

KAPITTEL 1

Perspectives on Globalization and Culture in Intercultural Communication Textbooks

Øyvind Økland

Volda University College

Abstract: Intercultural Communication as an academic discipline originated in the United States in the years following the Second World War to help Americans who were going abroad in different capacities: private, official or for business purposes. Since then, the globalization process has accelerated. Technology has made it possible to communicate through the internet, and social media has made communication cheap and simple worldwide. The academic discipline of Intercultural Communication has developed accordingly. This chapter investigates the discipline by asking: *What are the consequences of general global developments for intercultural communication in general and the academic field of Intercultural Communication in particular?* This chapter analyzes three textbooks in Intercultural Communication to see how they view these global developments. The results point to some differences in their various approaches. Neuliep's book follows the traditional, positivistic academic tradition in Intercultural Communication with historic roots in the United States. Jandt's book is close to the same tradition but has a critical and more complex understanding of intercultural communication. Holliday's book builds on general social sciences and cultural studies, and consequently it has a view of culture and the communication process as a negotiation between individual actors and social structures, belonging to a social constructivist and critical cosmopolitan understanding of intercultural communication.

Keywords: intercultural communication, textbooks, global, globalization, glocalization, hybridization, multiculturalism, social media

Introduction

Human communication across borders has always existed and people have always shown interest in “the other”. The modern academic discipline of Intercultural Communication¹ has developed since the Second World War. How different researchers have understood the cultural concept and what constitutes identity has of course varied. The world has changed rapidly since the inception of Intercultural Communication. Since the late 1980s, we have had the discourse of globalization and before that, we were introduced to the concept of the “global village” (Fiore & McLuhan, 1968).

The globalization process has many ramifications, including how to relate to the concepts of culture and identity. The need for a reconsideration of the “culture” concept is not new. Several researchers have advocated for the need to reconsider the concept (Hannerz, 1992; Mathews, 2000), as cultures are no longer regarded as fixed entities but have fuzzy borders and are blended in a complex and hybrid manner (Kraidy, 2002, 2017; Pieterse, 1994, 2001). We are no longer just locals; we are cosmopolitans as well (Hannerz, 1990; Held, 2010). This reconsideration is taking place within various academic fields: in social anthropology (Appadurai, 1996; Hylland Eriksen, 1993; Lewellen, 2002), as well as within Intercultural Communication, as this chapter will discuss further.

The aim of this study is to investigate how recent textbooks in Intercultural Communication deal with the concept of “culture”, and in what way the tension between the local and the global is understood. This chapter will therefore look at how this might have affected the academic field as well as textbooks in Intercultural Communication.

The research problem will therefore be to find out *how recent textbooks in Intercultural Communication understand and define culture and the relationship between local and global cultures in intercultural communication*. The underlying research questions are:

¹ When referring to the academic discipline of Intercultural Communication, capital letters will be used throughout this chapter, while lower-case letters will be used when speaking of intercultural communication in general.

- 1) How are the concepts of culture and identity treated in the textbooks?
- 2) How do the textbooks relate to a new, global reality and mixture of cultures?
- 3) How do the textbooks relate to new, digital media as a part of intercultural communication?
- 4) In what way do the textbooks relate to the academic foundations of intercultural communication?

Obviously, these questions have gained increased attention within the field of Intercultural Communication. As Giuliana Ferri states, “as events unfold in contemporary global politics, it is ... time to take stock and reflect on the nature of intercultural communication as an academic discipline” (Ferri, 2018). But first, in order to understand the background of the situation, we need to give a brief glimpse of the historical foundations.

A historical perspective

The anthropologist Edward T. Hall is often seen as the father of Intercultural Communication. However, it was never his intention to establish a new discipline. He worked as an anthropologist and taught about foreign cultures in a way that was useful to Americans who were going into service in other countries. The publication of the book *Silent Language* (Hall, 1959), which became a bestseller, made Intercultural Communication interesting to many people (Økland, 2019).

Hall focused on the micro level of culture and how our values affect all communication with others. Therefore, it was important to teach the cultural values of others and the meaning behind the communication. It was also important to understand communication in its context. Hall divided cultures into low-context and high-context cultures, and this has played a very central role in the academic discipline since then (Kalscheuer, 2013).

After a few decades with a very practical focus, a lot of theoretical development was carried out during the 1980s. Central names here are William Gudykunst and Young Yun Kim, who published the work *Communication with Strangers* in 1984. Such theoretical development was

especially important for gaining acceptance within the academic environment. In this book, they emphasized trying out and discussing the validity and usefulness of various intercultural theories, such as uncertainty reduction, intercultural communication skills, communication apprehension and relationship development. During this period, there were no studies from Africa, South and Central America, or Southeast Asia (Shuter, 2013). The global aspect was virtually absent. At that time, it was mostly Japan that was of interest as a non-Western culture. There were very few studies of specific cultures, world regions or ethnic groups (Shuter, 2013).

The studies of Geert Hofstede (1980) were gradually used extensively, especially from the 1990s. He identified five cultural dimensions: individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance. By using these dimensions, he evaluates features of various nations. Hofstede has been frequently criticized for using nations as his research unit, a critique he partly agrees to, but he claims that this is the only possible research unit (Jandt, 2020, p. 166).

From the beginning of the 1980s, Intercultural Communication studies started to distance themselves from the frameworks of national culture as equivalent to culture and look more into macro structures and the question of power and status differences (Romani & Claes, 2013). In addition to Hofstede's studies, many other studies were also published that emphasized how to apply theories and knowledge about cultures in a practical context (Brislin, 1990).

When the theoretical basis of the subject was largely laid, one could again concentrate on the relationship between theory and practice, which occurred throughout the 1990s (Martin, 1994, p. 12). Theory was no longer the dominant theme, and the number of published studies in intercultural communication increased sharply (Shuter, 2013).

In the 1990s, the spotlight in the United States was on multiculturalism and the relationship between different ethnic groups. In Europe, a sharp increase in immigration had been seen from the 1960s onwards, and here too multiculturalism was the center of attention. Edward Said's book *Orientalism* (1979) criticized both academia and art's image of "the other" as inferior to the West and characterized by a colonialist way of

thinking. This criticism was gradually heard in academia in general, also in Intercultural Communication. Today we are living in a postcolonial time, and the subject must develop further to become fully and completely intercultural, Kalscheuer claims (2013).

Currently, there are many different categorizations of schools and researchers in Intercultural Communication, as well as advocates that “radically” configure how we conceptualize, theorize, teach, and practice intercultural communication (Ganesh et al., 2017, p. 355), and we will come back to this when the three textbooks are discussed according to these different traditions. After the internet was introduced in the 1990s, the possibilities of actual intercultural communication across cultural borders have been revolutionized. Each individual with internet access is now able to communicate with the rest of the world, through what Castells calls mass self-communication (Castells, 2009; Fuchs, 2014; Haugseth, 2013).

Even though many researchers see the need for re-configuring how we understand intercultural communication, there is no doubt that especially within the business world, the theories of Geert Hofstede are still very dominant (Duguleană, 2014; Meyer, 2014). Undoubtedly, there have been many voices that are critical to Hofstede. He has been criticized for his numeric approach to his cultural dimensions, instead of using more qualitative techniques (MacSweeney, 2002). Some argue that globalization is causing increasing cultural convergence, which is not taken sufficiently into consideration (Shenkar, 2001) and Hofstede’s data from the 1960s might be too US and IBM-centric (Javidan et al., 2006). Others, although acknowledging and agreeing with much of the criticism, still argue that Hofstede’s dimensions provide some very important tools for analyzing cultures (Soares et al., 2007).

When it comes to the Norwegian context, Intercultural Communication appeared as a subject in the 1980s, parallel to the new wave of immigration. Educators saw the need for new tools and migration pedagogy was introduced into teacher training and schools (Bjørnæs, 1993). *Møte Mellom Kulturer (Meeting Between Cultures)* (Dahl & Habert, 1986) became a very popular book within academia, as well as outside. It was linked to the tradition of Hall and Hofstede. This book was later substantially revised and

renamed *Møter Mellom Mennesker* (*Meetings Between People*) by Dahl (2013), and it is still very much used in the educational system. The new title downplayed the importance of culture as opposed to the individual factor in communication. The first chapter of the book deals with global issues and refers to Roland Robertson's term "glocalization" (1995), as well as creolization and hybridization of cultures (Dahl, 2013, pp. 17–23). Later, an English version appeared (Dahl, 2016). Other books in basic intercultural communication have also been published in Norwegian (Dypedahl & Bøhn, 2017; Fife, 1991, 2002; Hylland Eriksen, 1997), as well as a number of books that focus on intercultural aspects related to various professional studies, many of them focusing on "diversity" instead of "interculturality" (Aadnesen & Hærem, 2007; Aambø, 2021; Berg & Ask, 2011; Fandrem, 2011; Javo, 2010; Jensen & Ulleberg, 2011; Magelssen, 2008; Melberg & Kjekshus, 2012; Nergård & Vitebsky, 2019; Nilsen, 2017; Rodd vik, 2010; Salole, 2013; Ylvisaker & Rugkåsa, 2020, Røthing, 2017; Økland, 2013).

Some of these textbooks belong to a traditional understanding of intercultural communication as a skill that can be learnt (Rygg, 2014), while others lean towards a more hermeneutical approach (Jensen, 1998; Jensen et al., 2006), but this is not the place to evaluate them further. However, the following research into new English textbooks will give insight into the basic positions of the new books and evaluate them according to how they balance the academic tradition from intercultural communication with the new global situation in the third millennium.

Method

The market for textbooks in Intercultural Communication has been rapidly increasing since the first ones appeared around 1970, with Samovar and Porter's book as a very popular example (Samovar & Porter, 1972). We can now find textbooks about Intercultural Communication in connection with many different academic disciplines: marketing, professional studies, social work, education and so on.

For this study, a very strict selection was made. Only textbooks from 2018 or later were considered. These textbooks had to be monographs by

one author and not anthologies by several authors. The title had to include “intercultural communication” and they had to be in English, published by major publishers. They were found through searches in Google Scholar, scholastic books and the university library’s search engine. Another criterion was that they had to be general textbooks for undergraduate students within the field of Intercultural Communication. If they were more specialized textbooks within certain specific fields, such as marketing, they were excluded. Likewise, if they focused on more specific cultures or regions, they were excluded as well. The books did not need to be first editions.

Given these limitations, the search ended up with three textbooks that were studied in more detail to find out how they were able to answer the problem statement and the research questions. The textbooks that matched the criteria were: *Understanding Intercultural Communication. Negotiating a Grammar of Culture* (Holliday, 2018), *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication. Identities in a Global Community* (Jandt, 2020) and *Intercultural Communication. A Contextual Approach* (Neuliep, 2020). These books were accessed in electronic versions. Adrian Holliday’s book was the second edition, James W. Neuliep’s book was the eighth edition and Fred E. Jandt’s book was the tenth edition. Special attention was therefore given to the changes from earlier editions that they themselves highlighted in their prefaces.

To find ways of comparing the textbooks, a mixture of qualitative and quantitative content analysis was used (Bratberg, 2014). Regarding how and to what degree the books emphasized the topics included in the research problem, quantitative analysis was used. An important focus in the analysis was to investigate to what extent the books related to the history of the academic field of Intercultural Communication and, consequently, if and how they referred to central figures such as Edward T. Hall, Geert Hofstede, and William Gudykunst. The books were searched for mentions of these names.

A tool that was used to find out how the textbooks understood and defined the relationship between local and global culture was to find out the frequency and the use of some central concepts that were chosen to represent several basic issues in the general discussion of cultural issues

related to globalization. Some terms were excluded, such as “intersectionality”, “transnationalism”, and “transculturalism”, either because they were in one way or another defined as covered, or they were regarded as not relevant enough.

Since the textbooks were available and searchable online, it was relatively easy to locate the selected terms. Five main categories were chosen: culture, global aspects, communication, identity, and tradition. In the “culture” category, the following terms were selected as subcategories: culture, essentialism, nation, ethnic and ethnicity. In the “global aspects” category, multicultural/ism, globalization, western and non-western were included. In the “communication” category, internet, Facebook, and social media were searched for. An important part of the research was to find out how the textbooks understood the communication part of intercultural communication, not only in theory, but in the practical sense too. The aim was to find out to what extent modern technology was recognized and included in their understanding of these terms.

Under the “identity” umbrella, the terms glocalization, glocal and hybrid/ity/ization were placed. Finally, to find out how they linked up to earlier, quite influential theorists in the field, E. T. Hall, Hofstede and Gudykunst were chosen. This served as an indicator of the degree to which they defined themselves as a part of their heritage.

The three textbooks' understandings of globality

In our research problem, we asked *how recent textbooks in Intercultural Communication understand and define culture and the relationship between local and global cultures in intercultural communication*. The three different textbooks had clear differences in their emphases. Before we continue with the qualitative presentation of the findings, it may be useful to look at the quantitative data and present a numerical table showing some of these differences. The various terms were searched for in both American English and British English, as well as different variations of the words.

	1. Culture					2. Global aspects					
	Culture	Essentialism	Nation	Ethnic	Ethnicity	Multicultural /ism	Globalization	Global	Western	Non-western	
Holliday	436	23	19	9	3	39	45	85	98	20	
Jandt	721	0	100	77	47	15	6	132	165	10	
Neuliep	936	0	12	88	39	40	3	37	69	3	
	3. Communication				4. Identity				5. Tradition		
	Internet	Facebook	Social Media	Non-verbal	Identity	Glocalization	Glocal	Hybrid	E.T. Hall	Hofstede	Gudykunst
Holliday	2	23	1	0	55	0	0	20	0	0	0
Jandt	95	36	89	115	314	10	0	1	20	83	8
Neuliep	39	51	42	335	80	0	0	0	80	27	91

Presentation of the numerical differences in the three textbooks' emphases.

Only some of the figures will be directly commented upon in the following presentation of the findings, but the table illustrates some of the different perspectives related to the research questions. Categories 1 and 4 relate to the first research question, category 2 to the second research question, category 3 to the third research question and category 5 to the fourth research question.

Categories 1 and 4: Understanding of "culture" and "identity"

The first research question was: *How are the concepts of culture and identity treated in the textbooks?* The findings here will focus on some of the terms that were searched for and used in the different books.

Culture

Naturally, understanding of the culture concept provides the foundation for the textbooks' treatment of intercultural communication. Quantitatively speaking, Neuliep is the author who uses the concept of culture the most. He uses it 936 times, while Holliday mentions culture less than half as many times, with 436 mentions, and Jandt is somewhere in-between. Jandt mentions it almost as often as Neuliep, at 721 times. It is not possible to interpret much from this, other than it is an interesting fact that the two American authors use the term about twice as often as the British author. That aside, let us then look at how they use the term and in what contexts.

For Neuliep, culture is defined as the shared values, beliefs, and behavior of a group. Such groups are mostly referred to as American, Japanese, Indian, and so on. Culture is defined as consisting of different layers. Next to the larger cultural context is the microcultural context, which consists of ethnic groups, minority groups, and subcultures. The next level is the environmental context, consisting of geographical and physical locations. In this context, the interaction between one person from culture A and another person from culture B takes place in a particular sociocultural context, using verbal and non-verbal codes. Neuliep is, however, clear about the fact that cultures are not fixed entities. They are fluid and constantly changing (Neuliep, 2020, p. xxiii).

Jandt has a slightly different approach. He defines six forms of regulators to define what constitutes culture: religion, nation, class, gender, race, and civilization. He describes the recent development within Intercultural Communication to revive the perception of making national identity almost equivalent to cultural identity (Jandt, 2020, p. 4). His definition of culture is a bit like Neuliep's when it is defined as "the totality of a large group's thoughts, behaviors, and values that are socially transmitted" (Jandt, 2020, p. 34). A difference here is that the members themselves consciously identify with the group. The terms "subculture", "subgroups", "counterculture", and "co-culture" are discussed, but Jandt suggests replacing them with "community" because of the negative connotations they may have (Jandt, 2020, p. 3).

By using his "grammar of culture" model, Holliday presents a complex view of how to understand culture and the communication process. It is inspired by the structure of languages, which "enable us to understand sentences, the grammar of culture provides a structure which enables us to understand intercultural events" (Holliday, 2018, p. 1). What makes up culture is a constant dialogue between social and political structures on the one side and cultural products on the other side. In between those two we find personal trajectories such as family, ancestry, peers, and profession, together with what Holliday calls "underlying cultural processes". They are small cultural formations like reading and making culture, constructing rules and meanings, and imagining Self and Other. This model, according to Holliday, is just a simple map to explain what is involved in the processes

of intercultural communication. It is an individual's negotiation with the social structure, and it is the social structure responding to an individual's actions. The actual terrain is much more complex, but the model can guide us in understanding the process, according to Holliday (2018, p. 1).

Holliday shows the complexity involved in intercultural communication, and that it is not a matter of communication from one fixed culture to another, but rather a complex negotiation based on one's background and the preconditions of each person. This view of the communication process, or rather the negotiation, relates to Holliday's emphasis on the need for having a non-essentialist view of culture. Jandt and Neuliep do not make any references to essentialism or an essentialist view of culture.

Nation

As Neuliep's book is aimed at American students, the author, when explaining the nature of culture, asks the question: "As you stand in the lunch line, do you say to yourself, 'I am acting like an American?'" (Neuliep, 2020, p. 12). Neuliep's definition of culture is "an accumulated pattern of values, beliefs, and behaviors, shared by an identifiable group of people with a common history and a verbal and nonverbal symbol system" (Neuliep, 2020, p. 13). He goes on to say, a bit later in the text, that "In the United States, for example, individuality is highly valued", and "Americans believe that people are unique".

Moreover, Americans value personal independence. Conversely, in Japan, with its collectivistic and homogenous culture, a sense of groupness and group harmony are valued. Most Japanese see themselves as members of a group first, and as individuals second. In a table, Neuliep lists some characteristic values connected to Saudi Arabia, India, Yemen and Maoris (New Zealand). Neuliep seems to equate culture with nation. When it is not the nation, the culture, for example, Maori culture, is separated from the country itself (Neuliep, 2020, p. 14).

As mentioned in the Preface (Jandt, 2020, p. xviii), Jandt has rewritten a chapter dealing with nation-state cultures, because of the critique against Hofstede's nation-state units in his research. Nevertheless, Jandt states that the nation-state identity is the primary identity for most people in the world today, especially in modern developed nations. It is often equated

with cultural identity. People are concerned that they will lose their traditional culture and national identity, especially because of immigration and foreign influence (Jandt, 2020, p. 200–201). When presenting dominant American values, Jandt states that even though the United States is extremely culturally diverse, the sharing of some basic underlying values are strong. These values have developed during the country's history and are today commonly shared among most of its inhabitants. These values are different from values in other countries (Jandt, 2020, p. 206).

Jandt nuances this picture when he looks at recent developments in the United States. He describes a tendency towards an increasing fragmentation of the national culture, towards regionalization:

The old industrial heartland is being replaced with new regional economic centers in the South and West, while at the same time the United States is becoming part of an integrated global economy. Integration and equal rights have resulted in recognition and acceptance of social and cultural differences. Immigration has eroded the homogeneity of the U.S. population and created ties between U.S. society and other societies around the world. As national media have grown into global media, new forms of local, special interest, and multilingual media have appeared. International air transportation makes it easier and less expensive to travel abroad than to rural U.S. locations. The end of the Cold War lessened for a time the need for a large national security establishment. (Jandt, 2020, p. 224)

Holliday critiques some of the established literature, which to him can be seductive because it claims objectivity and neutrality. He traces this kind of essentialist view of culture back to Emile Durkheim and his structural-functional model of society. According to the structural-functional model, national culture contains all other aspects of society, which again contain behavior and values. According to this understanding, "behaviour and values are (a) explainable and predictable by the characteristics of the national culture and (b) essentially different to behaviour and values in another national culture". Holliday calls this "methodological nationalism" (Holliday, 2018, p. 134).

Holliday's own model is based on the social action model of Max Weber (1964, 1968), which states that human behavior can never be determined.

Political and other circumstances may reduce the possibilities for individual social action, but that does not mean that it can be prevented altogether (Holliday, 2018, p. 6).

Ethnicity

Neuliep defines ethnicity as a microculture within the greater culture, as explained above. He names those who represent such microcultures within the greater American culture: Arab American, African American, or Black American, American Indian, Native American, Asian American, Hispanic/Latino and White or Caucasian if they are of European ancestry. He refers to colleagues when he explains how he has come up with this categorization, and states that “there is no consensus among them. The ‘correct’ terminology depends on who you ask” (Neuliep, 2020, p. xxiii).

Ethnicity is grouped as one of the six forms of regulators, parallel to race and skin color in Jandt’s book. Race is associated with physical appearance, while ethnicity generally refers to “heritage, family names, geography, customs, and language passed on through generations” (Jandt, 2020, p. 9). Due to increased mobility and immigration, as well as interracial marriage, people can have multiple or mixed identities. Jandt refers to the debate on “hyphenated” identities, such as “Italian-American”. He seems to agree with those who suggest omitting the hyphen. In the case of the term “African American”, however, he wants to keep it (Jandt, 2020, p. 13).

In Holliday’s textbook, ethnicity is barely mentioned. In connection with the explanation of his “grammar of culture” model, he explains that national, ethnic, or large culture relates to both the particular social and political structures, as well as the cultural products (Holliday, 2018, p. 1). Otherwise, ethnicity is only mentioned when he refers to Stuart Hall and his experience of exoticization of his cultural background (Holliday, 2018, p. 140).

Category 2: Global aspects

In the second research question, we asked: *How do the textbooks relate to a new, global reality and mixture of cultures?* Again, some chosen terms

are used to look at the various perspectives in the books. Our investigation of the textbooks involved looking at the discussions around terms such as “global”, “globalization”, “glocalization”, “multiculturalism”, “cosmopolitanism”, and “hybridity”.

Multiculturalism

Neuliep does not discuss multiculturalism, but it is mentioned once as an example of integration as opposed to assimilation: “Coleman contends that the development of the bicultural identity is what leads to a successful life in a bicultural context. In other models of acculturation, this mode is called pluralism or multiculturalism. This mode of acculturation guides many of the social and legislative efforts in U.S. educational and affirmative action statutes” (Neuliep, 2020, p. 410).

Jandt names meetings between different civilizations as possible causes of conflict. He refers to how the concept is treated historically and most recently in Samuel P. Huntington’s book *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order* (1996). Huntington claims that the world’s civilizations after the Cold War consist of the Western, Latin American, sub-Saharan African, Eastern Orthodox (including the former Soviet Union), Islamic, Confucian, Hindu, and Japanese civilizations, and that especially the Western and the Islamic relationship is problematic (Jandt, 2020, p. 10).

According to Jandt, what might challenge cultural identities first and foremost is cultural imperialism represented by global corporations, environmental issues, immigration, and economic disparity. Today’s cultural imperialism basically comes in the form of multinational corporations, which have gained great impact in most parts of the world and export their products, exemplified by Disney (Jandt, 2020, p. 407). The same corporations have, however, learnt to adapt to local cultures. McDonalds, for instance, is now producing meals that are adapted to local tastes. Jandt states that the counterargument to cultural imperialism is the fact that cultural flows do not only go in one but in multiple directions. Ethiopian and Thai cuisines are becoming popular worldwide and Salsa music, which originated in the Caribbean, is now known globally (Jandt, 2020, p. 414).

To Holliday, multiculturalism can be either essentialist or non-essentialist. The essentialist version is called “boutique” multiculturalism. By this, he means an oversimplification of the culture and “selling it as a commodity by exoticizing it”. A non-essentialist multiculturalism, however, appreciates diversity and does not easily fall into stereotyping cultures. In addition, it sees hybridity as present in all identities and cultural realities, as opposed to a non-essentialist multiculturalism that posits that cultural values cannot be shared because of barriers between cultures. The reference to not having to “cross one’s national borders” means that one does not have to be an Indian living in the United States to be hybrid or in a third space, but that this applies to *all of us all the time* – that *all* our communities are “multicultural mosaics” (Holliday, 2018, p. 137).

Holliday claims that countries’ education policies have contributed to this exaggeration and exoticization of people from “other cultures”, and in this way contributed to the “othering” of people. When highly renowned world leaders, such as Germany’s Angela Merkel, Britain’s David Cameron and France’s Nicolas Sarkozy, have stated that multiculturalism has failed, it is this kind of multiculturalism they have had in mind (Holliday, 2018, pp. 138–139).

Hybridity

Hybridity is not discussed much in the textbooks. Neuliep does not make any reference to it, while Jandt refers to it once in a non-relevant context. Holliday refers to it three times in connection with essentialism. For him, it is not about having to cross national borders to become a mixture of one’s original culture and one’s new host culture, but a relatively constant issue, “that all our communities are ‘multicultural mosaics’” (Holliday, 2018, p. 138):

Regarding hybridity, the essentialist version implies being mixed or impure. It is important to try to find a way to move from this easier notion to the more difficult, complex non-essentialist version that relates to all of us. It is important, therefore, for us to be able to look at our own cultural identity and imagine how we can characterize it as being hybrid in a positive way, and to think how this then takes us away from the essentialist notion of a ‘pure’ or even ‘virgin’ culture. (Holliday, 2018, p. 141)

Glocalization

The related concept of glocalization is only used by Jandt. He mentions it a few times, in the sense of the adaptation of global markets to local customs and consumer preferences (Jandt, 2020, p. 388).

Holliday uses some examples to explain how grand narratives can play in to produce misunderstandings and miscommunication. He refers to Said's book *Orientalism* (1979) and shows how great narratives about the Western and Arab cultures interfere in a personal communication situation because the individuals bring global issues into their personal communication (Holliday, 2018, p. 114).

His thesis is that through literature, art and the popular media, the West has depicted an imagined, Othering, exotic picture of the East which is based more on Western preoccupations than with what is going on in the East. This falls precisely within the global positioning and politics domain of the grammar, in which an idealized Western Self is defined against a demonized non-Western Other (Holliday, 2018, p. 113).

Category 3: Global perspectives in communication

In the third research question, we asked: *How do the textbooks relate to new, digital media as a part of intercultural communication?* From what is presented above, we saw that the three authors have different views on the essence of how intercultural communication takes place. Neuliep sees communication as a process, as well as being dynamic and symbolic. The model he uses in his definition is based on a traditional sender to receiver model:

Communication, then, is the ubiquitous, dynamic, interactive process of encoding and decoding verbal and nonverbal messages within a defined cultural, physiological, relational, and perceptual context. Although many of our messages are sent intentionally, some others – perhaps our nonverbal messages – can unintentionally influence other people. (Neuliep, 2020, p. 10)

Neuliep sees intercultural communication between person A and person B as coming into the communication situation with different attitudes and skills, such as socio-communicative style and empathy. The

communication's success, or failure, will also depend on the person's degree of intercultural communication apprehension, their success or failure in reducing uncertainty. When there is a meeting point between them, communication can take place and a third culture may appear: "whenever two people come together and interact, they create a third culture of shared meaning and relational empathy" (Neuliep, 2020, p. 304).

The examples of this kind of intercultural communication are basically taken from microcultural contexts, from person to person. Given the cultures in question, Neuliep describes challenges and possible outcomes of the communication: "People also bring with them a personal worldview largely based on cultural orientation. Hence, a Chinese person brings a collectivistic, high-context worldview, and a U.S. citizen brings an individualistic, low-context worldview. In a relationship, these two different worldviews merge into an independent worldview" (Neuliep, 2020, p. 305). There is little or no reference to kinds of communication that are not face-to-face or on a microsocial level in the chapter entitled "Developing Intercultural Relationships".

Like Neuliep, Jandt uses a classical communication model, with a sender who communicates to a receiver as his starting point when explaining communication. He emphasizes the contextual aspect of communication before he continues with a historical perspective on communicational technological developments (Jandt, 2020, p. 26). We can see a clear linear understanding of communication.

In Neuliep, 'global' or 'globalization' is mentioned in connection with technological advances such as the internet and smartphones, global business, global politics, or global conflicts (Neuliep, 2020, pp. 1–3). When explaining the dimensions involved in intercultural conflicts, Neuliep refers to Kim's model, which has three levels: macro, intermediary and micro. Neuliep refers to Gudykunst and Chua, and states that the way you solve intercultural conflicts between people who come from low-context cultures, such as the United States, and individuals who come from high-context cultures, such as China, differs in the way that an American is more likely to separate the issue from the person, as opposed to a Chinese. In other words, your cultural background can, to some degree, predict the outcome of the communication (Neuliep, 2020, p. 355).

Holliday has a rather substantial focus on globalization. He distinguishes between centered and de-centered globalization. Centered globalization holds the West as the Center and ‘the rest’ is the Periphery. If the Periphery buys into the stereotyped images of itself, it leads to what Holliday calls self-othering.

(Social) media

Facebook is, likewise, mentioned as an example of the spreading of technology (Neuliep, 2020, pp. 1, 320), and later, nations are compared in regard to their degree of fear of loss of privacy (Neuliep, 2020, p. 138) and how it is used for self-presentation (Neuliep, p. 321).

Neuliep refers to a study that shows the use of Facebook by African Americans, Latinos, and students of Indian ancestry. It shows that these groups invest more in self-marketing than Vietnamese and white students (Neuliep, 2020, p. 322). Neuliep does not make any remarks on the large groupings of these students or the grouping by skin color. In addition, another study that shows that Chinese and Koreans use social media to a greater degree as a means to achieve social gratification is mentioned as well (Neuliep, 2020, p. 139).

In Jandt, media is treated as a subcategory when discussing media as a part of intercultural communication. Social media is mentioned together with the telephone and the internet. The presentation is given as a statement of the actual status of use across the world. It is not discussed in the broader context of what it does to general intercultural communication, but rather focuses on the situation in different countries. Social media is mentioned several times in the book, mostly to show the situation and statistics in different places. Under the heading “The promise of new media”, the author lists different customs related to the use of mobile phones. The figure shows differences between countries, such as Japan, Spain and Italy, and India and parts of Africa. The main point of the paragraph is that “social media are now enabling individuals to connect across cultures in ways that were not possible only a couple of decades ago” (Jandt, 2020, p. 439).

Social media alone is only mentioned once, but Facebook is mentioned twenty-three times in Holliday’s book. It is used both as an

example of a centered globalization and a de-centered globalization. As a tool of centered globalization, it originates and is based in the United States, flowing culturally from the Center, while it can be utilized from the Periphery to promote almost any cause or idea (Holliday, 2018, p. 20).

Category 4: Relation to Intercultural Communication's academic tradition

The fourth research question was as follows: *In what way do the textbooks relate to the academic foundations of Intercultural Communication?* Between the two American textbooks, Neuliep appears to be the closest to the traditional foundations of Intercultural Communication. It is the eighth edition of the book, and it is aimed at American college students when it says that:

it alerts students to the importance and necessity of intercultural communication in the 21st century. An argument presented here is that modern technology has decentralized information. This means that billions of people across the planet now have access to information not available to them only a few years ago. Such information empowers them. The most current data from the U.S. Census Bureau are reviewed, which point to the growing diversity of the U.S. population. (Neuliep, 2020, p. xi)

The book is organized in a way common to many of the early textbooks (e.g., Dodd, 1991; Samovar & Porter, 1972), with chapters on verbal and non-verbal communication, following traditional theories from Hall and Hofstede on, for example, individualism vs. collectivism and high and low-context cultures. Its focus is on intercultural communication as a contextual enterprise, and the anxiety/uncertainty reduction theory has a relatively dominant place in his presentation.

Likewise, Jandt has quite a few references to both Hall and Hofstede. Here, Hall is credited for being the founding father of the academic field of Intercultural Communication, and his naming of high-context and low-context cultures is mentioned (Jandt, 2020, pp. 69, 83, 86). Jandt renders Hofstede and his dimensions of culture a significant space. After

having presented Hofstede's dimensions, he pays substantial attention to critiques and critics of Hofstede (Jandt, 2020).

This resonates with his remarks in the Preface, where Jandt states that he has removed the terms “subculture” and “subgroup” and replaced them with “community”, added the coverage of nonbinary gender identities, and rewritten the chapter on nation-state cultures to highlight the objections and alternatives to Hofstede (Jandt, 2020, p. xviii).

Jandt mentions that an important rationale for the latest revision of his book is the dramatic increase in immigration and refugees, “attitudes toward gender identifications, awareness of social class identity, and awareness of religious identity”. He adds that he has updated the book to “include the current international developments and communications challenges, such as the relationship between DNA testing and cultural identity, negotiations between North and South Korea, the refugee experience in Europe, and the introduction of the idea of ‘glocalization’” (Jandt, 2020, p. xviii).

The author of *Understanding Intercultural Communication* (2018), Adrian Holliday, is Professor of Applied Linguistics and Intercultural Education at Canterbury Christ Church University. He sees the connection between language and culture in the way that in meeting people from other cultures, you build on your own cultural norms, your “grammar of culture”, when you start learning and communicating with the other culture. This book has a different structure and does not refer to the same tradition as the two others, but rather to literature from anthropology, linguistics, and cultural studies.

Local, ethnic, global, hybrid or what?

In all Intercultural Communication literature, the question of how to define cultural identity plays a central role. What constitutes identity and what role does it play in the actual communication between people? Is it nationality, race, ethnicity, local community, gender, class, age or what? As the world has become increasingly globalized, these questions have been increasingly discussed. The three researched textbooks constitute no difference.

Based on the presented findings, we can see some differences in approaches to and understanding of these questions. As shown earlier in this chapter, the early history of Intercultural Communication to a large extent regarded nation as the natural research unit when, for instance, comparing values at a macro level. Even at a micro level, however, most of the literature took for granted that a person's national background was determinative for the outcome of the communication (Neuliep, 2020, p. 355). In this way, Neuliep clearly adheres to the early tradition of Intercultural Communication. Jensen calls this tradition a "functionalist tradition" (Jensen, 1998, p. 34). It represents a positivistic approach. The research is basically quantitative. Questionnaires quantify, for example, cultural values, as seen in Hofstede's research, and Piller refers to it as "Intercultural Communication 1.0." (Piller, 2009).

Early textbooks in Intercultural Communication (e.g., Dodd, 1982; Samovar & Porter, 1972; Samovar et al., 1981) followed an understanding of culture as, for example, a group's "beliefs, norms, activities, institutions, and communication patterns" (Dodd, 1982, p. 41) and chapters on such topics as national values, verbal and non-verbal communication were common, as we find in Neuliep's book as well. It is possible to communicate across these units, but then one has to overcome certain obstacles and reduce uncertainty when confronted by strangers. By acquiring knowledge of, for example, language, nonverbal communication, and the worldview, one might be able to minimize the difficulties and perhaps also predict some of the outcomes of communication (Dodd, 1991; Martin & Nakayama, 1993).

Therefore, the textbook that is closest to this early tradition is Neuliep's book. Here, we have seen that examples of cultural values are directly linked to nationality, as in the case of Maoris, who are the only ethnic group alongside other nationalities, even such a diverse nation as India, that are linked to a nation-state, namely New Zealand (Neuliep, 2020, p. 14).

The latest technological developments are added in Neuliep's latest edition, where we find statistics of the spread of Facebook and social media. This new technology is not linked to any general challenges to global culture. The view of communication is that of the traditional communication

model, with a sender and a receiver, a static cultural approach (Dahl, 2016, p. 68). If the message is received in the way the sender intended, then it is an effective communication: “the simultaneous encoding, decoding, and interpretation of verbal and nonverbal messages between people” (Neuliep, 2020, p. 10).

Jandt’s textbook differs from Neuliep in its understanding and definition of culture. When the first edition appeared in 1995, it introduced a change from previous textbooks. It defined culture in a critical hermeneutic way. It represented a breach with the mainstream of books when the first edition appeared in 1995 (Jensen, 1998, p. 36) since Jandt’s definition of culture emphasizes the way that the individual identifies him/herself as belonging to a culture, and not what he/she is assigned by others.

It has strong similarities to Neuliep’s book in its emphasis on the importance of nation as a cultural unit, although it is more nuanced here than Neuliep, because Jandt questions the usefulness of nation as a definite cultural marker while admitting that it is very important and has become increasingly so.

Holliday is, to a much larger extent than Neuliep and Jandt, occupied with globalization and presents two different kinds, centered and de-centered globalization. In centered globalization, the West is the dominant part, while in de-centered globalization, the cultural flows may go in many different directions. In his “grammar of culture”, he mentions “global positioning” as playing a role, even in inter-personal communication in cases where communication issues at the micro level might be connected to macro level topics. In this way, he adheres to an interpretive constructivist tradition. At the same time, Holliday sees globalization and cosmopolitanism not as a process of ideas and values going from the West to the rest, but rather as a condition where societies, in their meeting, change into an awareness where they see that social realities and social transformations happen constantly. This is a critical cosmopolitanism, because it is not a normative cosmopolitanism that sees the world going to a universal culture and a world polity (Delanty, 2006). Holliday’s textbook represents a more dynamic view of culture. Culture is not a fixed entity, but it is a constant interaction between individual

actors and the social structure. It should be categorized as belonging to a post-structuralist perspective.

Recently, we have seen a shift in direction towards a hermeneutic tradition, especially in the British and Scandinavian traditions. In this tradition, Clifford Geertz's definition of culture is used as an analytical concept, where culture is seen as a web that we spin around ourselves (1973). Thus, it is human relations that are central.

Within the Scandinavian tradition, we have seen a clear development from a functionalist and process-analytical understanding to a more semiotic and hermeneutic understanding, as in Nynäs, for example, who defines intercultural communication as a process in which one seeks to achieve a common understanding across cultural boundaries (Nynäs, 2006).

From this research, we can see that the traditional roots from the academic origins are still strong. They are stronger, though, in the American tradition than in the European one, as we can see from Holliday's textbook compared to the two American books. As shown in the presentation of the historical perspectives of the subject, this resonates with the general development. These three textbooks are from major publishers and in wide use.

Conclusion

We have seen that a new, global reality is included in the investigated academic textbooks. However, the balance between this new understanding and adherence to a more traditional way of perceiving cultures and intercultural communication varies. The far-reaching possibilities in communication provided by the new media alter the way we understand intercultural communication, and this fact is included in various degrees.

The research attempted to uncover the philosophical and ideological foundations of textbooks in Intercultural Communication. A part of this was to study how they position themselves in relation to this tradition and how they relate to new trends, developments, and other academic traditions. Especially instructors in intercultural communication need to

be aware of these underlying foundations to be effective teachers with a deeper knowledge of the issues involved.

It is a bit far-fetched to say anything decisive on the development of the field of Intercultural Communication based on the analysis of these three textbooks. Only a few perspectives have been highlighted, and it can only give some general insights into the academic discussion and positions within current Intercultural Communication. Other textbooks, and textbooks from other countries, may differ greatly from these three. More studies are therefore needed to investigate those and identify the trends and the academic traditions to which they belong.

Literature

- Aadnesen, B. N. & Hærem, E. (2007). *Interkulturelt barnevernsarbeid*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Aambø, A. (2021). *Innvandrerens helse og helsetjenestens ansvar*. Cappelen Damm.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization* (Vol. 1). University of Minnesota Press.
- Berg, B. & Ask, T. A. (2011). *Minoritetsperspektiver i sosialt arbeid*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Bratberg, Ø. (2014). *Tekstanalyse for samfunnsvitere*. Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Bjørnæs, E. (1993). *Leker like barn best?: Grunnbok i migrasjonspedagogisk teori og praksis*. Tano.
- Brislin, R. W. (1990). *Applied cross-cultural psychology*. SAGE Publications.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford University Press.
- Dahl, Ø. & Habert, K. (1986). *Møte mellom kulturer: Tverrkulturell kommunikasjon*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Dahl, Ø. (2013). *Møter mellom mennesker: Innføring i interkulturell kommunikasjon*. Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Dahl, Ø. (2016). *Human encounters: Introduction to intercultural communication*. Peter Lang.
- Delanty, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), 25–47.
- Dodd, C. H. (1982). *Dynamics of intercultural communication*. William C. Brown Publishers.
- Dodd, C. H. (1991). *Dynamics of intercultural communication*. W.C. Brown.
- Duguleană, L. (2014). National cultural dimensions and well-being in some countries of the world, in 2013. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 16(02), 305–314.

- Dypedahl, M. & Bøhn, H. (2017). *Veien til interkulturell kompetanse*. Fagbokforlaget.
- Fandrem, H. (2011). *Mangfold og mestring i barnehage og skole: Migrasjon som risikofaktor og ressurs*. Høyskoleforlaget.
- Ferri, G. (2018). *Intercultural communication: Critical approaches and future challenges*. Springer.
- Fife, A. (1991). *ABC om flerkulturell kommunikasjon*. Global.
- Fife, A. (2002). *Tverrkulturell kommunikasjon*. Yrkeslitteratur.
- Fiore, Q. & McLuhan, M. (1967). *The medium is the message*. Random House.
- Fuchs, C. (2014). *Social media: A critical introduction*. Sage.
- Ganesh, S., Li, M. & Vaccarino, F. (2017). The bases for intercultural communication in a digital era. In S. M. Croucher (Ed.), *Global perspectives on intercultural communication* (pp. 355–365). Taylor & Francis.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.
- Gudykunst, W. B. & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*. Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. Doubleday.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, culture & society*, 7(2–3), 237–251.
- Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of meaning*. Columbia University Press.
- Haugseth, J. F. (2013). *Sosiale medier i samfunnet*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Held, D. (2010). *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and realities*. Polity.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: National differences in thinking and organizing*. Sage.
- Holliday, A. (2018). *Understanding intercultural communication*. VitalSource Bookshelf. <https://bookshelf.vitalsource.com/#/books/9781351139502/>
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of the modern world*. Simon and Schuster.
- Hylland Eriksen, T. (1993). In which sense do cultural islands exist? *Social Anthropology*, 1(1b), 133–147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8676.1993.tb00246.x>
- Hylland Eriksen, T. (1997). *Flerkulturell forståelse*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Jandt, F. E. (2020). *An introduction to intercultural communication*. VitalSource Bookshelf. <https://bookshelf.vitalsource.com/#/books/9781544383880/>
- Javidan, M., House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J. & De Luque, M. S. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: A comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 897–914.
- Jávo, C. (2010). *Kulturens betydning for oppdragelse og atferdsproblemer. Transkulturell forståelse, veiledning og behandling*. Universitetsforlaget.

- Jensen, I. (1998). *Interkulturell kommunikation i komplekse samfund*. Roskilde Universitet.
- Jensen, I., Dahl, Ø. & Nynäs, P. (2006). *Bridges of understanding: Perspectives on intercultural communication*. Fagbokforlaget.
- Jensen, P. & Ulleberg, I. (2011). *Mellom ordene*. Gyldendal.
- Kalscheuer, B. (2013). Encounters in third space: Links between intercultural communication theories and postcolonial approaches. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader*. Routledge.
- Kraidy, M. M. (2002). Hybridity in cultural globalization. *Communication Theory*, 12(3), 316–339.
- Kraidy, M. (2017). *Hybridity, or the cultural logic of globalization*. Temple University Press.
- Lewellen, T. C. (2002). *The anthropology of globalization: Cultural anthropology enters the 21st century*. ABC-CLIO.
- MacSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith; a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 89–118.
- Magelssen, R. (2008). *Kultursensitivitet: Om å finne likhetene i forskjellene*. Akribe.
- Martin, J. N. (1994). Intercultural communication: A unifying concept for International Educational exchange. In G. Althen (Ed.), *Learning across cultures: Intercultural communication and international educational exchange* (pp. 9–29). Association of International Educators.
- Martin, J. N. & Nakayama, T. K. (1999). Thinking dialectically about culture and communication. *Communication Theory*, (9), 1–25.
- Mathews, G. (2000). *Global culture/individual identity: Searching for home in the cultural supermarket*. Psychology Press.
- Melberg, H. O. & Kjekshus, L.-E. (Eds.) (2012). *Fremtidens Helse-Norge*. Fagbokforlaget.
- Meyer, E. (2014). *The culture map: Breaking through the invisible boundaries of global business*. Public Affairs.
- Nergård, J. I. & Vitebsky, P. (Eds.) (2019). *Kulturen som pasient. Uvanlige møter for vanlige folk*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Neuliep, J. W. (2020). *Intercultural communication*. VitalSource Bookshelf. <https://bookshelf.vitalsource.com/#/books/9781544348735/>
- Nilsen, S. (2017). *Inkludering og mangfold: Sett i spesialpedagogisk perspektiv*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Nynäs, P. (2006). Interpretative models of estrangement and identification. In Ø. Dahl, I. Jensen & P. Nynäs (Eds.), *Bridges of understanding. Perspectives on intercultural communication* (pp. 23–39). Unipub.

- Pieterse, J. N. (1994). Globalisation as hybridisation. *International Sociology*, 9(2), 161–184.
- Pieterse, J. N. (2001). Hybridity, so what? *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(2–3), 219–245.
- Piller, I. (2009). Intercultural communication. In F. Bargiela-Chiappini (Ed.), *The handbook of business discourse* (pp. 317–329). Edinburgh University Press.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and heterogeneity-homogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). Sage.
- Roddevik, V. (2010). *Flerkulturelle arbeidsplasser: En veiviser*. Fagbokforlaget.
- Romani, L. & Claes M.-T. (2014). Why critical intercultural communication studies are to be taken seriously in cross-cultural management research? *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 14(1), 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595813507156>
- Røthing, Å. (2017). *Mangfoldskompetanse. Perspektiver på undervisning i yrkesfag*. Cappelen Damm.
- Rygg, K. (2014). Intercultural training: Learn to avoid treading on other people's toes or experience walking in the other person's shoes. *FLEKS-Scandinavian Journal of Intercultural Theory and Practice*, 1(1).
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.
- Salole, L. (2013). *Krysskulturelle barn og unge: Om tilhørighet, anerkjennelse, dilemmaer og ressurser*. Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Samovar, L. A. & Porter, R. E. (1972). *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E. & Jain, N. C. (1981). *Understanding intercultural communication*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Shenkar, O. (2001). Cultural distance revisited: Towards a more rigorous conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(3), 519–535.
- Shuter, R. (2013). The centrality of culture in the 20th and 21st centuries. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (pp. 48–58). Routledge.
- Soares, A. M., Farhangmehr, M. & Shoham, A. (2007). Hofstede's dimensions of culture in international marketing studies. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(3), 277–284.
- Weber, M. (1964). *The theory of social and economic organisation* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans. and T. Parsons, Ed.). The Free Press. (Originally published 1922)
- Weber, M. (1968). Ideal types and theory construction. In M. Brodbeck (Ed.), *Readings in the philosophy of the social sciences* (pp. 496–507). Macmillan. (Originally published 1949 in *The methodology of the social sciences*. The Free Press)

- Ylvisaker, S. & Rugkåsa, M. (2020). *Krysspress. Dilemmaer i sosialt arbeid i velferdsstaten*. Gyldendal.
- Økland, Ø. (Ed.). (2013). *Innvandrerungdom og mediebruk. Norsk-somalisk ungdom i en global medie verden*. Portal.
- Økland, Ø. (2019). Hvordan undervise i interkulturell kommunikasjon? In U. S. Goth (Ed.), *Verdier og visjoner. Profesjonalitet i endring* (pp. 105–123). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.