

Intercultural Rhetoric in the Technical Communication Curriculum: A Review of the Literature

Jennifer Bracken Scott
New Mexico State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/rpcg>



Part of the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scott, Jennifer Bracken () "Intercultural Rhetoric in the Technical Communication Curriculum: A Review of the Literature," *Journal of Rhetoric, Professional Communication, and Globalization*: Vol. 1 : No. 1, Article 4.

Available at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/rpcg/vol1/iss1/4>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.



ISSN: 2153-9480. Volume 1, Number 1. December - 2010

Intercultural Rhetoric in the Technical Communication Curriculum: A Review of the Literature

Jennifer Bracken Scott

New Mexico State University, USA

Abstract

Although many scholars in technical, professional, and business communication have argued for the inclusion of intercultural rhetoric and communication in technical communication curricula, several key tensions have emerged from this effort. These tensions center upon the competencies most necessary for graduates of our programs, as well as approaches for understanding and teaching intercultural communication. This literature review presents a discussion and critique of literature in the field based on articles collected from several major journals as well as book sections in the areas of technical, professional, and business communication; it also offers recommendations for further research and development in this area.

Introduction

A number of scholars have argued in favor of including intercultural communication in the technical communication curriculum. Their reasons for doing so vary, however, as do the approaches they recommend. This literature review presents a discussion and critique of scholarship in the field based on articles collected from several major journals as well as book sections in the areas of technical, professional, and business communication. The central question of this research is, how can intercultural communication be integrated effectively into technical communication curricula?

In this literature review, I discuss several key tensions regarding intercultural rhetoric and its incorporation into technical communication curricula. First, while there is general agreement that the globalizing forces in our current economy create a need for culturally competent

communicators, there remains some disagreement regarding which areas of competence are most valuable and necessary for graduates of our programs. Second, scholars in this area hold varying views toward theoretical frameworks for teaching intercultural rhetoric, particularly concerning the work of such researchers as Geert Hofstede and Edward T. Hall. I explore these perspectives and argue in favor of including such research in the curriculum. Third, as intercultural rhetoric has commanded more attention in technical communication pedagogy, exercises and assignments have been designed to increase students' awareness and elevate their intercultural communication competence; however, some of these classroom activities may be more effective than others. Many of the concerns raised by these approaches carry over into discussions about textbook selection and appropriateness of course materials. Finally, there remain several areas for further inquiry into intercultural communication, as well as further development of programs to ensure the preparedness of our graduates and the value of technical communication in the global economy.

Rationale for Teaching Intercultural Communication

Most scholars who write about intercultural communication justify its value in the context of globalization. Globalization is typically “characterized by a far-reaching shift in the means of production (i.e., the use of the Internet for the globally distributed production and delivery of services)” (Starke-Meyerring, Duin, & Palvetzian, 2007, p. 141). Increasing access to the Internet has been largely responsible for this shift; although most authors recognize that the U.S. and Western Europe have greater access to the web, “international online access is increasing with amazing speed” (St. Amant, 2005, p. 192). Greater access to internet resources overseas, among other factors, has led to a higher instance of outsourcing, which has subsequently led to new challenges for technical communicators in several industries. But not all scholars agree on what those challenges are.

Thrush (1993), for example, points to issues of audience; she claims, “The probability that the documents we prepare will be used by people of widely differing linguistic and cultural backgrounds has increased dramatically in the past 20 years” (p. 272). Goby (1999) argues instead that the issue is “the increasing diversity of language backgrounds, ethnicities, classes, and other variables in people working together,” a position echoed by Matveeva (2008): “the reason for the inclusion of the multicultural workplace communication is the growing diversification of the working force either through Internet access, outsourcing, or steady immigration” (p. 179; p. 387). The most reasonable position is that advocated by St. Amant (2002), which suggests that workplaces, clients, *and* audiences are becoming more globally diverse (p. 289).

In the context of workplace expansion into global forums, some scholars have identified language barriers as the most pressing issue communicators must address. For example, Flammia (2005) argues that “technical communication faculty need to prepare students to be skilled intercultural communicators and to play a role on the translation team” because “many documents prepared by technical communicators are destined to be translated. Documents are often translated into multiple languages and are also read in English by nonnative speakers” (p. 401). DeVoss, Jasken, and Hayden (2002) recommend that “students take a foreign

language. In addition to learning a marketable skill, students inevitably learn more about the cultures in which that language is spoken” (p. 87). Those that advocate a language-based approach often argue in favor of “develop[ing] guidelines for writers to follow without severely limiting the vocabulary that they are allowed to use” (Flammia, 2005, p. 405). Many of these guidelines appear in textbooks in the form of lists of do’s and don’ts.

Despite some support for a language-based approach to intercultural communication, most scholars in this area agree that language is not the only important difference between cultures. As St. Amant (2002) points out, “humans appear to evaluate information based on the rhetorical expectations of their native culture, regardless of the language in which that information is presented” (p. 291). Regarding claims that students should learn a second language, Thrush (1993) counters, “few U.S. students study a foreign language beyond a very rudimentary level... The use of a particular grammar and vocabulary does not necessarily imply a shared value system, a uniform approach to business transactions, or a common pool of knowledge,” all of which can effect intercultural communication (p. 273). If students *are* able to become fluent in a second language, Beamer (1992) notes, “Fluency in another language is unarguably valuable, but does not always produce cultural fluency—intercultural communication competence does not automatically accompany linguistic skill” (p. 293). Even in exercises where students interact with individuals from other cultures, instructors should “make it clear [to students] that these exercises are not a study of language” (St. Amant, 2002, p. 303). In other words, there is much agreement that learning a language is not equivalent to learning a culture.

In an effort to help students negotiate linguistic barriers in intercultural communication, a few authors recommend either providing students with lists of guidelines or having students develop them in class (e.g., Flammia, 2005). However, such practices are more frequently frowned upon than advocated. For example, DeVoss et.al. (2002) point out that suggestions such as “limit your vocabulary, keep sentences short, and so on” may be helpful, “but, these same sets of guidelines seem useful in succeeding in any business situation. Many textbooks suggest that the principles associated with a North American style of technical writing are in some senses universal, but we must be cautious when making these kinds of claims” (p. 82). In his study of a company preparing to adapt training modules for readers in Japan, Melton (2009) states that the participants understood mere translation to be inadequate:

The participants all agreed that these modules would not be effective if they were simply translated from English to Japanese. However, the participants were somewhat unclear about how the adaptation took place: Was the training content actually different, or was the adaptation just a matter of cosmetics? My observations showed that these adaptations did not occur in an absolute version of either of these terms; rather, they occurred on both ends of this continuum and in between. (p. 232)

Melton’s research illustrates that creating materials for a culture other than one’s own requires a delicate balance between language needs and larger rhetorical concerns, such as evaluating the appropriateness of content and arrangement for a given audience.

Scholarship suggests that focusing on writing for translation and altering only language when writing for other cultures are inadequate methods. Instead, instructors should provide avenues for students to examine and analyze “materials produced by individuals from other cultures in order to analyze those materials according to... items that could transcend language barriers—specifically, aspects of visual design, layout, and image use” (St. Amant, 2002, p. 293). In other words, students should understand that culture involves far more than language; it also involves choices in rhetorical patterns and medium.

Theoretical Frameworks for Discussing Culture

With most scholars in agreement that language should not be regarded as the sole variable between cultures, there remains a question of which theoretical frameworks are most appropriate for teaching culture. One approach that has been used in the past involves providing students with lists of facts about individual cultures, which typically include basic do's and don'ts for Americans who interact cross-culturally. Generally, scholars in the field have agreed that such lists are ineffective; as Beamer (1992) puts it, “The lists of do's and taboos, so beloved of business people, are helpful in categorizing the unfamiliar, but they rarely offer more than stereotypes” (p. 294). Such lists, especially when they appear in textbooks, may be problematic, particularly since “authors usually borrow these factoids from research articles.

Many articles are case studies, and there is some danger of taking those research findings out of context” (Matveeva, 2007, p. 158). In place of “decontextualized factoids about ‘others,’” says Miles (1997), instructors should seek out “a more strategic approach to professional writing instruction” (p. 190). Grattis (2010) argues for the inclusion of contextual analysis in curricula in order to prepare students for work in other nations; learning to “read between the lines” can help students “learn to go beyond rules [as t]hey prepare themselves to work with the absence of a single correct answer, or with the possibility of several answers” (p. 198). In short, learning a straightforward list of rules can get technical communicators only so far in an intercultural communication situation; communicators must also acknowledge the complexities of this kind of work.

Many scholars have located strategies for teaching in works that focus on cultural dimensions or variables, such as Hofstede's (1997) cultural value dimensions, Hall's (1976) high- and low-context theory, and Hooker's (2003) model of the cultural iceberg. Beamer (1992) supports this kind of approach in her writings; she argues that “acquiring knowledge and understanding of cultural factors is the key to successful communication across cultures” (p. 302). Flammia (2005) suggests the inclusion of all three, particularly when students then “apply them to technical communication case studies” (p. 402). Thrush (1993) mentions high and low context as important variables in rhetorical patterns and preferences (p. 275). St. Amant suggests web resources where instructors and students can learn more about Hofstede's framework, with the goal of applying them to sample documents from other cultures (p. 199).

Despite the prevalence (and empirical validity) of Hofstede and Hall's frameworks, there remains opposition in the field to the heuristic/information acquisition approach these authors advocate. Matveeva (2007) notes that "many textbooks offer various cultural dimensions/typologies (for example, Hall's high- and low-context cultures or Hofstede's dimensions) that ask students to categorize cultures and cultural factoids that Miles and Corbett argued against in the mid 1990s" (p. 157). Most critiques of this approach lie in the perception that cultural dimensions and variables encourage students to stereotype members of cultural groups. Hunsinger (2006) claims that in the heuristic approach, "Culture is commonly treated as a prediscursive, effectively autonomous essence posing as a set of durable habits and practices, and cultural identity is something brought to communication rather than constructed and mobilized during communication" (p. 34). In other words, Hunsinger takes issue with the approach because it fails to acknowledge the individual identities of participants in an interaction and the role of language in the construction of identity. The problem with this viewpoint and others like it is somewhat of a misunderstanding of research conducted by Hall, Hofstede, and their peers; scholars who argue against their methods seem to see these frameworks as dictating the values of every member of a culture, whereas the real intention of describing cultural values is to describe regularities or tendencies.

A third—but apparently uncommon—approach to teaching intercultural communication is a "universal" approach, as represented by Goby's writings (1999, 2007). Goby states, "I hypothesize that an investigation of the business communication needs of respondents in multicultural settings would uncover, alongside culturally determined communication differences, a universal core of business communication needs" (2007, p. 428). Regarding preferences for interpersonal communication among different cultures, she argues that "we can eventually identify more fundamental commonalities than differences. Furthermore, I believe that people (students, managers) are aware that they need a particular set of communication skills and that this set is similar in all cultural settings" (Goby, 1999, p. 181).

Although she does acknowledge the existence of cultural variation, this approach remains problematic for a variety of reasons. First, as Thrush (1993) reminds us, "research in anthropology, cognitive psychology, linguistics, and writing theory has identified several factors that vary within languages and cultures and affect the way readers read and interpret texts" (p. 274). Goby counters such claims by suggesting that all humans engage in certain kinds of activities, such as "searching for in-group status, fulfilling family responsibilities, exercising group leadership, and so on"; however, she does not acknowledge that the *means* by which individuals from different cultures pursue such activities may vary widely (2007, p. 427). Second, as Hunsinger (2006) notes, "most attempts at universality have ended in ethnocentrism, no matter the intentions behind them" (p. 32). What is, therefore, crucial for the effective teaching of intercultural communication is an understanding of those variables which are not universal, as well as means of helping students develop this understanding.

Exercises for Raising Awareness and Fostering Competence

In her survey of technical and professional communication instructors, Matveeva (2008) found that “most of the instructors reported that students needed to know or be aware of cultural differences in written and oral communication” (p. 396). However, perspectives vary greatly regarding which differences matter most, and what constitutes “awareness” of other cultures. There seems also to be some uncertainty as to where to begin when teaching intercultural communication. Beamer (1992) offers some insight when she concludes from her review of intercultural learning models that “learning is incremental and that the individual’s internal perceptions, challenged through personal experience, are the starting point of learning intercultural competence” (p. 291). Thrush (1993), too, suggests that raising students’ awareness of culture and the potential problems related to intercultural communication is crucial to their learning (p. 280).

The importance of awareness reported in the research often boils down to an assumption that students in technical communication courses have U.S. cultural values, and think that these values can simply transfer to intercultural situations. Most technical communication courses focus on skills that can be useful for intercultural communication—audience analysis, for example—but as Melton (2010) notes, “without an accompanying look at our own assumptions, we will be hindered in our efforts” to understand intercultural audiences (p. 132). DeVoss et. al. (2002) state, “Because the United States is a cultural and economic global force, Americans tend to see intercultural situations through the lens of white, Protestant, middle-class, male values” (p. 76). Likewise, Goby (2007) reports that “U.S. students may tend to assume that they can carry their well-known culture with them into new cultural settings” (p. 434). Matveeva (2007) warns that “if students do not understand fully what constitutes a culture, what is the American culture and how it comes into being, then the discussion of other cultures and cultural differences may not be effective” (p. 160). This situation presents a need for students to become aware of their membership in a certain cultural group and to acknowledge the many ways in which their culture affects their communication practices.

Teaching exercises designed to raise students’ cultural awareness are often designed to “help students break out of their *ethnocentrism*” (Barker & Matveeva, 2006, p. 193). Despite many claims that such activities are valuable, there are relatively few sources that mention specific exercises that might be incorporated into classrooms. DeVoss et. al. (2002) are among these few sources, though their approaches may be slightly problematic. In one exercise, students are given cultural artifacts—specifically, food wrappers—and are asked to discuss what assumptions these artifacts make about their readers’ values (p. 77). The authors suggest that food wrappers “offer much information about the characteristics of our culture, such as our economic system..., wealth..., and regulatory systems” (DeVoss et. al., p. 77). Although economic systems and regulation are indeed *connected* to cultural values, the authors do not offer ways in which such an exercise would help students understand the rhetorical and communicative preferences of a given culture. They do not discuss, for example, use of color, typeface, or arrangement and how these factors might vary between cultures, although this exercise would certainly create opportunities for such a discussion to take place; as Kostelnick

(2010) argues, study of visual language may actually present better opportunities to discuss cultural variation than written discourse, particularly in regards to variables like high- and low-context.

Part of the problem with discussions of “awareness” is the fact that this term is often poorly defined. Therefore, articles that address specific differences between cultures and how to teach students about these differences are often more effective at illustrating their point. Because culture can create differences in rhetorical expectations, as St. Amant (2002) points out, “students who will be entering this workforce need to understand how different expectations of argument presentation and format can affect success rates” (p. 309). To familiarize students with differing expectations among target cultures, he suggests that students “analyze...the work of a specific assigned culture” by choosing “five websites created by individuals from that culture” and reporting on their observations of those sites (pp. 299-300). He also suggests a comparison of one company’s websites for different nations in which students “use this comparative approach to devise a checklist of four or five factors to keep in mind when designing a Web page for people from each of these three cultures” (p. 297). In both exercises, students use their findings to develop lists of recommendations for communicators targeting materials to these cultures (pp. 297, 299-300).

In addition to understanding the cultural variables that might affect rhetorical strategies, students should also have well-honed skills of audience analysis in order to be effective intercultural communicators. Issues of access, literacy, population, and language play a part in the effectiveness of all technical documents, but are particularly important when there may be a large gap in these areas between author and audience. Flammia (2005) mentions “political, economic, social, religious, educational, linguistic, and technological” variables, all of which are “an important part of understanding any culture” (p. 403). Students can locate such information on websites such as the CIA World Factbook, which “contains information on a wider range of variables, particularly those relating to government policies, communication infrastructure, and economic trends” (St. Amant, 2005, p. 199).

When creating documents that incorporate visuals, students should also be aware of differences in what is deemed culturally acceptable or unacceptable to the target audience; for example, “cultural expectations of depictions of women in images (e.g., dress, task performed, etc.),” “cultural associations for different hand gestures,” and “comfort levels when determining how much text should be used with an image or graphic” can vary between cultures, and communicators should be conscientious of these differences (St. Amant, 2002, pp. 296-297). Although such recommendations fall into the category of “do’s and taboos” mentioned by Beamer (1992) and are typically frowned upon, resistance to these lists occurs primarily when they are the *only* source of information about culture. When information about taboos is presented in conjunction with knowledge of cultural variables and rhetorical preferences, they may spare a communicator embarrassment and may prevent an audience being offended or alienated by the document in question.

In order to teach students how to better understand international audiences, several scholars suggest that students have an opportunity to interact not only with artifacts from other

cultures, but also with individuals from other cultures. “One effective way of achieving this objective,” says St. Amant (2002), “is to use a computer classroom that allows students to use online media to interact directly with people and materials from other cultures” (p. 291). Such interactions can help students “learn how cultural factors can affect presentation in both e-mail messages and online postings as both are used in outsourcing practices” (St. Amant, 2005, p. 195). If such resources are not available to instructors, DeVoss et. al. (2002) suggest inviting guest speakers who participate in international organizations, such as clubs or student offices, to discuss professional practices across culture, or “encourag[ing] students to attend intercultural events on campus and within the community” (pp.87-88). Interactions with members of cultures outside their own may affect on student engagement with the material as well; Goby (2007) suggests that among business students, “exposure to communication with foreign nationals increases students’ interest in studying international business communication” (p. 432).

Most scholars focus their attention on differences in written communication between cultures; however, “skills of effective oral communication across cultures are a must in multicultural workplaces” (Matveeva, 2008, 397-8). A survey of students with business experience in the U.S., Cyprus, and Singapore revealed that “what students feel they need in the workplace are good interpersonal skills” (Goby, 1999, p. 184). In other words, students need experience interacting in a real-time, conversational situation with members of other cultures. Although it may be difficult to arrange such interactions, online resources can present more opportunities for instructors “to help students appreciate how cultural factors affect real-time exchanges [by using] exercises in which students interact in real time with counterparts from other cultures” (St. Amant, 2005, p. 195). Such exercises expose students “to how other individuals think and interact within their own culture,” which can “[help] students realize that the individuals involved in such exchanges are actual persons and not unknown entities on the other side of an Internet connection” (St. Amant, 2005, p. 197).

The ultimate goal of these approaches is to help students become interculturally competent communicators. Beamer (1992) summarizes her definition of competence as follows: “The communicator becomes interculturally competent when messages may be encoded and directed as if from within the new culture and when messages from the new culture may be decoded and responded to successfully” (p. 301). To accomplish this level of competence, students must possess knowledge and skills in communication. Flammia (2005) argues that this skill base should be broad, noting that “when preparing students for careers in technical communication, it is more beneficial to give them analytical skills that can be applied in many situations than to train them to use one particular system that is narrowly defined” (p. 405). Effective communicators must also be able to strike a balance between audience needs and cultural appropriateness of the document (Melton, 2009, p. 233). In sum, a competent intercultural communicator is one with an awareness of the complexities of culture and flexibility in coping with challenging communication situations.

Selecting Materials for Effective Teaching

In their efforts to evaluate the state of teaching in intercultural communication, several scholars have assessed technical communication textbooks and their treatment of intercultural issues. Miles (1997) argues in favor of textbook analysis on the basis that “textbooks often act as a vehicle for the dissemination of practice-based information, and their distribution is often nation-wide (if not continent-wide or world-wide), they are in a powerful position to send messages (both intentional and unintentional) about the nature of a globalized curriculum and a globalized workplace” (p. 181). However, the results of a survey of 30 instructors by Matveeva (2008) showed some general dissatisfaction with textbooks: “63% (17) of the respondents said that textbooks need more examples, 56% (15) said that textbooks need more cases, 41% (11) more Web resources, 37% (10) more projects, 33% (9) more exercises and 33% (9) more short articles, 26% (7) more theoretical discussions, 22% (6) more guidelines and bibliographies” (p. 400). DeVoss et. al. (2002) further note, “We found that because the textbooks dedicate so little space to intercultural issues, the information tends to be vague or difficult to apply in workplace environments” (p. 72).

Because of these common weaknesses in textbooks, it is important that textbooks are selected with care and, as Barker and Matveeva (2006) suggest, with consideration for the instructor’s level of experience and familiarity with intercultural theory. They assign scores to textbooks based on the quantity and frequency of “projects, games, and activities that encourage exposure to cultural differences,” “discussions of models, theories, [and] analytical models,” “examples of cultural characteristics illustrating theories,” “exercises focusing on intercultural communication,” and “guidelines, principles, and checklists (in sidebars)” (p. 194). Textbooks are then ranked as low, middle, or high in the amount of space dedicated to intercultural communication (p. 201). This evaluation is then compared against instructor qualifications, described in terms of their knowledge of intercultural communication (as dictated by exposure to other cultures as well as intercultural theory) and the amount of variety in their teaching techniques (p. 197). They conclude that in situations where the instructor has a low level of experience, textbooks with a high score in the evaluation should be used, as these instructors are likely to rely primarily on the textbook for information about intercultural communication; on the other hand, instructors with high scores can likely work with even a low-scoring textbook effectively, as they will be able to draw upon their own knowledge and experience in their teaching (p. 201).

The problems scholars have found with textbooks may be remedied in two ways. First, instructors can compensate for the lack of adequate information, examples, and activities by providing these materials for students (Hunsinger, 2006, p. 44). St. Amant (2005) discusses a number of resources instructors can use, as referred to in the previous section. Second, improvements can be made to subsequent editions of textbooks that better serve the needs of students and instructors. In addition to lists of guidelines or tips, textbooks should also provide an adequate number of sample documents from other cultures (Matveeva, 2007, p. 157). Furthermore, as Matveeva (2007) states, “If textbook writers want students to be able to write, create, or revise for people from other cultures, they need to discuss these approaches in detail and provide some basic principles for students to use” (p. 160).

Areas for Further Development

The need for a greater emphasis on intercultural communication in technical communication curricula is becoming increasingly urgent. Pressures of globalization make workplaces increasingly international and intercultural, and graduates of technical communication programs will need this training in order to market themselves as professionals and to perform their work effectively. Furthermore, instructors should consider that our graduates “may soon face stiff competition from candidates in other nations,” as many nations have now begun to develop technical communication programs of their own (St. Amant, 2010, p. 2). It is therefore vital that in our instruction and curriculum development, we incorporate intercultural communication as an important component in every course we offer, not just as one course in a curriculum (Cleary, 2010; Smith & Mikelonis, 2010).

There are several needs that future scholarship in intercultural communication must address. First, stronger, more clearly stated definitions of culture are needed in the literature. Surprisingly few of the articles discussed here offered a coherent definition of culture or mentioned definitions posed by other authors. The lack of such definitions weakens scholarship because if readers do not understand how an author defines culture, they will not be able to determine how culture might influence communication and where differences in communication patterns might originate or appear. Second, scholars who criticize or reject existing models for intercultural communication or for understanding culture should offer readers alternatives. Although literature that notes inadequacies of current models can be useful to the field, many of these authors do not articulate their own theoretical perspective before moving on to discussions of pedagogy and leaving many questions unanswered.

Professional organizations may also play an important role in expanding technical communication into global markets. Draper (2010) notes that the Society for Technical Communication (STC), the world’s largest professional organization for technical communicators working in industry, has gained some prominence in other nations, but membership has decreased in his home nation of New Zealand due to the persistent “U.S.-centric nature of the STC” (p. 266). While Draper notes that a New Zealand-specific professional organization has emerged recently, the professional network provided by STC membership cannot be overlooked as a potentially valuable source of information about intercultural communication. STC and organizations like it would be wise to shift away from U.S.-centrism and toward a global perspective, particularly since several STC chapters are located at universities and connected to technical communication departments.

The final and most pressing need in the literature is the need for more empirical research in this area. Many of the writings cited here fall into one of two categories: theoretical works, or teacher lore. Although both varieties can be somewhat useful to instructors of intercultural communication, there is virtually *no data* available on how effective certain teaching approaches are in terms of what students learn from courses that incorporate intercultural communication. There is a somewhat limited body of empirical research that focuses on this topic in business settings, but most of what is said about what certain activities will

accomplish and what students will gain from acquiring information about cultural variables is pure speculation.

Instructors who seek to incorporate intercultural communication into technical communication curricula have a variety of resources at their disposal to help them accomplish this task, from theories of culture to suggested activities. What remains a challenge is a way to determine which goals we need—and are most likely—to achieve within the course of a one-semester writing and communication class, and which of the suggestions are most likely to produce the gains we hope to make. Future research should strive to answer these challenges and to encourage the field as a whole to pay attention to cultural issues in communication

References

- Barker, T., & Matveeva, N. (2006). Teaching intercultural communication in a technical writing service course: Real instructors' practices and suggestions for textbook selection. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 15(2), 191-214.
- Beamer, L. (1992). Learning intercultural communication competence. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 29(3), 285-303.
- Beamer, L. (2000). Finding a way to teach cultural dimensions. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 63(3), 111-118.
- Cleary, Y. (2010). An integrated framework for teaching international communication. In B. Thatcher & K. St.Amant (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural rhetoric and technical communication: Theories, curriculum, pedagogies, and practices* (pp. 15-29). Amityville: Baywood.
- DeVoss, D., Jasken, J., & Hayden, D. (2002). Teaching intracultural and intercultural communication: A critique and suggested method. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 16(1), 69-94.
- Draper, R. (2010). An overview of technical communication education in New Zealand. In B. Thatcher & K. St.Amant (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural rhetoric and technical communication: Theories, curriculum, pedagogies, and practices* (pp. 257-271). Amityville: Baywood.
- Flammia, M. (2005). Preparing technical communication students to play a role on the translation team. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 48(4), 401-412.
- Gattis, L. F. (2010). Between the lines: Reading contextually in the international internship. In B. Thatcher & K. St.Amant (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural rhetoric and technical communication: Theories, curriculum, pedagogies, and practices* (pp. 193-216). Amityville: Baywood.
- Goby, V. P. (1999). All business students need to know the same things! The non-culture-specific nature of communication needs. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 13(2), 179-189.
- Goby, V. P. (2007). Business communication needs: A multicultural perspective. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 21(4), 425-437.
- Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life: The other dimension of time*. Toronto: Anchor Books.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Hooker, J. (2003). *Working across cultures*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hunsinger, R. P. (2006). Culture and cultural identity in intercultural technical communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 15(1), 31-48.
- Kostelnick, C. (2010). Seeing difference: Teaching intercultural communication through visual rhetoric. In B. Thatcher & K. St.Amant (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural rhetoric and technical communication: Theories, curriculum, pedagogies, and practices* (pp. 31-48). Amityville: Baywood.
- Matveeva, N. (2007). The intercultural component in textbooks for teaching a service technical writing course. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 37(2), 151-166.
- Matveeva, N. (2008). Teaching intercultural communication in a basic technical writing course: A survey of our current practices and methods. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 38(4), 387-410.
- Melton, J. H. (2009). Going global: A case study of rhetorical invention, packaging, delivery, and feedback collection. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 52(3), 229-242.
- Melton, J. H. (2010). Global revisions: (Re)Thinking the future of technical and professional communication competencies. In B. Thatcher & K. St.Amant (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural rhetoric and technical communication: Theories, curriculum, pedagogies, and practices* (pp. 131-157). Amityville: Baywood.
- Miles, L. (1997). Globalizing professional writing curricula: Positioning students and re-positioning textbooks. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 6(2), 179-200.
- Smith, S. L., & Mikelonis, V. M. (2010). Incorporating "shock and aha!" into curriculum design: Internationalizing technical communication courses. In B. Thatcher & K. St.Amant (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural rhetoric and technical communication: Theories, curriculum, pedagogies, and practices* (pp. 89-112). Amityville: Baywood.
- St.Amant, K. (2002). Integrating intercultural online learning experiences into the computer classroom. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 11(3), 289-315.
- St.Amant, K. (2005). An online approach to teaching international outsourcing in technical communication classes. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 35(2), 191-201.

St. Amant, K. (2010). Thinking globally, teaching locally: Understanding the changing nature of technical communication in an age of globalization. In B. Thatcher & K. St. Amant (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural rhetoric and technical communication: Theories, curriculum, pedagogies, and practices* (pp. 1-11). Amityville: Baywood.

Starke-Meyerring, D., Duin, A. H., & Palvetzian, T. (2007). Global partnerships: Positioning technical communication programs in the context of globalization. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(2), 139-174.

Thrush, E. (1993). Bridging the gaps: Technical communication in an international and multicultural society. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 2(3), 271-283.

Jennifer Bracken Scott is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Professional Communication at New Mexico State University. Her research interests include technical communication pedagogy, intercultural rhetoric, and multimedia.