Review

"Knowledge Strategies" for Indigenous Studies on Intercultural Communication in Non-Western Countries in the Global Power Structure

Yingchun Sun and Yi Shi *

School of Government and Public Affairs, Communication University of China, Beijing 100024, China; sunychun@cuc.edu.cn
*   Correspondence: 2021100503z9001@cuc.edu.cn

Abstract: According to Michel Foucault's power/knowledge theory, knowledge is not produced in a vacuum; the construction of any knowledge system implicitly contains power relations. The "knowledge strategies" for Indigenous studies on intercultural communication should evolve and improve in response to shifts in the global power structure. With the development of globalization and the evolution of communication technologies, this study interprets the current global power structure as a "dual structure" in which the international society and the world society coexist and develop together. This structure leads to a complex trend of simultaneous "centralization" and "decentralization", as well as "homogenization" and "hybridization" in the global cultural order. For scholars from non-Western countries, Indigenous studies on intercultural communication need to interpret the new global power structure, expanding their research perspectives and topics to a global dimension. This approach links Indigenous conceptual resources and methodologies with an open and diverse global cultural order. This study proposes "knowledge strategies" for Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in non-Western countries and introduces a third level of significance for intercultural communication beyond daily interaction and cultural interaction: community building. Regarding the research purpose, this study aims to provide a new perspective for the study of intercultural communication theory, promoting an equal dialogue between Western and non-Western knowledge systems of intercultural communication, and enhancing the inclusiveness and humanistic awareness of this discipline.

Keywords: intercultural communication; global power structure; world society; Indigenous studies

1. Introduction

As an essential component of human communication activities, intercultural communication is indispensable among individuals, groups, and nations. Intercultural communication helps maintain the balance within social structures and systems, fostering the development and evolution of human culture. Specifically, based on the nature of human cultural exchanges, intercultural communication refers to the information exchange activities among social members from different cultural backgrounds and involves the diffusion and transformation of various cultural elements globally. Therefore, existing research indicates that intercultural communication has two levels of significance: first, at the level of daily communication, it primarily refers to the misreading, adjustment, and adaptation of social members from different cultural backgrounds in daily interaction; second, at the level of human cultural exchanges, it mainly refers to the integration, interaction, and conflict among significantly different grand cultural systems (Sun 2015).

As an academic field, intercultural communication emerged in the United States in the 1940s. For over half a century, intercultural communication has primarily evolved in Western countries, developing into a discipline with a unique theoretical framework and research topics by integrating knowledge and practices from various humanities

disciplines. Intercultural communication is a discipline that studies communication across different cultures and social groups or how culture affects communication. It describes the wide range of communication processes and problems that naturally appear within an organization or social context made up of individuals from different religious, social, ethnic, and educational backgrounds. In this sense, it seeks to understand how people from different countries and cultures act, communicate, and perceive the world around them (Lauring 2011).

The development of intercultural communication research in the United States and Europe since the late 1940s was confronted with the political and cultural demands of spreading Western culture abroad. Its academic foundation is rooted in Western social conditions and cultural traditions, and it has sometimes, knowingly or unknowingly, served as a tool for colonial assimilation of Indigenous groups and sparking Western curiosity. Moreover, in the field of intercultural communication, the dominance of English presents certain limitations. Researchers may tend to use English literature and data for analysis and argumentation, overlooking research resources and perspectives from other languages and cultures (Guo and Beckett 2007; Ives 2009; Kaplan 1993). Consequently, the results of intercultural communication studies may be more inclined to reflect the cultural characteristics and values of English-speaking countries. This partiality can lead to research outcomes that fail to comprehensively and objectively reflect the diversity and complexity of global cultures.

As a result, some scholars proposed the approach of indigenization in their studies of intercultural communication. Indigenization refers to the process of making the discipline sensitive to cultural nuances and social reality. Specifically, it is a process of using the Western social science system as a reference and overcoming its limitations from an Indigenous perspective to adapt to local realities and solve local problems (Alatas 1993). The background of this approach was the structural dominance of the West in social sciences since modern times. Most of the theories and methodologies in social sciences were based on Western knowledge systems, which restricted the independent knowledge production and expression of non-Western countries. Boroujerdi (2002) pointed out that the indigenization movement of social sciences began to gain momentum in the late 1970s as a postcolonial phenomenon. Related studies by Kim (2010), Chang et al. (2006), and Miike (2006) have discussed the uniqueness of Asian cultures and the indigenization of intercultural communication studies in Asia.

The Indigenous studies discussed here are different from the indigenization of a discipline. Indigenization emphasizes the use of Western knowledge as a frame of reference and the modification of Western knowledge from an Indigenous perspective to fit the local situation. In contrast, Indigenous studies stem from the "self-consciousness" of local researchers in practicing academic subjectivity and emphasize that knowledge is historical, contextual, and strategic. Therefore, Indigenous studies can uncover "knowledge strategies" that continuously create new concepts and adapt to changing environments. This leads to a knowledge system that effectively expresses the uniqueness and human values of Indigenous cultures while reconstructing their cultural identity (Lamaison and Bourdieu 1986). Existing Indigenous studies on intercultural communication mainly focus on the cultural conflicts between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in the modernization process, the cultural shock and adaptation of Indigenous people, etc. (Liddicoat 2009; Alexander et al. 2014; Mendoza and Kinefuchi 2016). This paper holds the view that for the vast majority of non-Western countries, Indigenous studies on intercultural communication are not simply "localization". Their ultimate aim is to reconstruct paradigms, research topics, and practical implications of intercultural communication to form a knowledge system with both local specificity and global universality. Specifically, first, it is necessary to avoid Orientalism in reverse, which means overlooking other cultural perspectives and rejecting dialogue with the Other out of ultra-nationalist sentiments. Second, the "cultural others", long oppressed and marginalized, are gradually stepping out of the margins and making efforts for self-expression and self-interpretation. Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in

non-Western countries should adopt a "global perspective". This involves connecting local cultural characteristics, research topics, theories, and methodologies with broader concepts like "human destiny" and the "global situation" to foster international mindedness. By embracing universal humanism, non-Western knowledge communities can engage in equal dialogue and pursue common progress with Western academia.

If indigenization is a process of integrating knowledge, then Indigenous studies are a process of generating new knowledge. As Jandt and Tanno (2001) proposed, the existence of cultural others stems from the power of Western colonizers to observe and express, and the inequality in the knowledge field stems from power inequality. According to Michel Foucault's power/knowledge theory, knowledge is not produced out of thin air. The construction of any knowledge system inherently contains power relations. In other words, the birth and dissemination of certain knowledge require real power as support to grant it legitimacy. Some scholars from non-Western countries have realized that the dominance of Western academic discourses is based on the political, economic, and technological advantages established by Western countries during the period of globalization (Mlambo 2006; Kim and Hubbard 2007; Demeter 2019). The global power imbalance between Western and non-Western societies has created "center-periphery" dynamics in the field of knowledge production within intercultural communication. This paper argues that drawing inspiration from Foucault's power/knowledge theory, Indigenous studies on intercultural communication should adapt to the changes in the global power structure, seize opportunities to improve and adjust, expand the production channels of Indigenous intercultural communication knowledge, and gradually get rid of the marginal status. Currently, the development of globalization and the evolution of communication technologies have resulted in a "dual structure" of global power where the international society and the world society coexist and develop together. In this framework, global and local contexts intersect through various media, shaping human interaction under the influence of cultural, political, economic, and other factors. This results in a complex trend where "centralization", "decentralization", "homogenization", and "hybridization" coexist within the global cultural landscape. Individuals, groups, organizations, and nations can reconstruct their identities through intercultural communication, expanding the space for exchanges between Western and non-Western knowledge systems. Given this reality, this paper proposes "knowledge strategies" for Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in non-Western countries. It also suggests expanding the significance of intercultural communication beyond everyday interactions and cultural exchanges to include community building as a crucial third dimension. This paper aims to introduce a fresh perspective to Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in non-Western countries. It seeks to foster equal dialogue between Western and non-Western knowledge systems in intercultural communication, enhancing inclusiveness and promoting humanistic awareness within the discipline.

2. The Dual Structure of Global Power: International Society and World Society

How non-Western countries conduct Indigenous studies on intercultural communication is a matter of how knowledge generates its influence. Traditionally, knowledge production and dissemination are considered to interact with power in three ways: knowledge is a means of acquiring power; power is a tool to hinder the pursuit of knowledge; knowledge is a means to resist power (Shiner 1982; Bevir 1999). However, Foucault presents an alternative view from these three perspectives, which considers knowledge as an autonomous entity. Foucault argues for a state of perpetual contingency, including within knowledge itself. Knowledge constantly flows in history, and the development of all branches of knowledge in the humanities is closely related to the exercise of power. From the perspective of power, power necessitates the creation of knowledge to legitimize itself and influence individuals' thoughts and actions. Otherwise, it cannot effectively discipline individuals. From the perspective of knowledge, the structure of knowledge must conform to specific power relations by assimilating and revising pertinent content. Otherwise, the

knowledge risks losing its ability to convincingly explain reality, may not endure or be transmitted, and could become "marginalized" (Foucault 1995; Driver 1985; Miller 1990).

Thus, within the framework of the power/knowledge theory, knowledge is neither absolute nor independent. Any knowledge could be obscured, distorted, or eliminated by other knowledge, or it could be accepted as "truth" by the public. The key is to examine the power struggles behind the contestation of knowledge and the specific power structures of different periods. In other words, researchers from non-Western countries should always study the production of knowledge under the context of specific global power structures. Global power structures refer to the distribution of political, economic, and military influence among nations on a global scale. It involves understanding which countries possess dominant positions while considering factors like alliances, economic strength, and military capabilities (Caporaso 1978; Barnett and Duvall 2005). Existing research has highlighted the link between Western dominance in knowledge production and global power structures. The connection validates the power/knowledge theory and illustrates the competition between knowledge systems of different countries. For example, Engerman (2007), an international history scholar, explores how the production of knowledge contributed to the expansion of US global interests. He argues that many American disciplines and research areas, such as political science, sociology, and area studies, served to bolster America's global power. The desire to win the Cold War stimulated the development of several disciplines. Additionally, Engerman points out that three concepts—the calorie, the demographic transition, and gross national product (GNP)—had far-reaching but almost hidden impacts. It was through the relentless promotion of these concepts by Americans that the US indoctrinated the modern world with American values. This indoctrination influenced the development philosophies of developing countries, leading them to gradually abandon their local characteristics in favor of American-style ideas and submit to the US-led power order.

The rise of intercultural communication in the United States was a result of post-WWII global power shifts and Western countries' global expansion. After the war, the U.S. established overseas bases in many regions and urgently needed to understand the cultural conditions of various countries. In 1946, the U.S. Congress passed the Foreign Service Act, establishing the Foreign Service Institute under the Department of State to provide language and cultural training for American diplomats. Some scholars believe this marked the formal beginning of intercultural communication studies (Leeds-Hurwitz 1990; Moon 1996; Baldwin 2017). For a long time, intercultural communication knowledge served the expansionist needs of Western countries. From the perspective of the power/knowledge theory, from the end of WWII to the era of globalization, Western countries' structural advantage in global power structures positioned them at the "center" of the field of intercultural communication, constructing the "authority" of Western intercultural communication discourse (Sorrells 2010; Jordan 2009). It must be noted that this "authority" often came at the cost of suppressing the cultural experiences and theoretical traditions of non-Western countries. Constrained by this power inequality, intellectual elites in non-Western countries were long suppressed and rendered voiceless, unable to articulate their own cultural characteristics. This led to the exclusion of research rooted in local academic traditions from their own perspectives.

The legitimacy of the "authority" of Western intercultural communication knowledge is supported by the traditional global power structure, where Western countries occupy the center while non-Western countries are marginalized. With the end of the Cold War and global economic integration, some non-Western countries have modernized and begun to emerge in global technology, trade, and finance. Meanwhile, traditional Western powers continue to consolidate their authority in various ways, and interdependence between countries has become increasingly evident. Western and non-Western countries are no longer the oppressors and the oppressed. They participate in multifaceted communication, cooperation, and confrontation in political, economic, and cultural fields (Muzaffar et al. 2017; Cooper and Flemes 2013). Therefore, the current global power structure cannot be

simplistically described as "center-periphery". Increasingly close interactions among multiple actors lead to a new global power structure. Drawing on discussions in international relations, this paper identifies the current global power structure as a "dual structure" of international society and world society.

In the international society, states are the primary actors with a relatively centralized authority as traditional great powers use international norms to allocate benefits and provide a hierarchical order from the top down (Watson 1987). Interactions in the international society are primarily "superficial", based on the maximization of self-interests, combining knowledge systems like evolutionism, racism, and colonialism with transnational capital expansion to create unidirectional and unequal relations. As a result, Western culture has dominated global cultural homogenization as a "universal" force (Linklater 2010; Rosow 1990).

The world society, as a result of globalization and the expansion of modernity, features more diverse actors who continuously reconstruct global economic, political, and cultural orders through frequent interactions and interdependence, forming an egalitarian order from the bottom up (Buzan 2018). To some extent, the world society represents the ideal development model of the international society, where various actors share more common cultural elements, oppose exclusive cultural boundaries, and reject fixed cultural identities. Interactions in the world society are "deep", and characterized by coexistence and mutual engagement. The global flow of people, capital, services, and popular culture, along with the emergence of multicultural organizations, enterprises, and labor forces, drives the development of globality and leads to the "deterritorialization", "reterritorialization", and "glocalization" of human interaction (Weinert 2020).

Especially in the cultural realm, the continuous development of digital communication technologies allows individuals to engage in virtual tourism, and the interactions between groups, organizations, and nations blur the difference between presence and absence, significantly transcending geopolitical, ethnic, and religious boundaries, promoting the democratization and popularization of global cultural power, and energizing various marginalized "subjects" within non-Western cultures and Western cultures. This fosters a super-diversity of interaction in the world society. For instance, French sociologist Frédéric Martel (2018) believes that the current cultural ecology of cyberspace exhibits characteristics of territorialization: "There are many globalized platforms but not as much globalized content . . . Far from a globalism without borders, the digital transition is not homogenization. Cultural and linguistic standardization must not be dreaded. On the contrary, the digital revolution appears as a territorialization and a fragmentation: the Internet is a 'territory'". This means that although American Internet giants like Google, Amazon, and Facebook provide monopolistic digital platforms for global cultural exchanges, the convergence of communication media does not lead to the Americanization of the cultural ecology in cyberspace. Instead, it creates multiple cultural domains within the digital realm, where people gather into diverse cultural communities based on languages, interests, opinions, and emotional connections. They produce, consume, and share cultural content they like. Local cultures, subcultures, and various other cultural expressions have emerged as significant forces. Furthermore, as more countries accelerate their digitalization processes and local digital platforms rise, offering information services and communication climates with more national cultural characteristics, the development of cultural and creative industries in different countries is stimulated, creating a pattern of "multidirectional flow" of global culture. Many scholars point out that the shifts in communication power relations caused by technological development allow non-Western cultures to achieve large-scale production and global consumption of local cultural symbols, challenging and potentially replacing Western influence (Jin 2017; Elkins 2019; Aguiar and Waldfogel 2021; Bourreau et al. 2022).

Therefore, it is essential to recognize that factors such as trade, capital flows, population migration, and the development of communication technologies have led to new forms of communities and the growth of global culture, collectively driving shifts in the global power structure. This transformation marks the progression from an international society

toward a world society. Intercultural communication will exist within this "dual structure", characterized by multidimensional interaction. New cultural forms that transcend national boundaries will continually emerge, bringing to light previously suppressed and obscured local cultures and subcultures through various information channels, resulting in unprecedented cultural diversity. From the perspective of power/knowledge theory, the "dual structure" implies that the local cultural experiences of non-Western countries have the potential to gradually move away from their marginalized positions, gaining ethical and academic value. The inability of Western intercultural communication academic discourse to objectively and comprehensively represent the Indigenous cultural experiences of non-Western countries creates a new knowledge vacuum. This presents an opportunity for researchers in non-Western countries. Indigenous studies on intercultural communication must generate new knowledge to adapt to the new global power structure. Researchers should expand their perspectives and scholarly attention to a global dimension, linking Indigenous conceptual resources and methodologies with a more open and diversified global cultural order. By doing so, they can fill the new knowledge vacuum and engage in equal dialogue with Western knowledge systems.

3. "Knowledge Strategies" for Indigenous Intercultural Communication Studies

Although Foucault's theory of power/knowledge explains the inseparable connection between knowledge production and power structures, he generally maintains a critical stance toward the interdependence of power and knowledge. Foucault posits that power is everywhere and can constrain subjects in various forms. As he states in his book: "In fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production" (Foucault 1995, p. 194). In light of this, it is important to reflect on the fact that individuals, particularly intellectuals, possess agency. Any transformation in the power structure can alter existing power relations, creating space for the discovery, production, and dissemination of new knowledge and ideas. Understanding this concept can help non-Western countries expand the scope of Indigenous studies on intercultural communication. The "knowledge strategies" discussed in this paper refer to the techniques of knowledge production that researchers employ to adapt to the new global power structure. These strategies underscore the academic agency that researchers wield in advocating their academic positions and upholding human ethics. They encompass both strategies for knowledge production and the mindset of the researcher.

In the global power structure, the development of the world society has made intercultural communication a widespread cultural practice in human interaction. Individuals, groups, organizations, and nations can use intercultural communication to reconstruct new identities, redefine relationships between themselves and others, and expand the space for sharing different types of knowledge (Çöteli 2019; Belamghari 2020; Salazar 2021). In other words, the development of the world society allows the cultural experiences and knowledge of non-Western countries to influence the West through extensive human interaction. This process gradually enables the integration of different cultures, overcoming their isolation. Within the human cultural system, Indigenous knowledge that indicates cultural differences coexists with universal morality and truth. Therefore, "knowledge strategies" for Indigenous studies should explore how to release the diverse and inherent value of Indigenous knowledge, as well as promote the integration and mutual conversion between Indigenous knowledge and the global knowledge system. From the perspective of the effects of knowledge, intercultural communication, as a discipline aiming to answer what kind of future human interaction will lead to, focuses on the "practicality, rationality, and nationality" of communication outcomes and information choices (Kuo and Chew 2010). Thus, the effectiveness of "knowledge strategies" for Indigenous studies in non-Western countries ultimately reflects in their ability to create relevant knowledge discourses that resist hegemonic discourses in the global power structure. Effective "knowledge strategies" will help form a "discourse power" that embodies academic autonomy and

cultural subjectivity, thereby contributing to public ethics of humankind, promoting the continuous development of the world society, and helping non-Western countries escape the fate of being represented and observed. In this context, the ability of non-Western academia to achieve "interconnections between Indigenous specificities" is the fundamental prerequisite for establishing equal dialogue with Western knowledge. Specifically, Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in non-Western countries should adopt the following approaches.

3.1. Developing Indigenous Theories Aligned with Public Ethics of Humankind

The dual structure of the global power landscape indicates the complex interactions among different countries, ethnicities, and organizations. Despite the growing global cultural exchanges, many actors struggle to transcend self-serving and profit-oriented mindsets, particularly in the realms of political and economic competition. Long-standing biases driven by power struggles, cultural differences, ideological conflicts, populism, and racism persist. Various global risks, such as pandemics, wars, and trade conflicts, continually undermine existing international norms, urgently necessitating the exploration of public solutions. Specifically, global risks challenge the integrity and coherence of traditional identities, requiring individuals and groups to clarify the boundaries between collective human interests and individual interests. This necessitates addressing differences in a holistic rather than fragmented manner, thereby facilitating cooperative coexistence.

Culture provides a crucial spiritual prescription for humanity to address these global risks. From a cultural perspective, there is an urgent need for public ethics to rebuild moral order, exert non-coercive control over hegemonic and irrational behaviors, and offer moral grounds for conflict containment and arbitration (Jonsen and Butler 1975). The development of public ethics of humankind stems from a collective vision of a better life. While Western culture's rationalist approach has contributed significantly to human modernization, it has also led to issues such as hegemony, alienation, and estrangement. In addition to Western culture, humanity also needs the Indigenous knowledge of non-Western countries, which has been marginalized over generations. Good elements of Indigenous knowledge that are conducive to understanding, friendship, inclusiveness, and psychological healing can contribute to the construction of the public ethics of humankind. The goal is to develop universal knowledge that describes the uniqueness of Indigenous cultures and their commonalities with other cultures. Ultimately, this will lead to Indigenous theories that are beneficial to the future of humanity and aligned with the public ethics of humankind. For example, the Confucian concept of "the Doctrine of the Mean" advocates for harmonious development between humans and nature, and among people. It emphasizes avoiding extremes to achieve inner equilibrium and maintaining moderation and balance in handling affairs. In the realm of ethics, this means that in policy-making and addressing social issues, one should fully consider and balance the interests of all parties to promote mutual benefit and avoid unilateralism (Tu 1996; Cheung et al. 2003; Qin 2024). In today's increasingly globalized world, this Indigenous Chinese thought is significant for fostering mutual understanding among different cultures, countries, and ethnic groups. It may provide valuable insights for the development of Indigenous theories in intercultural communication.

3.2. Studying the Indigenous Knowledge from Other Non-Western Countries

The dual structure of the global power landscape facilitates the bidirectional examination of knowledge systems from different countries. Existing literature from postcolonial and linguistic research fields (Akena 2012; Canagarajah 2002) indicates that the long-standing dominance of Western knowledge has led to a tendency for non-Western scholars to adopt Western theories, paradigms, and evaluation standards. This imitation often results in neglecting the Indigenous knowledge of other non-Western countries, causing non-Western knowledge systems to remain isolated and disconnected from each other. Over time, this isolation stifles the vitality of non-Western knowledge, hindering its evolution and progress, and leading to further marginalization. Therefore, researchers in intercultural

communication from non-Western countries must not overlook the Indigenous knowledge from other non-Western countries. They should focus on the historical and contemporary impacts of Western influence on these countries, examine the suppressed cultural autonomy of other non-Western nations, and consider the shared destinies of non-Western cultures as a critical issue. The production of knowledge will help foster communication and understanding among non-Western knowledge systems.

This approach aligns with the concept of "cultural self-awareness" proposed by Chinese sociologist Xiaotong Fei (2016). It underscores the importance of understanding one's own culture while also appreciating and respecting the diverse cultures encountered, including recognizing the historical and contemporary contributions of the non-western humanities. This approach helps individuals establish their position in a multicultural world. In essence, true global recognition of non-Western intellectual resources can only come through their comprehensive and diverse revitalization, which offers meaningful contributions of scientific, universal, and imaginative knowledge. From a practical standpoint, non-Western countries' understanding of each other's Indigenous knowledge relies on various forms of grassroots cultural exchange. Art groups, academic organizations, and NGOs can organize events such as art performances, academic exchanges, and volunteer services, providing opportunities for people from different countries to connect and learn about each other. For instance, in academic exchanges, it is crucial to establish an "academic community" for intercultural communication research among non-Western countries. Hosting international seminars and lectures and inviting experts from non-Western countries to explore specific topics in detail helps build mutual understanding and advance research on each other's Indigenous knowledge within the non-Western academic community.

3.3. Guarding Against Self-Centered Academic Attitudes

Researchers should recognize that every culture is a component of world culture. Non-Western intercultural communication researchers must carefully manage the relationship between the Self and the Other, guarding against self-centered research attitudes and avoiding an "Asiacentric" or "local-centric" stance. Both Western and non-Western societies have demonstrated that self-centeredness in academic research can result in biased outcomes that may exacerbate conflict and division in practice (Furumizo 2005).

To have the appropriate research mindset, researchers must first cultivate self-reflection. This involves continuously examining the characteristics and limitations of their Indigenous cultural experiences. The prerequisite for this is a collective reflection on the cultural experiences and intercultural communication practices of their own country and ethnicity to identify problems within the context of the global power structure. This helps non-Western researchers clarify the connection between national capability and the legitimacy of knowledge, offering insights into the optimal scenario for intercultural communication studies in non-Western countries. Moreover, intercultural communication studies are intrinsically interdisciplinary. The foundational framework of intercultural communication is built on the academic achievements of various disciplines. Therefore, non-Western intercultural communication scholars need to engage further in dialogue with other disciplines, constantly updating their knowledge structures. This approach will deepen their understanding of intercultural communication issues and help them avoid making premature or overly confident theoretical assertions. For instance, fields such as linguistics and translation studies can help identify cognitive biases and misunderstandings in intercultural communication, often caused by overlooking or misinterpreting linguistic and cultural differences. By examining how language relates to cognition, intercultural communication research can reveal the cognitive traits and needs of different cultural groups. This perspective helps avoid cultural stereotypes and promotes a more nuanced and rational approach to understanding intercultural differences.

4. The "Three Levels" of Intercultural Communication

According to the power/knowledge theory, knowledge is a product of specific periods and historical contexts. The transformation of macro power structures is highly complex, involving the interplay of different interest groups and factors such as the invention and application of new technologies. Consequently, changes in power structures inevitably lead to new political, economic, and cultural patterns, the emergence of new social relationships, and even the gradual formation of new social and demographic structures. These transformations create new knowledge vacuums that urgently need to be filled by researchers with new knowledge. The continuous development of any discipline is partly driven by the renewal and supplementation of research topics. To date, academic discussions about the definition of intercultural communication have primarily focused on the historical development of the international society. Intercultural communication and research topics are limited to two interrelated levels: daily communication and cultural interaction. However, the dual structure discussed in this paper offers a third level of intercultural communication: community building. This level encompasses the flow and integration of global cultural elements, where increasingly diverse intercultural communication actors not only engage in extensive and frequent daily communication and cultural interaction but also potentially overcome cultural boundaries to construct a shared global cultural community. The "knowledge strategies" of Indigenous studies in non-Western countries, when integrated with the three levels mentioned above, help to expand the problem awareness in intercultural communication and develop more pathways for sharing Indigenous cultural experiences and values. This, in turn, promotes mutual understanding between Western and non-Western cultures.

4.1. Daily Interaction

Daily interaction reflects the most authentic characteristics of a culture, showcasing the customs and worldviews of different cultural entities. As a discipline that initially served diplomatic affairs, the traditional topics of intercultural communication have primarily focused on daily interaction, such as translation, commerce, tourism, advertising, education, and psychotherapy. It also encompasses the major theories developed over the years in Western intercultural communication research, including cultural shock and adaptation, identity negotiation, communication networks, and intercultural competence (van der Zee and van Oudenhoven 2013; Toomey 2005).

In the dual structure, the ongoing advancement of digital communication technologies has bridged the gap between different cultures, infusing daily interaction of intercultural communication with more complex cultural conflicts. Researchers can draw on Indigenous studies in anthropology and employ relatively detailed technical analysis methods at the micro-level. By engaging with various online platforms, they can read and experience the emotions expressed in daily interactions across different cultures. A highly valuable topic is how daily interaction among individuals and groups reconstructs an Indigenous culture in the digital communication era. This involves examining how everyday bricolage redefines and enriches Indigenous culture with new meanings, and how Indigenous culture evolves toward creolization or hybridization in response to external influences and environmental changes. This process involves both the resistance of Indigenous specificities to external influences and the integration of Indigenous universality with external perspectives. At the same time, the continuously evolving digital communication technologies provide a platform for exporting the Indigenous cultural experiences of non-Western countries. Ordinary people or media organizations can use short videos to share local cultural customs in the form of everyday entertainment or storytelling, subtly promoting Indigenous cultural experiences.

4.2. Cultural Interaction

Intercultural communication at the level of cultural interaction involves the collision of different cultural systems, encompassing the history of Western colonialism and the

resistance of colonized countries (R'boul 2020). It reflects the historical process of humanity transitioning from an international society to a world society. Topics at this level are vast and complex, involving the spread of Western culture, particularly consumer culture, and the protection of non-Western cultural diversity. It also includes the impact of global racism and populism on nation-building and cultural security, the effects of global cultural homogenization on non-Western cultures and global cultural order, the reconstruction of Western culture through the rebellious and diverse nature of postmodern culture, and the expansion or contraction of the "middle ground" between the center and periphery in the global cultural landscape. The human interaction at this level, along with the underlying power dynamics, attracts the attention of numerous fields, including humanities, social sciences, and political science.

Within the dual structure, the cultural hegemony of the international society persists. Meanwhile, the cultural pluralism of the world society provides a theoretical foundation for deconstructing cultural hegemony. However, it also leads to an unprecedentedly complex cultural ecology in a country, with the emergence of various subcultures challenging national and ethnic cultural traditions (Clarke et al. 2017). For non-Western countries, efforts in Indigenous studies on intercultural communication at this level must focus not only on the traditional topic of cultural conflicts but also on the major issue of preserving and perpetuating national and ethnic cultural traditions. This requires an in-depth exploration of the continuation and transmission of cultural heritage, safeguarding the public's admiration for, emotional connection to, and identification with their Indigenous culture. At the cultural exchange level, non-Western countries can promote their Indigenous cultural experiences by developing clear strategies of cultural diplomacy. This can involve organizing cultural festivals, art exhibitions, film screenings, academic lectures, and other cultural exchange activities. The goal is to preserve and highlight the uniqueness and value of their own cultures, avoiding cultural homogenization. By showcasing the appeal of their Indigenous cultures, they can attract attention and gain recognition from the international community.

4.3. Community Building

With the development of multidirectional global cultural communication models, the humanistic essence of non-Western countries can gradually achieve global dissemination. The gradual integration of Western and non-Western cultures allows different cultural entities to achieve emotional resonance through intercultural communication. The concept of community building implies altering the global cultural order from being Western-dominated and exclusive to one where diverse cultural entities can coexist (Parekh 2001; Reus-Smit 2017). The French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre argued that the concepts of the Self and the Other, when considered in isolation, lack significance. This means that the Self cannot exist independently and that subjectivity cannot awaken without the presence of the Other. Emphasizing subjectivity while isolating the Self from the Other also creates a binary opposition. The existence of the world society in the dual structure can be understood as the concurrent progress of Indigenous subjectivity and intersubjectivity.

Therefore, for non-Western intercultural communication scholars, a key task in Indigenous studies is to grasp the complexity and interconnectedness of human interaction. This involves curbing the divisiveness and conflicts caused by various forms of self-centeredness, promoting the establishment of a reciprocal order of communication between entities, and guiding the global cultural landscape toward balance and sustainability. To establish a reciprocal order of communication between entities, researchers must explore and cultivate certain common beliefs, such as the public ethics of humankind, from the perspective of human civilization. These common beliefs should be developed into beneficial universal knowledge, broadening the commonality and publicness of humanity as a whole. Non-Western countries can enhance their support for cultural innovation by improving cultural policies and promoting the development of cultural industries. By encouraging artists and institutions to create more innovative and influential cultural products, these efforts can

showcase the modernity and vitality of Indigenous cultures. Such products can spread universal values like peace, development, cooperation, and mutual benefit, contributing to the construction and internalization of the public ethics of humankind.

5. Conclusions

Based on Foucault's power/knowledge theory, this paper connects the production of intercultural communication knowledge with the shifts in the global power structure, providing potential pathways for Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in non-Western countries. The aim is to stimulate new discussions and unleash the Indigenous academia's capacity for innovation. The paper proposes that, within the dual structure of international society and world society, "knowledge strategies" for Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in non-Western countries should include actively developing Indigenous theories that contribute positively to the future of humanity and align with public ethics. Additionally, it advocates comprehensive studies of other non-Western cultures to prevent cultural isolation among them, while promoting an inclusive academic mindset that avoids self-centeredness and respects the knowledge of the Other. Additionally, the paper suggests that under the dual structure, the levels of intercultural communication should include not only daily interaction and cultural interaction but also community building. Each level requires scholars to identify new topics, linking local issues with global situations to expand the scope of intercultural communication. As an academic field that seeks to address how different cultures interact and what kind of future humanity is heading toward, the essence or "core" of intercultural communication studies, as Larry Samovar has stated, lies in its "pragmatic, philosophical, and ethical" approach, focusing on communication effects and information selection. Utilizing this understanding to explore the effectiveness of "knowledge strategies" in Indigenous studies is not merely about revealing the exclusive boundaries, imbalances, and power relations in human interactions. Ultimately, it must manifest in whether it can uncover a "countervailing force" strong enough to resist external hegemony and dominant discourses, addressing the relationship between local specificity and the universality of Western and global cultures.

The paper reflects on Foucault's denial of individual agency, arguing that intellectuals possess subjective agency within the changing global power structure. By creating and documenting knowledge and employing appropriate "knowledge strategies", they can fill the knowledge vacuum created by shifts in the global power structure. In the context of Indigenous studies on intercultural communication in non-Western countries, the "knowledge strategies" should embody the unique will, demands, and creativity of non-Western cultures. These strategies must transcend self-centeredness to produce knowledge that enhances global order and serves common human interests. They should also offer practical diagnoses and action plans for all levels of intercultural communication. Furthermore, there is a need to transform Indigenous knowledge, originally rooted in self-interest, into universal knowledge, and to integrate and disseminate this knowledge effectively within the global knowledge system. Given the complexity and uncertainty of global situations, non-Western intercultural communication researchers must conduct thorough investigations to explore overlooked variables and potential factors. This approach aims to reveal authentic aspects of Indigenous, the Other's, and global cultures, thereby generating new intellectual resources and theoretical tools for Indigenous studies.

Although not detailed in this paper, a very important issue is the methodology of intercultural communication studies. The development of social science theories has always been closely related to breakthroughs and transformations in methodology or research paradigms. For example, Western intercultural communication scholar Geert Hofstede used survey methods to gather the views of IBM employees to assess value differences across cultures. From a methodological perspective, his approach is Western-centric, with questionnaire designs primarily based on Western values and samples limited to IBM employees, which may have contributed to the Western-centered nature of his theory. There is significant room for innovation in methodology among researchers from non-

Western countries. For instance, adopting a multicultural perspective in research can help, which means considering the uniqueness and diversity of different cultures throughout the research process. By incorporating multiple cultural samples and cases, researchers can gain a more comprehensive understanding of the complexity and diversity of intercultural communication. Additionally, critical approaches, such as critical discourse analysis, are also valuable. These approaches require researchers to continuously reflect on their own cultural positions, biases, and assumptions to ensure the objectivity and fairness of their studies.

Amid the complex power struggles between international, regional, and organizational entities and the uncertainties brought about by various global risks, public ethics of humankind can provide hope of reciprocity and compossibility for more entities. Public ethics of humankind can also facilitate mutual understanding and expectations to stabilize and balance, thereby reinforcing shared expectations rooted in interests and costs. It also establishes a practical, impartial framework for fostering human cooperation and coexistence. In practical terms, the public ethics of humankind can help maintain balance among major actors. When dealing with conflicts where the cost of compromise is too high (such as nuclear deterrence or arms races), it aids in developing non-violent strategies and keeping actions within ethical boundaries, thereby limiting hegemonic or coercive behaviors and preventing "free-riding" that undermines cooperation and order. On a symbolic level, the public ethics of humankind can strengthen the expectation of "organic unity" among diverse actors, enhance their sense of connection, and build the cohesion and mutual trust needed to address global crises and avoid disorder. Therefore, this paper argues that in the future, researchers of Indigenous studies on intercultural communication should focus on how to construct public ethics of humankind through intercultural communication. This research topic also underscores the community-building level advocated in this paper. It emphasizes how non-Western countries can leverage intercultural communication to disseminate Indigenous cultural experiences and values, foster ongoing mutual understanding between Western and non-Western cultures, and utilize diverse media channels to enhance universal human aspirations for peace and unity. This approach aims to promote the development and widespread adoption of the public ethics of humankind.

References

Aguiar, Luis, and Joel Waldfogel. 2021. Platforms, power, and promotion: Evidence from Spotify playlists. *Journal of Industrial Economics* 69: 653–91. [CrossRef]

Akena, Francis Adyanga. 2012. Critical Analysis of the Production of Western Knowledge and Its Implications for Indigenous Knowledge and Decolonization. *Journal of Black Studies* 43: 599–619. [CrossRef]

Alatas, Syed Farid. 1993. On the Indigenization of Academic Discourse. *Alternatives* 18: 307–38. [CrossRef]

Alexander, Bryant Keith, Lily A. Arasaratnam, Roberto Avant-Mier, Aisha Durham, Lisa Flores, Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz, S. Lily Mendoza, John Oetzel, Joyce Osland, Yukio Tsuda, and et al. 2014. Defining and Communicating What "Intercultural" and "Intercultural Communication" Means to Us. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 7: 14–37. [CrossRef]

Baldwin, John. 2017. Murky waters: Histories of intercultural communication research. *Handbook of Intercultural Communication* 9: 19–43.

Barnett, Michael, and Raymond Duvall. 2005. Power in international politics. *International Organization* 59: 39–44. [CrossRef]

Belamghari, Mohamed. 2020. The fragmentation of identity formation in the age of glocalization. *SAGE Open* 10: 2158244020934877. [CrossRef]

Bevir, Mark. 1999. Foucault, Power, and Institutions. *Political Studies* 47: 345–59. [CrossRef]

Boroujerdi, Mehrzad. 2002. *Subduing Globalization: The Challenge of the Indigenization Movement*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 39–49.

Bourreau, Marc, François Moreau, and Patrik Wikström. 2022. Does digitization lead to the homogenization of cultural content? *Economic Inquiry* 60: 427–53. [CrossRef]

Buzan, Barry. 2018. Revising World society. *International Politics* 55: 138–39. [CrossRef]

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2002. Reconstructing Local Knowledge. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 1: 243–59.

Caporaso, James A. 1978. Dependence, dependency, and power in the global system: A structural and behavioral analysis. *International Organization* 32: 13–43. [CrossRef]

Chang, Hui-Ching, Rich Holt, and Lina Luo. 2006. Representing East Asians in intercultural communication textbooks: A select review. *The Review of Communication* 6: 312–28. [CrossRef]

Cheung, Tak-sing, Hoi-man Chan, Kin-man Chan, Ambrose Yeo-chi King, Chi-yue Chiu, and Chung-fang Yang. 2003. On Zhongyong rationality: The Confucian doctrine of the mean as a missing link between instrumental rationality and communicative rationality. *Asian Journal of Social Science* 31: 107–27. [CrossRef]

Clarke, John, Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson, and Brian Roberts. 2017. Subcultures, Cultures and Class. In *Cultural Criminology*. London: Routledge, pp. 47–116.

Cooper, Andrew F., and Daniel Flemes. 2013. Foreign policy strategies of emerging powers in a multipolar world: An introductory review. *Third World Quarterly* 34: 943–62. [CrossRef]

Çöteli, Sami. 2019. The impact of new media on the forms of culture: Digital identity and digital culture. *Journal of Communication and Media Technologies* 9: e201911. [CrossRef]

Demeter, Marton. 2019. Power relations in global knowledge production. A cultural/critical approach. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 15: 1–17. [CrossRef]

Driver, Felix. 1985. Power, Space, and the Body: A Critical Assessment of Foucault's Discipline and Punish. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 3: 425–46. [CrossRef]

Elkins, Evan. 2019. Algorithmic cosmopolitanism: On the global claims of digital entertainment platforms. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 36: 376–89. [CrossRef]

Engerman, David C. 2007. Bernath lecture: American knowledge and global power. *Diplomatic History* 31: 599–622. [CrossRef]

Fei. 2016. *Culture and Cultural Self-Consciousness*. Beijing: Qunyan Press, p. 5.

Foucault. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, p. 206.

Furumizo, Eiki. 2005. East meets West and West meets East: A comparison of Occidentalism and Orientalism. *Review of Communication* 5: 128–37. [CrossRef]

Guo, Yan, and Gulbahar H. Beckett. 2007. The Hegemony of English as a global language: Reclaiming local knowledge and culture in China. *Convergence* 40: 117–31.

Ives, Peter. 2009. Global English, Hegemony and Education: Lessons from Gramsci. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 41: 661–83. [CrossRef]

Jandt, Fred E., and Dolores V. Tanno. 2001. Decoding Domination, Encoding Self-Determination: Intercultural Communication Research Processes. *Howard Journal of Communications* 12: 119–35.

Jin, Dal Yong. 2017. Digital platform as a double-edged sword: How to interpret cultural flows in the platform era. *International Journal of Communication* 11: 3880–98.

Jonsen, Albert R., and Lewis H. Butler. 1975. Public ethics and policy making. *Hastings Center Report* 5: 19–31. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Jordan, Kurt A. 2009. Colonies, colonialism, and cultural entanglement: The archaeology of postcolumbian intercultural relations. In *International Handbook of Historical Archaeology*. New York: Springer, pp. 31–49.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1993. The hegemony of English in science and technology. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 14: 151–72. [CrossRef]

Kim, Min-Sun. 2010. Intercultural communication in Asia: Current state and future prospects. *Asian Journal of Communication* 20: 166–80. [CrossRef]

Kim, Min-Sun, and Amy S. Ebesu Hubbard. 2007. Intercultural Communication in the Global Village: How to Understand "The Other". *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 36: 223–35. [CrossRef]

Kuo, Eddie CY, and Han Ei Chew. 2010. Beyond ethnocentrism in communication theory: Towards a culture-centric approach. In *De-Westernizing Communication Research*. London: Routledge, pp. 172–88.

Lamaison, Pierre, and Pierre Bourdieu. 1986. From Rules to Strategies: An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu. *Cultural Anthropology* 1: 112–13. [CrossRef]

Lauring, Jakob. 2011. Intercultural Organizational Communication: The Social Organizing of Interaction in International Encounters. *The Journal of Business Communication* 3: 231–55. [CrossRef]

Leeds-Hurwitz, Wendy. 1990. Notes in the history of intercultural communication: The Foreign Service institute and the mandate for intercultural training. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76: 262–81. [CrossRef]

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2009. Communication as Culturally Contexted Practice: A View from Intercultural Communication. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 29: 115–33. [CrossRef]

Linklater, Andrew. 2010. The English School conception of international society: Reflections on Western and non-Western perspectives. *Ritsumeikan Annual Review of International Studies* 9: 1–13.

Martel. 2018. *Smart: The Digital Century*. New York: HarperCollins, p. 373.

Mendoza, S. Lily, and Etsuko Kinefuchi. 2016. Two stories, one vision: A plea for an ecological turn in intercultural communication. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 9: 275–94. [CrossRef]

Miike, Yoshitaka. 2006. Non-Western Theory in Western Research? An Asiacentric Agenda for Asian Communication Studies. *Review of Communication* 6: 4–31. [CrossRef]

Miller, Seumas. 1990. Foucault on discourse and power. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory* 76: 115–25.

Mlambo, Alois S. 2006. Western Social Sciences and Africa: The Domination and Marginalisation of a Continent. *African Sociological Review* 10: 161–79.

Moon, Dreama G. 1996. Concepts of "culture": Implications for intercultural communication research. *Communication Quarterly* 44: 70–84. [CrossRef]

Muzaffar, Muhammad, Zahid Yaseen, and Nazim Rahim. 2017. Changing dynamics of global politics: Transition from unipolar to multipolar world. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal* 1: 49–61. [CrossRef]

Parekh, Bhikhu. 2001. Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory. *Ethnicities* 1: 109–15. [CrossRef]

Qin, Yaqing. 2024. The Zhongyong Dialectic: A Bridge into the Relational World. *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 17: 206–21. [CrossRef]

R'boul, Hamza. 2020. Postcolonial interventions in intercultural communication knowledge: Meta-intercultural ontologies, decolonial knowledges and epistemological polylogue. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 15: 75–93. [CrossRef]

Reus-Smit, Christian. 2017. Cultural diversity and international order. *International Organization* 71: 851–85. [CrossRef]

Rosow, Stephen J. 1990. The forms of internationalization: Representation of Western culture on a global scale. *Alternatives* 15: 287–301. [CrossRef]

Salazar, Noel B. 2021. Post-national belongings, cosmopolitan becomings and mediating mobilities. *Journal of Sociology* 57: 165–76. [CrossRef]

Shiner, Larry. 1982. Reading Foucault: Anti-method and the genealogy of power-knowledge. *History and Theory* 21: 382–98. [CrossRef]

Sorrells, Kathryn. 2010. Re-Imagining Intercultural Communication in the Context of Globalization. In *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell Pub, pp. 171–89.

Sun. 2015. *Intercultural Communication: Global and Indigenous Perspectives*. Beijing: Peking University Press, pp. 4–8.

Toomey. 2005. Identity negotiation theory: Crossing cultural boundaries. In *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication*. California: SAGE, p. 387.

Tu, Wei-Ming. 1996. Confucian traditions in East Asian modernity. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 50: 12–39.

van der Zee, Karen, and Jan Pieter van Oudenhoven. 2013. Culture Shock or Challenge? The Role of Personality as a Determinant of Intercultural Competence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 44: 928–40. [CrossRef]

Watson, Adam. 1987. Hedley Bull, states systems and international societies. *Review of International Studies* 13: 147–53. [CrossRef]

Weinert, Matthew S. 2020. World Society and the Globality of IR. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 33: 480–82. [CrossRef]