situation defined as ‘best interviews’ by Briggs (1986). It smooths inhibitions and hesitations on the part of the researcher/s in approaching the interviewee/s, as experienced by Pollard in researching with the White students, but which she could not manage with non-white students (1984). In cross-cultural contexts, the elements of threat and unease are heightened because of *difference-based* situation. Latif elaborates this point in a cross-cultural context, arguing that ‘what may be appropriate in one culture may not be so in another due to having different conventions’ (2002:63).

Many studies have emphasized the significance of the insider’s knowledge and a shared identity for ‘getting on’ in interviewing. Foster, interviewing black women emphasises the ‘positive effect that a shared identity can have on establishing rapport and recovering authentic accounts (1994:136). She discusses a shared understanding of the problems and possibilities “when researcher and researched are members of the same cultural and speech community” (1994:131). Researching with South Asian girls and women, Mehreen Mirza highlights the importance of drawing on the normal ground rules of reciprocity and trust that pertain for social interaction in the community (1995). A shared cultural identity is less threatening on the one hand, and on the other hand, shared cultural knowledge enables a manoeuvring of flexible adaptations and alignments across and within interviews. An awareness of forbidden topics, hidden taboos and other unacceptables/acceptables and priorities saves from embarrassment and possible breakdown of the relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee. It may mean that some perspectives and explanations for perspectives might get overlooked because participants chose not to explore certain perspectives; but in face-to-face interviewing, as in any other ‘social event’, related socio-cultural conventions need to be observed for making it a social success, in spite of the possibility of not getting answers to all the research questions, which in any case are constrained by limitations.

## **Making Meaning**

Analysis of data collected through cross-cultural interviewing is another crucial area liable to erroneous interpretations. Meaning is not simply elicited by apt questioning, nor simply transported through respondent replies; it is actively and communicatively assembled in the interview encounter' (Holstein and Gubrium 1995:115). Different cultures enable different ways of thinking and different ways of interpreting objects and events. Literature on qualitative interviewing places great emphasis on understanding and familiarising with the context. Stressing the importance to establish rapport, empathy and understanding between interviewer and interviewee, Hitchcock and Hughes recommend "familiarity with the biographical and contextual features of the respondents life history, outlook, customs and life-style in order to be able to relate more fully and in a more appreciative way with those being interviewed" (1991:85-6).

A familiarity with social structures and behavioural patterns improves an understanding of the responses (Garfinkel 1959; Coulon 1995). It is perceived to facilitate interpretation by situating the responses in the context. A tacit understanding gained through 'indwelling' (Polanyi 1967) provides a knowledge background for making meaning. Shared social and cultural knowledge contributes to give meaning to responses (Foster 1994: 141). Adelman points towards the possibility of misunderstandings arising 'from a lack of sharing of a frame of reference' (1984: 39). Without going into the problems related to the issues of language and translation, and assuming that people have the linguistic ability to communicate their message effectively, misunderstandings can still easily arise if the cultural understanding does not exist (Latif 2002: 63). Without a familiarity with socio-cultural context, there are problems in following interactional dynamics and a deeper analysis (Shah 1998). Poole argues that:

"We communicate more than we say explicitly. This disparity between what we intend to communicate and what we actually say is central to pragmatics. It is bridged by what the speaker implies and what the listener infers on the basis of shared knowledge, shared assumptions and the context of utterance" (1999:34).

Another aspect highlighted by Stephen Ball is the possibility that 'the respondents may find themselves manipulated into saying more than they intend' (1991: 181), particularly so under the pressure of cross-cultural power relations influenced by race, colour, gender, age, knowledge, language, status, and many others, raising ethical issues regarding the research itself.

Rapport building in cross-cultural interaction requires an understanding and manipulation of the socio-cultural norms to adjust action accordingly without being offensive. Discussing cross-cultural communications and understanding, Barna (1998) identifies six stumbling blocks:

- Assumption of similarities
- Language difference
- Nonverbal misinterpretations

- Preconceptions and stereotypes
- Tendency to evaluate
- High anxiety

This model provides a useful framework for analyzing issues in cross-cultural interviewing for the purposes of making meaning. Interview data gains meaning from the interviewer's presentation and interpretation of information. The researcher engages with the data from a particular positioning, and the process of making meaning is worked from that subjectivity, giving a particular slant to 'meaning'. In intercultural research the researcher needs to engage with data from *difference-based* perspectives.

#### *Assumption of similarities*

A listener is not a passive receiver of information. While communicating, s/he is active in 'assigning meaning' (Barnlund 1998: 40). The process of assigning meaning draws from the existing knowledge base to engage with the ongoing activity. In cross-cultural situations, in the absence of a shared frame of reference, assigning meaning works towards assumption of similarities derived from available knowledge. This ignores the *difference-based* nature of the context to which Dimmock draws attention:

“how apparently identical concepts, policies, ideas and behaviours may hide important differences in meaning and connotation, depending on their cultural context” (2002:34).

Assumption of similarities might temporarily ease the discomfort of 'walking on thin ice', but it can be seriously misleading with implications for data interpretation and the research itself (Holstein and Gahmberg 1995). The question that Lamphere propounds from a feminist perspective: 'How can White women write about Black women without cultural stereotypes informing their analysis?' (1994: 222), can be posed from a cultural perspective, raising ontological and epistemological issues regarding cross-cultural research.

#### *Language difference*

Many research studies consider it impossible to acquire more than a very crude notion of the insider's world, until the researcher comprehends 'the language and culture that is used to communicate its meaning' (Jorgenson 1989:14). Communication competence studies insist that knowing the language is not enough unless and until it is supported by cultural knowledge. A huge literature on ICC (Intercultural Communication Competence) is bursting with examples of communication failure where the cross-cultural interactants shared the language but did not share cultural knowledge (Barna 1998; Bennet 1998; Latif 2002; Spencer-Oatey 2000).

Language grows in contexts in response to contextual communication needs. Knowing language out of context may not prepare the speaker for the world of hidden or implied meanings, signifiers, markers and other cultural determinants where even yes or no may not mean yes or no. Language knowledge also does not prepare a language speaker for patterns of engaging in different interactional situations. Gunther (2000) mentions a first

meeting between German and Chinese students and explains problems in rapport building as the German's keep asking opinion about some controversial issue (women's role) and Chinese try to indulge in small talk aiming at getting to know, and avoiding to share opinions with 'relative strangers'.

#### *Nonverbal misinterpretations*

Qualitative researchers recognise the significance of non-verbal messages and signals. Potter (1997) recommends an inductive discourse analysis paying attentive to social practices - hesitation, pauses, silences and overlaps. He explains these as not simply 'a blurred edge on the pure message' but determining precisely what action is being performed and why (1997:152). But, there is another dimension to the issues. Nonverbal communication can be there in its very absence in cultures that guard expression of emotions and personal responses. This absence of nonverbal signals may lead an outsider researcher/interviewer to erroneous interpretations and conclusions.

Non-verbal messages and signals are located within cultures and patterns of behaviour, and cannot be accessed or learned through mere language acquisition. For example, a very common signal like nodding which implies 'yes' in many cultures, means 'no' in parts of Greece. Then there are cultures like Japanese, which express very little through facial expressions. Barna (1998) discusses some interesting and enlightening examples of Japanese/Germans and Japanese/American interaction to emphasise how Japanese control of emotions and facial expressions causes misunderstandings in communication.

#### *Preconceptions and stereotypes*

In the present context of globalisation, multiculturalism, and migrations there is an increased exposure to cultural diversity. However, this exposure can be limited, skewed, or partial depending on the context and extent of exposure. Intercultural communication thus takes place in the backdrop of preconceptions and stereotypes deriving from initial contacts with other cultures. For example, there are multiple preconceptions and stereotypes regarding the cultures of the parent countries of diverse ethnic groups now living in Britain. The practice of transferring these preconceptions from specific groups to societal cultures ignores the inner diversity of a broad cultural group, and thus can be misleading for research purposes.

#### *Tendency to evaluate*

Qualitative/interpretive research gains validity from the depth of understanding and insight that it makes available. It sees the world as complex, interconnected, and multidirectional (Lincoln and Guba 1985), with a view of reality as multiple and constructed. The researcher/researched participate in knowledge construction from their subjective positions. The problem in cross-cultural interviewing is that the 'psychological posture' becomes 'inter-group' rather than 'interpersonal', which encourages the participants 'to perceive each other as a group representative rather than as a unique person' (Kim 1991: 266). This has implications for qualitative data and analysis, and raises ontological and epistemological concerns.

Kim (1991) argues that inter-group posturing tendencies - creating a 'psychological distance' - accompanied by 'in-group loyalties', 'out-group discrimination' and 'we-they' orientation - have been observed to be stronger when the interactants come from groups that have a history of dominance/subjugation, or a significant discrepancy in current power status or prestige of the respective group. The growing research in the territories with such 'histories' demands careful consideration of the interacting issues, particularly those concerning the interviewer/interviewee subjectivities.

Moreover, the tendency to evaluate does not take cognizance of the *difference-based* context. Paradoxically, the evaluations are made in comparison with the known value systems and patterns of behaviour, derived from one's own cultural background, causing doubts regarding validity of interpretations and conclusions.

### *High anxiety*

In intercultural interaction, both the participants might experience stress and anxiety at the prospect of dealing with the 'unknown'. Without the normal props of one's own culture, there is unpredictability, helplessness, a threat to self-esteem, and a general feeling of "walking on ice"- all of which are stress producing, and hamper understanding. The degree of anxiety for the interviewee is definitely higher due to knowing less, compared to the researcher, regarding the overall study, its purpose and directions.

Even in mono-cultural research situations, the researched complain of anxiety and stress due to a myriad of factors such as power relations, gender, age, class, knowledge, profession, and many others. The cultural divide increases the seriousness of threat as the whole frame of reference changes from broadly known to unknown. The perceived threat posed by the traditional white male researcher is explained in literature through gender and race concepts; it will be interesting and enlightening to analyse it for cultural dimensions.

Intercultural difference and intergroup posture lead to stress. Kim (1991) emphasises the need to manage intergroup-anxiety and culture-shock for successful intercultural communication. This requires a capacity to stretch beyond the internalized cultural parameters, to absorb the attendant cultural shock and to develop the adaptive capacity, together with culture-specific knowledge and skills (Kim 1991).

These 'stumbling blocks' in cross-cultural communication imply that 'an insider researcher' is better positioned to understand responses and to make meaning. But this argument ignores that

### **A Social Intruder!**

The outsider status of the cross-cultural researcher poses theoretical and social problems. The 'human-as-instrument' role of the qualitative researcher is perceived appropriate 'to capture the complexity, subtlety, and constantly changing situation that is the human experience' (Lincoln and Guba 1985: 193). The theoretical stand requires the researcher's subjectivity to be made explicit. However, the explicit positioning of the researcher and the researched by the researcher (often assumptions in *difference-based* contexts) may



not be enough to apprehend the researcher's responsibility of doing a rigorous piece of research. The need is to move beyond that, to develop models and frameworks, which possess the sensitivity and flexibility to capture the interplay of multiple factors. Here, the related issue is to accommodate research validity with the researcher's lack of cultural knowledge in cross-cultural contexts. Can an explicit positioning account for the absence of relevant knowledge background for the purposes of research outcomes? How can the issue of research rigour be accommodated?

Furthermore, there is the problem of how the outsider researcher is perceived by the cross-cultural participant/s, particularly across historically loaded socio-political divides of Black/White, East/West, colonial/imperial, developed/developing, and others. These perceptions have implications for what is 'knowable', and what can be 'knowable'. If respondents perceive themselves as marginalised, sensitively placed or vulnerably positioned they are reluctant to share information (Adler 2001). In the typical 'white researcher' context of Black/White dichotomy 'many people would not tolerate the white stranger snooping around were it not that he belongs, as far as they are concerned, to the powerful white society which they hate to brush with' (Jarvie 1982: 71). How's and why's of access have deep implications for the data collected and its interpretations. In such contexts, agreeing to be researched becomes a political decision which impacts with the data made available to an 'outsider'. For example, studies are increasingly pointing to deepening distrust people of different cultures have when it comes to allowing 'White' researchers to enter into their lives. It may not necessarily be the colour divide:

'Those oppressed people who used to allow researchers to enter their institutions and communities freely are now demanding through their advocates, attorneys, and governments and media that researchers be accountable and give something of significance back to them. ... [A] growing number of people of color and poor people are beginning to bar researchers from their cultural sites' (Stanfield 1994 174).

Qualitative research has an intrusive dimension because it is 'entry' at a certain point, which is bound to leave an impact or at least some reverberations in most of the cases. Its welcome or unwelcome nature can be debatable. The Oxford Dictionary explains intrusion as, 'Something that affects a situation or people's lives in a way that they do not want', and further defines intruder as, 'A person who is somewhere where they are not wanted', thus emphasizing the unwelcome aspect. This 'unwelcome' and 'uninvited' dimension of research for the researched is sharpened in cross-cultural contexts. First, it can be an intrusion in the researched area (Dimmock 2002: 34); and second, the researcher lacking detailed knowledge and appreciation of the indigenous culture, can be a social intruder.

**Lee and Boster (1991)** social penetration more difficult in initial intercultural contact than in initial intracultural contact.

An ignorance of norms, values, conventions, and patterns of behaviour has high significance for research on *difference-based* sites. However, the debate around its impact on research process and outcomes is unresolved. These debates also challenge the quality of information collected by a cultural insider, raising such points as:

how much the respondents may not tell, making assumptions about the researcher's knowledge as an insider (Anand 1979; Kamil -(problems across group divisions with indigenous researcher)

- 1991; Nath 1991);

how much the researcher may fail to ask, believing it to be too obvious or too insignificant (Panini 1991; Srinivas 1979), and the implications of nearness 'blunting the criticality' (Haw 1998)

how much the respondents may not choose to share with a person who poses the possibility of being judgmental due to a shared knowledge of value systems, and which they may unburden with a complete stranger who might sympathise or would disappear with the information (Bangun 1991; Haw 1998; Jayaraman - discusses problems in interviewing Brahman who were reluctant to disclose to another Brahman.- 1979).

### Objectivity

#### nearness

The argument put forward is that just as unfamiliarity can hone criticality, familiarity and subsequent assumptions may blunt criticality. Morse emphasises this point arguing that "Familiarity with the setting or previous acquaintance with the participants dulls the researcher's ability to view the setting with the sensitivity one would have when seeing it for the first time" ((1994:27). Dimmock also maintains that "'outsiders' may bring a 'fresh' perspective, one which may not only highlight key aspects of a particular culture, but recognise salient differences between it and other cultures" (2002: 37).

Both perspectives have their strengths and weaknesses. The crucial point is that every researcher should knowingly be aware of the nature of context (*difference-based/similarity-based*), place herself/himself in the text, and be explicit about limitations, so that the reader as one of the other participants can bring a critical eye to the text.

Moreover, there is need to explore how the participant construct and position a particular researcher with reference to culture and *difference-based* contexts. An improved understanding of concepts may ease the researcher's anxiety of 'walking on ice' and the participant's feeling of being 'threatened' or 'dissected', and may provide a framework for engaging in 'conversations'. It may be stretching the imagination too far to expect a researcher being perceived as an academic engaging in an altruistic activity for the future of mankind; and definitely not in a *difference-based* context with all the accompanying signals and connotations.

Cultural studies propose developing cultural sensitivity. An interesting model for 'rapport management' in cross-cultural communications is presented by Spencer-Oatey (2000) emphasizing 'face needs' and 'sociality rights'. Another useful DMIS (Developing Model of Intercultural Sensitivity) offered by Bennet (1993) moves through six stages leading to improved understanding. It is a progression from initial point of contact, moving through stages of denial / defense / minimization, towards acceptance / adaptation / integration. The first three are argued as ethnocentric stages and last three as ethno-relative stages, improving cultural sensitivity with progression along the

continuum. However, these models have more relevance to multicultural co-existence over a period of time, rather than to a research-interview situation, which is often an isolated or limited encounter.

An interviewer is a visitor on a cross-cultural site, and any emerging constructions of her/his subjectivity by the interviewee/s are underpinned by the mode and manner of access, and accordingly impact the directions of interview and the data collected. Triandis 1972 produced persuasive evidence from a number of different cultures that interpersonal behaviour is understood along the dimensions of ( methodology for social analysis) association-disassociation (affiliation), subordination-superordination (dominance), and intimacy-formality. these do not account for all variability in social behaviour. At the initial stages **Ting-Toomey** and Korzenny (eds) 1991. ---- (intro) ---- p-1. --- Many authors acknowledge the importance of the influence of particular relationship stage or relationship type (e.g., acquaintance, friendship, or romantic relationship) and its impact on other communication variables such as relational openness, relational involvement

There is a complex interplay of social norms, values, and patterns of behaviour involved in these constructions. Some broad dimensions for positioning a cultural outsider can be:

- an opponent
- a stranger
- a tourist
- a learner
- a guest
- a friend

These are not exhaustive, not discrete, and not points on a scale. These are some indicators of a social intruder's position in a *difference-based* context linked with possibilities of (social!) responses, varying from defiance (conflict) to avoidance (distancing), and to acceptance (conceding), with multiple intermediary positions, impacting on knowledge-building in cross-cultural research. Familiarity and subsequent assumptions may blunt criticality just as unfamiliarity can hone criticality, and that is why I would argue that each have their positive sides which makes it crucial that every researcher has to place herself/himself in the text, and be explicit about limitations, so that the reader as one of the other participants can bring a critical eye to the text.

The paper does not argue against outsider researcher; it proposes to critically engage with different perspectives with a view to develop informed practices.

OK But needs a conclusion where you hammer out what is the core of your message to interpretative researchers]

**Kim 1991** op cited in Ting-Toomey and Korzenny 1991 – ‘everything involved in a given encounter, including the conditions of the social context in which the encounter takes place, codetermines the communication outcomes’ p-262. ‘cultural differences that enter into a given encounter introduce a high degree of *unfamiliarity* with each others messages and meanings’ p- 265 cultural difference and unfamiliarity between the culturally dissimilar interactants bring the experiences of anxiety or lack of attributional confidence to the interactants – ‘The gap between respective experiential backgrounds

limits the interactants' ability to encode and decode messages with fidelity' p-266 ---  
'recognition of verbal and non-verbal codes and behaviours and interpretation of the hidden assumptions underlying those behaviours are likely to be more difficult' p 266.

The issue of distribution of power in interviewing is another culture-specific phenomena. The Western concept of the researchers power in interview context associated with control over research direction, data, and dissemination may not have similar connotations in the cultures where sources of power differ widely from those in the Western capitalist societies.

### **References:**

- Adler, P. A. and Adler, P. (2001) 'Reluctant Respondent', in Handbook of interview research: context and method, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein; Thousand Oaks, CA ; London: Sage.
- Adler, P. S. (1998) 'Beyond Cultural Identity', in Bennett, Milton J. (ed) Basic concepts of intercultural communication: selected readings, Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Adelman, C. (1984) 'Who are you? Some problems of ethnographer culture shock', in Burgess, R. G. (ed.) The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies, London: Falmer.
- Anand, Chakravarti, (1979) 'Experiences of an encapsulated observer ...', in Srinivas, M. N.; Shah, A. M. and Ramaswamy, E. A. (eds) The Fieldworker and the field: problems and challenges in sociological investigation; Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bangun, M. (1991) 'Sensitive Social Relationships: an urban professional women in a village setting', in Panini, M. N. (ed) The female eye: accounts of women field workers studying their own communities. Delhi: Hindustan Publishing.
- Ball, S. (1994) ??? in Researching the powerful in education / edited by Geoffrey Walford, London U.C.L. Press.
- Barna, L. M., (1998) 'Stumbling Blocks in Intercultural Communication', in Bennett, M. J. (ed) op cited.
- Barnlund, Dean (1998) 'Communication in a global village', in Bennet, M. J. (ed) op cited.
- Basch, C. E. (1987) 'Focus Group Interview: An Underutilized Research Technique for Improving Theory and Practice in Health Education', in Health Education Quarterly 14 (4): 411-448.
- Bennet, M. J. (1998) 'Intercultural communication: A Current Perspective', in Bennet, M. J. (ed) op cited.
- Bennet, M. J. (1993) 'Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity', in R. Michael Paige (ed) Education for the intercultural experience, Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Bhatti, Ghazala (1995) 'A journey into the unknown: an ethnographic study of Asian children', in Griffiths, M and Troyna, B (eds) Antiracism, Culture and Social Justice in Education; Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Bogdan, Robert C. and Biklen, Sari Knopp (1992) Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean-Claude (1977) *Reproduction in education, society and culture*, translated from the French by Richard Nice, with a foreword by Tom Bottomore. London: Sage Publications.
- Brah, Avtar (1996) *Cartographies of diaspora: contesting identities*; London: Routledge.
- Brah, Avtar, Hickman, Mary J. and Mac an Ghaill, M. (eds) 1999, *Global futures: migration, environment and globalization*; Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Briggs, C. L. (1986) *learning to ask ...*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brine, Jacqueline: 1993: *ESF funded training for unemployed women : policy aims and implementation*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Nottingham.
- Burgess, R. G. (1991) *In the field: an introduction to field research*. London: Routledge.
- Burgess, R G (ed.) 1984, *The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies*. London: Falmer.
- Carspecken, Phil Francis (1996) *Critical ethnography in educational research: a theoretical and practical guide*, New York; London: Routledge.
- Castles, Stephen and Miller, Mark J. (1998) *The age of migration: international population movements in the modern world; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*; Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Cheng, Y. C. (2000) 'Cultural Factors in Educational Effectiveness', in *Educational Leadership and Management* 20 (2): 207-225.
- Child, J. (2003) 'Theorising about organisation cross-nationally: part 1...' in Warner, Malcolm and Joynt, Pat (eds.) *Managing across cultures: issues and perspectives*, London Thomson Learning.
- Child, J. (2003a) 'Theorising about organisation cross-nationally: part 2...' in Warner, Malcolm and Joynt, Pat (eds.) *op cited*.
- Coleman, Marianne and Briggs, Ann R.J. (eds) 2002, *Research methods in educational leadership and management*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Coulon, Alain (1995) *Ethnomethodology*. Thousands Oaks: Sage. A Sage University Paper.
- Davies, Lynn (1984) 'Focusing on gender in educational research' in Burgess. R. (1984) *op cited*.
- Deem, R. (1994) ??? in *Researching the powerful in education*, edited by Geoffrey Walford, London U.C.L. Press.
- Delamont, Sara (1992) *Fieldwork in educational settings: methods, pitfalls, and perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (eds) 1994, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage: London.
- Dimmock, C. (2002) 'Research Methods in educational leadership and management', in Coleman, Marianne and Briggs, Ann R. J. (eds) *Research methods in educational leadership and management*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Dingwall, R. and Miller, G. (eds) 1997. *Context and method in qualitative research*; London: Sage.
- Edwards, A. (2002) 'Responsible researcher: ways of being a researcher' in *British Educational Research Journal* 28 (2): 157-168.
- Finch, J. (1984) 'It's great to have someone to talk to': The ethics and politics of interviewing women', in *Social researching: politics, problems, practice*, edited by C. Bell and H. Roberts; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Fine, Gary Alan and Sandstrom, Kent L. (1988) *Knowing children: participant*

- observation with minors, Newbury Park, Calif.; London: Sage Publications.
- Flick, U. (2002) *An introduction to qualitative research*; 2nd ed; London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Foster, M. (1994) 'The Power to Know One Thing is Never the Power to Know All Things', in Giltin, A. (ed) *Power and Method: Political Activism and Educational Research*. New York - London: Routledge.
- Furukawa, H. (1989) 'Motivation to work' in Riches, Colin & Morgan, C. (eds) *Human resource management in education*; Milton Keynes : Open University Press.
- Ganesh, Kamla (1993), 'Breaching the Wall of Difference', in Bell, D., Caplan, P. and Karim W. J. (eds) *Gendered Fields: Women, Men and Ethnography*. Routledge.
- Giddens, Anthony (1993) *Sociology* (2nd rev. ed); Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goffman, Erving (1967) *Interaction ritual: essays in face-to-face behaviour*; London; Chicago: The Penguin Press: Aldine.
- Griffiths, M. (1998) *Educational research for social justice: getting off the fence*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gubrium, Jaber F. and Holstein, James A. (eds) 2001, *Handbook of interview research: context and method*; Thousand Oaks, CA ; London: Sage.
- Gunther, A. (2000) 'Argumentation and resulting problems in the Negotiation of rapport in a German - Chinese conversation' in Spencer-Oatey, Helen (ed) *Culturally speaking: managing rapport through talk across cultures*, London: Continuum.
- Hammersley, M. (1995) *The politics of social research*. London: Sage.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Harding, S. (1987) *Feminism and methodology: social science issues*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Haw, K. (1998) *Educating Muslim Girls: Shifting Discourses*. Open University Press.
- Hitchcock, G. and Hughes, D. (1991) *Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research*. London: Routledge.
- Hofstede, Geert (2003) 'Images of Europe: past, present and future', in Warner, Malcolm and Joynt, Pat (eds.) op cited.
- Hofstede, Geert (1980) *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values*, Newbury Park, Calif. ; London: Sage Publications.
- Holstein, James A. & Gubrium, Jaber F. (1995) *The active interview*, Thousand Oaks, Calif.; London: Sage Publications.
- Husserl, Edmund (1964) *The idea of phenomenology*; translated by William P. Alston and George Nakhnikian ; introduction by George Nakhnikian; The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Jarvie, I. C. (1982) 'The problem of ethical integrity in participant observation', in Burgess, R. G. (ed.) *Field research: a sourcebook and field manual*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Jayaraman, R. (1979) 'Problems of Entry', in Srinivas, M. N., Shah, A. M. and Ramaswamy, E. A. (eds) *The Fieldworker and the field: problems and challenges in sociological investigation*; Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Jenks, Chris (1993) *Culture*, Routledge, London and New-York.
- Kamil, S. (1991) 'Maidenhood, Marriage and Fieldwork: experiences in India and

- Pakistan', Panini, M. N. (ed) *The female eye: accounts of women field workers studying their own communities*. Dehli: Hindustan Publishing.
- Kim, Young Yun (1991) 'Intercultural Communication Competence', in Ting-Toomey, Stella and Korzenny, Felipe (eds) *Cross-cultural interpersonal communication*, Newbury Park ; London: Sage Publications.
- Kerr, C. et al (1962) *Industrialism and industrial man: the problems of labour and management in economic growth*, London: Heinemann.
- Kincheloe, Joe L. and Steinberg, Shirley R. (1997) *Changing multiculturalism*; Buckingham: Open University Press.
- King, N. (1994) 'The Qualitative Research Interview', in Cassell, C. and Symon, G. (eds) *Qualitative Methods in Organisational Research*. London: Sage.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde and Kroeber, A. L. (1952) *Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions*, Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum.
- Laine, M. de (2000) *Fieldwork, participation and practice: ethics and dilemmas in qualitative research*; London: SAGE.
- Latif, S. (2002) 'A theoretical Framework for Analysing Cross-Cultural perspectives ...', in *Quarterly Journal of Gender and Social Issues*, 1 (1): 63- 74.
- Lamphere, L. (1994) *Critical Qualitative Methodology in Giltin, A. (ed) Power and Method: Political Activism and Educational Research*. NewYork - London: Routledge.
- Lee, H. O. and Boster, F. J. (1991) 'Social information for uncertainty reduction during initial interaction', in Ting-Toomey, Stella and Korzenny, Felipe (eds) *Cross-cultural interpersonal communication*, Newbury Park; London: Sage Publications.
- Miller, J. G. (1991) 'A Cultural Perspective on the Morality of Beneficence and Interpersonal Responsibility', in Ting-Toomey, Stella and Korzenny, Felipe (1991) op cited.
- Mirza, Mehreen (1995) 'Some ethical dilemmas in field work: feminist and antiracist methodologies', in Griffiths, M. and Troyna, B. (eds) *Antiracism, Culture and Social Justice in Education*. Trentham Books.
- Nath, J. (1991) 'A Bengali women in two different field situations', in Panini, M. N. (1991) op cited.
- Oakley, A. (1981) 'Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms', in Roberts, H. (ed) *Doing Feminist Research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Opie, A. (1992) 'Qualitative Research, Appropriation of the 'other' and Empowerment', in *Feminist Review* 48: 52-69.
- Panini, M. N. (ed) 1991, *The female eye: accounts of women field workers studying their own communities*. Dehli: Hindustan Publishing.
- Polanyi, M. (1967) *The Tacit Dimension*. London: Routledge: Kegan Paul.
- Pollard, Andrew (1984) 'Opportunities and difficulties of a Teacher-Ethnographer', in Burgess , R. (1984) op cited.
- Poole, S. C. (1999) *An introduction to linguistics*. Macmillan.
- Potter, Jonathan (1997) 'Discourse analysis ..' in Silverman, D. (ed) *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice*, London: Sage Publications.
- Powney, Janet and Watts, Mike (1987) *Interviewing in educational research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Pugh, D. S. and Hickson, D. J. (2003) 'On Organisational Convergence', in Warner, M.

- and Joynt, P. (2003), op cited.
- Said, E W (1978) *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Scott, S. (1984) 'Contradictions in researching postgraduate education', in Burgess, R. (1984), op cited.
- Shah, S. (1998) *Educational Management*, PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.
- Shotter, J. (1993) *Conversational realities: constructing life through language*; London: Sage Publications.
- Silverman, D. (1985) *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology*. Adershot: Gower.
- Silverman, D. (2001) *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition; London: Sage Publications.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen (ed) 2000, *Culturally speaking: managing rapport through talk across cultures*, London: Continuum.
- Spindler, George D. (ed) 1963, *Education and culture: anthropological approaches*; New York; London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Spivak, G. C. (1992) 'The Politics of Translation', in M. Barrett and A. Phillip (eds) *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*. Polity Press.
- Spradley, James P. (1979) *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Srinivas, M. N., Shah, A. M. and Ramaswamy, E. A. (eds) 1979, *The Fieldworker and the field: problems and challenges in sociological investigation*; Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Stanfield, J. H. (1994) 'Empowering the Culturally diversified Sociological Voice', in Giltin, A. (1994) op cited.
- Stanley, Liz and Wise S. (1990) 'Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research processes', in *Feminist praxis: research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology*, edited by Liz Stanley, London: Routledge.
- Tannen, Deborah (1987) *That's not what I meant! how conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others*. London: Dent.
- Tannen, D. (1992) *You just don't understand: women and men in conversation*. London: Virago.
- Tannen, D. (ed) 1993, *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ting-Toomey, Stella and Korzenny, Felipe (eds) 1991, *Cross-cultural interpersonal communication*, Newbury Park; London: Sage Publications.
- Torrington, Derek (1994) *International human resource management: think globally, act locally*; New York ; London: Prentice Hall.
- Triandis H. C. (1972) *The analysis of subjective culture*. Newyork: John Wiley.
- Warner, Malcolm and Joynt, Pat (eds.) 2003, *Managing across cultures: issues and perspectives*, London Thomson Learning.
- Wax, Rosalie H. (1971) *Doing fieldwork: warnings and advice*, Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.