

The Interpretive Approach in the Sociology of Communication

Prof. Dr. Seham Ahmed Al-Azab¹

¹ Department of Sociology and Social Work, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Prof. Dr. Seham Ahmed Al-Azab, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. E-mail: Selazab@kau.edu.sa

Received: August 30, 2024

Accepted: January 15, 2025

Online Published: January 31, 2025

doi:10.5539/ass.v21n1p13

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v21n1p13>

Abstract

The interpretative approach emphasizes the importance of understanding the subjective meanings individuals attribute to communication, rather than focusing solely on objective factors. The article highlights the understanding of human communication through various interpretative methodologies, including symbolic interactionism, ethnography, and ethnomethodology, on several issues, including the main goal, the position of the researcher and the methodological basis, the ontology of communication, the epistemology of communication, the axiology of communication, and finally, the process of interpretation of communication.

Keywords: interpretive, ontology, epistemology, axiology, interpretation

1. Introduction

The interpretative approach examines the world's relativity, viewing truth as subjective and created by participants. Researchers focus on realism in observing conclusions to achieve objectivity. This approach emphasizes the importance of values in the interpretation process and their relevance to all topics. Interpreters prioritize rich, and deep descriptions of people over control of experience and generalizations derived from shared observations and experiences, highlighting the individual situation. The interpretative approach emerged as a reaction to the positive approach as the main alternative method of research in the social sciences. In short, researchers and scientists with an interpretative orientation, view the world from the premise that there are multiple ways to look at or interpret a problem the characteristics of individuals affect how they see the world or interpret their experience, and that all truth or knowledge is context-related (i.e., context-related knowledge) (Adu, n.d.). Since the 1960s, many interpretive views have emerged that differ in their vision of a range of anthropological, cognitive, political, and ethical issues, mainly the degree to which there is an external "objective reality" to which social researchers can access and interpret reality. There is a controversy between two points of view in this context. The first view is that the explanatory vision has become selective and that the differences between them are so profound that the qualitative analysis they tend to favor is not linked to the theoretical assumptions with which it was associated. From this point of view, the qualitative analysis is no longer more than an invitation to a group of disparate scientists who find themselves under the explanatory umbrella. The second point of view is that, despite the various forms of interpretation now taking place and the profound differences between them, they in essence continue to share a common interest in human action and to build the meaning and effectiveness of social actors. Everyone shares an interest in knowledge about the social world from within (Pawluch, 2005). Taking the second view, the present study will briefly attempt to define the general vision of the interpretative approach as follows:

1.1 Objective

The interpretative approach seeks "to provide sociological reasons for something to happen. For example, to explain the growing trend of parents towards foreign education in a given society by wanting children to have a good job. The interpretative approach regards the truth as subjective and has been co-founded by the participants" (Abdel-Gawad, 2002).

1.2 The Position of the Researcher and the Methodological Basis

According to the interpretive approach, "the researcher must be far from positivistic scientific attempts because social life is nothing like nature" (Jones, 1993). The interpretive researcher is one of the participants in the research process, and therefore the focus is on objectivity. In this approach, it is less than in the positivist

approach because complete objectivity is seen as impossible. However, this does not mean that research under this approach should rely entirely on what participants say without external judgment by the researcher. Therefore, many methodologists suggest the importance of the researcher ensuring accurate realism in this approach. The interpretive methodology depends on understanding, where the individual puts himself in the place of the actors, and the theories explaining this behavior are determined. The situation lies in the actions of the individuals, and the interpretation is based on the researcher being part of the situation. Therefore, he is unable to understand the reasons for performing the behavior (Jones, 1993). The interpretive approach includes three basic methodologies, including symbolic interactionism (the use of understanding *Verstehen*), the unstandardized interview, and the ethnographic methodology. This interpretive model has been linked to the unstandardized qualitative approaches that include studies based on participatory observation. Observation and in-depth interviews, and its focus is on allowing participants to provide an interpretation of their world using their own words” (Galabi, 2013), and the ethnomethodological methodology (interpretation of understanding) and one of its most important tools is conversation analysis.

1.3 Communication Method

Language is the primary means of communication in the interpretive approach. It is the tool through which meanings can be determined, and so to sympathize with the participants, it is important to allow them to express their meanings in the way they are accustomed to through their language (Galabi, 2013).

1.4 Ontology

Ontology is the science of studying existence and non-existence, or, in other words, the study of reality. The word ontology comes from the Greek language and means the science of ontology or the general principles of existence. It is a branch of metaphysics related to the nature and relationships of existence and under which problems of the nature of existence are investigated. It is called the first philosophy because determining the nature of existence is the basis for the existence of philosophy, and ontology often revolves around certain questions about the amount of free will that people enjoy. According to the view of interpretive researchers, reality is the content accompanying social actors (Jones, 1993), so the behavior of the neighborhood is a product of how people interpret the world around them. Therefore, appropriate behavior is selected in light of people's definitions of the situations they experience. The task of the interpretive researcher in this context is to discover what exists in reality in terms of an orientation that allows individuals' freedom of choice. An interpretive researcher has a role in shaping reality with the research participants. In application to the field of communication, the interpretive researcher believes that values are relevant to the study of communication and that researchers need to be aware of their values and state them clearly to readers because values will naturally permeate the research. Interpretative researchers are not interested in issues such as control and generalization as much as they are interested in rich descriptions of the people under study, and for them, it is better to derive theory from the observations and experiences that the researcher shares with the respondents.

1.5 Epistemology

Epistemology (how things are known) Epistemology: Questions related to epistemology focus on how things are known, which is considered knowledge closely related to ontology. How a researcher sees the world, truth, and human nature affects the way they believe they should go about knowing these things. The explanatory interest is in understanding the actors' theories. Since, behavior is rooted in the realistic interpretations of the understanding actors, where the individual puts himself in the place of the actors and the theories explaining this behavior are determined, the situation lies in the action of the individuals, and the interpretation is based on the researcher, being part of the situation. Thus, he is unable to understand the reasons for performing the behavior (Jones, 1993). As an application to the field of communication in the interpretive tradition, the researcher will not be satisfied with his analysis of the conversations. For example, he may rather invite the participants in the conversation and re-read the texts of their conversations to express their opinion on the researcher's analysis or explain the reasons for their carrying out a certain behavior in a different way.

1.6 Axiology

It alludes to research into the nature of values, their types and standards, and the extent of recognition of how they influence them. According to the interpretive approach, there is a recognition of the influence of values on the entire research process. Values cannot be deleted from any part of theorizing or research. Because values are rooted in the culture of researchers, even if they are not aware of them (Richard, 2020).

1.7 Interpretation

The basis on which analysis and interpretation are based in this approach is based on the researchers'

understanding of the meanings with which the respondents or individuals interpret their lives and their achievements. Here, the meaning that the subjects give to their actions is the unit of observation and analysis with which the researcher is preoccupied, and here the researcher's subjectivity intervenes in understanding and interpreting these meanings that individuals give to their behaviors and actions (Bousahla, 2016). Finally, the structure of this research depends on a review of the interpretive methodology of communication at its three levels, which include the symbolic interactionist methodology, the ethnographic methodology, and the ethnomethodological methodology, which will be discussed in more detail as follows:

2. Firstly: The Methodology of Symbolic Interaction

2.1 Objective

The name symbolic interactionism was given to the vision that indicates the patterns of human activity whose elements are necessary for understanding social life. According to the symbolic interactionist approach, social life, cognitively, is human interaction through the use of symbols and signs. Therefore, this approach is concerned with two basic foundations: A: how humans use symbols for what they mean and for each other to communicate with each other. B: Explanations of the results of these symbols on the behavior of groups during the process of social interaction (Jones, 1993). Symbolic interactionists place primary importance on the social meanings that people give to the world around them. Symbolic interaction, according to Blumer (1979), is based on three basic premises:

- A. People act towards others and things based on the meanings that these things have for them. Thus, people do not simply respond to stimuli or act according to cultural scripts. It is the meaning that determines the action.
- B. Meanings are not inherent in things but are social products that arise during interaction. "The meaning of a thing for a person grows from how other people act towards the person about the thing." People learn how to see the world from other people. As social actors, we develop shared meanings for the things and people in our lives.
- C. Social actors attach meanings to situations, things, and themselves through the process of interpretation. This process has two distinct steps. First, the agent directs himself to the objects for which he must act; he must direct himself towards things that have meaning. Second, by the process of communicating with itself, interpretation becomes a matter of processing meanings. The agent selects, examines, comments, reassembles, and transforms meanings in light of the situation in which he is placed and the direction of his action.

2.2 The Position of the Researcher and the Methodological Basis

"The researcher, according to the symbolic interactionist approach, is part of the situation, and his interest is in what the interactants say in the interactive situation. Therefore, symbolic interactionists focus on direct interaction within the framework of daily life. The scientific methodology adopted by symbolic interactionism is based on understanding and analyzing social phenomena." Complex matters such as culture, class, structure, and institutions" (Al-Hassan, 2015), as symbols subject to evaluation by others in the context of the process of social interaction, that evaluation determines a specific value for these symbols based on which the extent of the continuity of the interaction process is determined or not. Furman Denzen in Zayed (1981) identified the methodological basis of symbolic interactionism in several methodological issues that we briefly summarize as follows:

- A. The researcher starts with the apparent behavior patterns and then tries to uncover the meanings that the actors give to these patterns, that is, linking the implicit (latent) behavior with the apparent behavior patterns.
- B. The researcher focuses on the self as a subject and a process and, at the same time, studies behavior from the point of view of the interactants in question while clarifying the transformation of the self through different meanings in different behavioral situations.
- C. The researcher moves from the psychological level to the social level by examining the symbols and meanings used by the individuals under research in social circles and broader social relations.
- D. Analysis of the elements of the situation (the actors as subjects, the characteristics of the interaction or the situation, the meanings that appear in the situation, and the time the interaction takes) are among the basic elements in the study because behavior appears within "situations" and the meaning given to these situations influences subsequent patterns of behavior.
- E. Research strategies should reflect the continuous and changing aspects of symbolic interaction.

2.3 Communication Method

Language is the primary means of communication in the symbolic interactionist approach, but conversation and gestures also play an important role, and we will briefly review each method as follows:

- A. **Language:** The main interest of the pioneers of the symbolic interactionist approach is communication that indicates meaning. Therefore, they pay most attention to language analysis, as language is the main engine of social communication, and its goal is to express meaning. Mead rejects the idea that language is a form of imitation, as almost all meanings that an individual seeks to express are available in the vocabulary of most languages (Abdel-Gawad, 2002). The interactive approach indicates that individuals interact with each other through language, and through it, they can express approval or rejection of many issues. For individuals to become able to interact with others, they must develop the ability to dialogue and interact between them (Jenkins, 2002). This concept of language as a social construct highlights the importance of communication and shared understanding among individuals. It emphasizes the role of context and interpretation in shaping the meanings of words. The process of communication through language is one of the forms of symbolic interaction, and the use of symbols represents a revolution in the human ability to communicate with other members of society and a means of increasing the ability to convey feelings, inclinations, and trends among members of society. Mead was interested in studying the relationship between language and upbringing. Humans can communicate and interact through symbols that carry socially agreed-upon meanings (Griffiths et al., 2015).
- B. **Conversation:** Symbolic interaction is essentially an approach within sociology, focusing on how people form meaning and structure through conversation. The concept of the self as a social being among symbolic interactionists is based on the basic principle that when people interact with each other over time, they share certain meanings and actions and thus understand events in certain similar ways. Society itself emerges from interconnected conversations between individuals. Symbolic interactionists believe that communicators do not only interact with others and social objects; they also communicate with themselves; they conduct self-conversations as part of the interaction process; and all people have conversations in their minds to distinguish between things and people (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009).
- C. **Gestures:** Mead believes that gestures are important mechanisms in social actions. The gesture is an aspect of the action taken. Language is a special transformation of gestures necessary for more complex forms of social life. The gesture indicates the future course of social action. Symbolic interaction using gestures involves interpreting another's situation and responding based on those interpretations. Each participant can imagine their actions from the other's point of view. Human communication processes involve continuous conscious adjustment to change the behavior of others through redefinition and reinterpretation. Thus, society is formed through symbols and the ability to pronounce these symbols. We can hear ourselves, and respond to ourselves as others respond to us. We can imagine what it would be like to receive our messages, and we can empathize with the listener and take on the role of listener, mentally complementing the other's response. Society, then, consists of a network of social interactions in which participants assign meaning to their actions and the actions of others through the use of symbols (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009).

2.4 Ontology

Charles Cooley, one of the pioneers of symbolic interactionism, defines communication as "that mechanism through which human relationships exist and mental symbols grow and develop using disseminating symbols across space and continuing them over time (Murghad, 2014). In one sense, it is a symbolic interaction itself, and thus it constitutes symbolic behavior that produces, to different degrees, common standards and values among the elements of the communicative process. According to Richard (2020), symbolic interactionism focuses on three themes linked to seven basic assumptions, as follows:

- A. **The importance of meanings for human behavior:** According to the symbolic interactionist approach, individuals are the ones who create meaning through the communication process. The goal of interaction is to create a shared meaning. Because without shared meaning, communication is very difficult, if not impossible. Meaning is an internal dialogue used to test alternatives, re-listen to actions, and anticipate reactions before responding (self-talk). According to Blumer, meanings arise from social interaction between people. They are not inherent in things because they do not pre-exist in a state of nature. Meaning is negotiated through the use of language (Griffin et al., 2009). Humans act towards others based on the meanings that others imagine about them. Meanings arise through the process of interaction that takes place between them, and modification of the meaning occurs based on an interpretive process by the individual.

- B. The importance of the concept of the self: According to Mead, the self is “the product of social processes, especially the process of communication between humans” (Mead, 2023). The self is a stable set of perceptions that people hold about themselves, and it is a product of the interaction between two factors; the internal psychological factor expresses the individual's privacy and unique personal characteristics, and the social factor, embodies the influences of the social structure surrounding the individual” (Al-Hassan, 2015).
- C. The relationship between the individual and society: It relates to the relationship between individual freedoms and social restrictions. Mead and Blumer took a middle position on this question, trying to explain both order and change in social processes. Suggestions regarding this phenomenon include:
- People and groups are affected by cultural and social processes.
 - Social construction is established through social interaction.

2.5 Epistemology

According to the symbolic interactionist approach, communication research is concerned with understanding the meaning in the interactive (communicative) situation in which language is used primarily as a means of communication. Therefore, the symbolic interactionist researcher is interested in what people say, and from this standpoint, interactional researchers have relied on many methods. Such as conversation analysis, participant observation, and the unstandardized interview, which is predominantly qualitative and is considered the most common method for those who follow the symbolic interactionist approach, provided that the interviewer takes care not to influence the behavior of the respondents. According to Goffman, it is more of an interaction than a dialogue between people who were close to each other before (Jones, 1993). The unstructured interview does not rely on tables of pre-prepared questions, and the interviewers do not proceed from specific assumptions; therefore, they cannot determine a list of questions in advance, nor are they necessarily equal in the meaning of the topics or the words used in formulating the short questions, i.e., the topics and vocabulary used may vary (Lune & Berg, 2017). According to Neuman (2003), field interviews do not have specific beginnings or endings, and the interview can be resumed at a later time. The questions and their order are determined by the people and situations. The interviewer shows interest in the responses and encourages details. The interviewer exchanges friendly conversations while asking more questions. It occurs with a group or with others and is interspersed with joking, stories, and diversions. In the recording process; open-ended questions are common, and surveys are frequent. The interviewer and the researcher participate in determining the speed and direction of the interview. The social context of the interview is noted, which is important for interpreting the meanings of the responses. The interviewer also tries to adapt to the criteria of the interviewee.

2.6 Axiology

George Herbert Mead's famous book entitled *Mind, Self, and Society* (Mead, 2015) reflects the three main concepts that represent what is worth knowing according to the symbolic interactionist approach, which:

- A. The self: As Mead sees it, it is an active element—not a passive, reciprocal one that receives things and responds to them according to motivation. The self is also defined by another concept, which is the individual, and this can appear through the mutual relationships between him and other individuals. Mead divides the self into two parts: the internal ego-actor (I) and the external ego-actor (Me). The ego is the positive, active, and creative part of the self, on the one hand. On the other hand, the object is the negative part that consists of the situations that are absorbed from our interaction with others (Henslin, 2007), and that the self refers to or includes personal feelings and attitudes that the individual derives from the opinions, judgments, positions, tendencies, evaluations, and perceptions of those around him and those interacting with him. Here an individual realizes the image of his feelings and attitudes through the visions of those surrounding him and those interacting with him. This image represents an image of himself. It determines the features of his psyche, and self-knowledge by the individual does not occur quickly or arbitrarily, but rather gradually, at different times, in situations of varying ease and difficulty, and through his continuous interaction with members of his family, colleagues, and friends, which then forms an interactive and social experience that emanates from the family in which the creator faces approval. And disapproval, praise, rejection, punishment, and reward from his parents during his interaction and behavior with them, which stimulates him to think about his behavior as acceptable, rejected, or unpalatable (Pawluch, 2005). Charles Cooley used the concept of the Looking Glass Self to describe how we form an impression of ourselves through the responses of others, and when the individual becomes aware of the negative part of himself (the object), he is then able to influence himself by controlling it, and in the language of Meade, “The individual becomes an object of himself (Abdel-Gawad, 2002).

- B. The mind: It is not a thing but a process. It is nothing more than an interaction with yourself. This ability, which develops along with the self, is essential to human life because it is part of every action. The mind involves hesitation (postponing overt action) as it interprets the situation, thinks about the situation, and plans future actions. A mentality to choose between possible alternatives, and when wanting to make certain decisions about how to act toward a social being, the individual creates something similar to an action plan, guided by the attitudes about the goal he wants to achieve. People's determination of the meanings of social objects, attitudes, and action plans does not occur in isolation from each other. Rather, it arises from interaction with others i.e., mentors who have a special influence on people's lives. These mentors may be present in our lives in the present or from the past, such as parents to whom we are emotionally and psychologically committed and who provide us with the general vocabulary and concepts that help us recognize how we are similar to or different from others. Thus, they help us get to know who we are as people, as a person's self-concept is nothing more than his plans for action towards himself, his identity, interests, rejections, goals, ideologies, and self-evaluations that constitute his fixed positions and serve as a frame of reference for judging things (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009).
- C. The Society: It consists of the cooperative behaviors of its members, and human cooperation requires understanding the intentions of others such as reading the actions and intentions of others and responding appropriately. This holistic approach to behavior recognizes the interconnectedness of various cognitive processes and emotional states. It emphasizes the importance of understanding the individual as a whole, rather than focusing solely on isolated behaviors or stimuli.

Action in its simplest form includes a relationship of three parts: an initial gesture from an individual., a response to that gesture by another, and a result. The result is what the action means to the communicators, and the meaning does not lie only in any of these things but in the tripartite relationship of all of these things. The combination of these two factors (psychological and social factors) with each other is what constitutes the individual's social self. As for the social origins of the self, it is the gradual growth of the individual's abilities since childhood to occupy functional roles and evaluate these roles through their evaluation by others. Here, language, which is the means of communication between individuals, becomes a symbol. Because it affects one individual as well as others (Al-Hassan, 2015).

2.7 Interpretation

Symbolic interactionism helps researchers in the field of sociology of communication and media understand the field better because of the important role that the media plays in creating and disseminating shared symbols on one hand. On the other hand, the power of the media enables it to build symbols on its own. Using a symbolic interactionist approach, researchers can consider how media influences the shared symbols of society and, in turn, the impact of these symbols on the individual (Jansson-Boyd, 2019). This approach emphasizes the role of symbols, gestures, and language in shaping our understanding of social interactions and relationships. By focusing on how individuals create and interpret symbols, symbolic interactionism offers valuable insights into the complexities of communication dynamics. This is what Charles Cooley called "the individual self in the social mirror." What he means is that the individual obtains an image of himself through what others around him portray of him, through their view of him (not his physical appearance) but rather his behavior, thinking relationships, and attitudes. He does not think. He perceives his actions and attitudes as negative or positive. Rather, he obtains them from others' judgments of him, so that this image is activated in his memory and forms the impressions of those around him and those interacting with him (Pawluch, 2005). Light Jrand Keller (1975) pointed out that assuming or imagining others' attitudes toward us or to ourselves, according to Cooley, takes three levels:

- A. We imagine how we present ourselves to others. In other words, we perceive how others view us.
- B. Then we imagine how others evaluate us and how we appear to them after they evaluate us.
- C. Finally, we develop a kind of feeling about ourselves in light of others' judgment and evaluation of us.

The process of analysis and interpretation in the context of the symbolic interactionist approach is based on using Verstehen's understanding to make the things surrounding a person have meaning. This requires understanding the interactive relationship in light of basic determinants that include interaction, roles, symbols, mental image, and situation, which can be understood according to the symbolic interactionist vision of George Herbert Mead in Al-Hassan (2015) as follows:

- A. Interaction occurs between individuals occupying certain roles over a period ranging from a week to a year.

- B. After the interaction process ends, the interacting individuals form mental symbolic images of the other individuals interacting with them. These images are a superficial impressionistic state linked to a specific period and do not reflect the essence or actual reality of the interactant.
- C. The symbolic image that a person forms of another, whether positive or negative, is what determines the nature of the interaction.
- D. The interacting person spreads his avatar of the interactor among other interactors, so they form positive or negative avatars based on the impression and not an expression of the person's reality and motives.
- E. The avatar of the person being evaluated has a rigid pattern that must be changed. When the person being evaluated learns of this image, he re-evaluates himself according to the avatar that others have created of him.
- F. The continuation of the interaction depends on the nature of the symbolic mental image that others have formed about it. If the symbolic image is positive, the interaction continues, and if it is negative, the interaction is interrupted or stopped.

This interpretation process acts as an intermediary between meanings or tendencies to push the individual towards acting in a certain way and determining the type of action itself. People continue to interpret and define things across different situations, and the structure of social organization is built through these activities. That is, activities produce specific social situations, groups, and societies. Taylor et al. (2015) explained the difference in words and actions between people for the following reasons:

1. People have different experiences and learn different social meanings. In addition, the race, gender, or class of participants may influence how participants view the situation and define each other.
2. People find themselves in different situations.
3. The process of interpretation is a dynamic one. The way a person interprets something depends on the meanings available and how a particular situation is guessed.

3. Secondly: The Methodology of Ethnography

3.1 Objective

Ethnography is the science of cultural description. It is an act of describing a cultural or social system or group to understand it from the point of view of its people and locals. Ethnographic research is usually used when researchers are interested in the nature, structure, and process of cultures, especially when they explore the cultural determinants of human behavior (Sarantakos, 2017). Ethnographic research aims to achieve an in-depth understanding of the way individuals belonging to different cultures and subcultures understand the meaning of the reality of their lives. The literal meaning of the word ethnography is to write about culture. Ethnographers go inside the social worlds of the people in their research community. Those outside the community observe and record the ongoing social lives of the members of that community by providing an intensive description of this social environment and the daily lives of the individuals who live in these places (Bibeer & Levy, 2011). Communication ethnography is one of the fields of ethnography that is concerned with studying the intertwined relationship between communication and culture. Within communication, the beliefs and value systems that makeup culture are built, and people create social structures that constitute the common style of their daily lives. When members of a community communicate, they display their own verbal and non-verbal elements of their society. While at the same time creating (and re-creating) the value systems that structure that society. The credit for its inception goes back to the linguistic anthropologist Dell Hymes in 1962 (Hymes, 1962). It was called the ethnography of speech, in which he followed the methodology of discourse analysis to determine the role of speech in human behavior through an attempt at a combination in which he combine the fields of linguistics and ethnography, and then renamed it as "An Ethnography of communication" in 1964 for a more explicit account of context-dependent non-vocal and non-verbal uses of communication. In 1992, Philipsen et al. (2005) expanded the field of communication ethnography by introducing speech codes theory (SCT), in which he presented a communication-based analytical framework designed to describe, explain, or predict cultural communication in the context of speech communities as an interpretive tool for answering questions. Questions about the existence of symbols, their content, methods of discovering them, and their social power over members of cultural societies as the study of symbols in the sense of describing sets of principles and rules by which different societies enact and interpret their ways of life (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009).

3.2 The Position of the Researcher and the Methodological Basis

Ethnographic research is based on the logic of understanding the social world of individuals from their point of view, and therefore it belongs to the qualitative approach. Hence, ethnographic work relies heavily on the

interpretive perspective, but it does not break with quantitative techniques, as researchers use them in some cases often to achieve an understanding of the society they are studying (Bibeer & Levy, 2011). Ethnographic research is an approach to constructing facts and deducing evidence from actual observation of the studied phenomenon. This approach requires the researcher to experience the field under study (Abdel-Gawad, 2002). Ethnographic field research requires the researcher to have two different types of tasks: First, entering a social environment and trying to get to know the people who live in it. The researcher participates in routine daily matters, develops ongoing relationships with members of the community over time, and observes everything that goes on in it moment by moment. Second, he records in an organized and systematic manner everything he observes and all the information he comes across while participating in the daily rounds of others. Thus, the researcher creates a written record in which observations and experiences accumulate (Emerson et al., 2010). The role of the ethnographic researcher revolves around recording all data through his participation in the daily life that the group is accustomed to and how they practice it. He tries to explore and describe the culture of a particular group of individuals. The ethnographic researcher integrates with the group under study as an active participant and then records his observations precisely and in detail. He watches and hears what is said and asks questions through formal and informal interviews. In addition, he collects all documents and information relevant to his research (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2019). Bibeer and Levy (2011) pointed out that the role of the ethnographic researcher fluctuates between several levels of participation, starting with the pure observer. The role requires that the identity of the researcher remain hidden, and the researcher does not interact with those individuals present in the research community but rather conducts his observations from afar.

A. The observer as a participant: Along the way of observation and participation, he moves towards creating an atmosphere of intimacy within the field of research. This role requires that he reveals himself as a researcher, but his participation is limited.

B. The observed participant: The observed participant fully contributes to the ongoing activities in the field of research and the personality of the researcher is known to members of the research community. The pure participant: the researcher fully engages with the members of the research community without them knowing that he is a researcher. He participates in a hidden way as an original member of that community.

Thus, ethnography is a research strategy in which the researcher studies an intact cultural group in a natural environment over a long period by collecting. It relies primarily on observation and interviews in collecting data, and the research process is flexible and usually develops according to the context in response to the living realities encountered in the field (Creswell, 2009).

3.3 Method of Communication

Speaking is a tool for identifying symbols such as Hymes (2013) presented it in Littlejohn et al. (2011) It is a descriptive framework for discovering, understanding, and describing patterns of communication in any culture. The framework is intended to provide an initial set of questions to guide the underlying discovery and accounting of a community's ways of life, as reflected and shaped by its way of communicating. Speaking is also a useful tool for making social and cultural comparisons. According to Hymes (2013), it consists of eight social units useful for describing patterns of communication and isolating cultural topics, as follows:

- Scene or setting: (physical arena and/or psychological setting)
- Participants: (people involved in interaction and relationships with each other).
- Ends: (the purposes and results of the interaction).
- Key: (the tone or way in which the call is issued).
- Instrumental tools: (communication channels or blogs).
- norms of interaction: (rules for how to behave).
- Interpretation: (rules for verifying what a particular behavior means).
- genre: (categories or types of speech, actions, and events).

3.4 Ontology

Ethnographic methodology is generally based on specific assumptions about the nature of the social world and how it should be studied, which were defined by Hammersley and Atkinson (2019) in Churton and Brown (2016) below:

A. Nature: Its meaning is that social research should aim to understand human behavior that occurs in a natural setting.

- B. Understanding: realizing that human actions are based on interpreting stimuli and incentives and interpreting responses that differ from physical objects, and therefore they require a special understanding for members of the research community.
- C. Discovery: Research is seen as being dedicated to exploring the nature of social phenomena and revealing their characteristics.

Littlejohn and Foss (2009) identified the basic assumptions of communication ethnography as follows:

- A. Members of society make communicative choices that go beyond the grammatical rules of the language. They determine their choices based on what is appropriate for their social and cultural contexts.
- B. People are users of symbols, and the special formation of symbols lies in the structures of social and cultural life.
- C. Communication is stereotyped. Although an individual's personality and personal idiosyncrasies can influence communication choices, much, if not most, human communication is socially structured, and people's daily lives include many communication sequences that are repeated across contexts during daily routines.
- D. Communication is differentiated according to the resources available to conduct communication, how communication is conducted, and how communication is established across different social and cultural contexts.
- E. Communication is a social product, and people bear the consequences of violations of normative structures defined by a particular society.
- F. Communication is strategic, and speakers can skillfully use verbal and non-verbal codes as cultural resources through which to achieve individual and group outcomes.
- G. Communication does not occur absolutely through culture or group. Because, as Hymes points out, speech communities are diverse organizations, people are free to circumvent, challenge, and revise patterns of communication.

3.5 Epistemology

Many methods are used in collecting ethnographic data, which are briefly presented below:

- A. Participation observation: Participatory observation is the primary means of collecting data, despite the presence of other forms of data that were also collected from the research site, such as documents, for example. Writing and analyzing field notes is one of the features (Bieber & Levy, 2011). Participant observation in social science has its roots in its adoption by anthropologists as part of ethnographic methodology. Angrosino (2005) pointed out two methodological approaches to ethnographic observation:

The first is the objective approach to ethnography or observation, which relates to positivist research, in which researchers claim that they can maintain objectivity and that they do not influence or interfere with the people or activities subject to observation. They adhere to strict rules that prevent researchers from biasing the data, and from their point of view, failure to adhere to this entails turning the researcher into a citizen, which negatively affects the credibility of the data.

The second is the postmodernist approach to ethnographic observation: It relates to approaches, such as construction social, etc., in which researchers are affected and influenced by the research environment and constitute a large part of it, and the objectivity of observation is neither useful nor desirable, as the researcher is part of the production of knowledge. One of the important methods used in applying participant observation to the ethnographic method is the method of dialogue, which means narrating the conversations that take place in the presence of field researchers or which the research community decides to conduct with others as accurately as possible. Among the important features of the method of participant observation in ethnographic research are the following:

- B. Dialogue: Writing dialogue is a more complex task than simply remembering the words, or rewriting all the words verbatim. People usually speak in short, flowing bursts of words, and sometimes they follow their words with a gesture or facial expression. Therefore, field researchers must record the meanings of what they infer from the physical expressions accompanying the words, such as gestures, movement, facial expressions, and tone of voice. In addition, people do not exchange their roles in the dialogue smoothly, as they interrupt each other, and this exchange of roles during the dialogue can be put on a page of paper about the method of writing overlapping speech between parentheses. If the researcher does not know the local language of the research community, he can rely on an assistant to compensate for this difficulty (Emerson et al., 2010).

- C. **Field observation:** Although field notes are commonly used in many qualitative research methodologies, their use in ethnographic methodology is of particular importance. Given the nature of ethnographic methodology, which focuses primarily on studying humans in the context of their socio-cultural environment, field observations and their documentation are at the core of ethnographic research. Field notes in ethnographic research aim to document the researcher's observations about places, people, and events relevant to the research objectives during data collection (Al-Quraini, 2020). Observations from the field (eyewitness accounts of places and behaviors) are typically used to describe the surroundings or provide social context for what people in the field say about themselves and others. In this case, the researchers attempt to convey the atmosphere of the place in which the observations are generally conducted through more detailed ethnographic descriptions in specific sections. Such a description of the surroundings paves the way for later experimental documentation, and this is to some extent an analysis in itself. The important thing here is that the observer is always an essential part of the observation and recording, no matter how deep or good the recording and analysis are. To provide us with a window to view the research site, such as the humans who live in it, the physical features, etc. We can look at field notes as parts that ultimately make up one of the puzzle pictures made up of the parts of a certain picture. The goal is to put these pieces together to form the complete puzzle (which represents analysis) and then tell the reader what you see (which represents interpretation) (Bibeer & Levy, 2011).
- D. **Mental investigation:** It is considered one of the basic methods used in the ethnographic approach to describe various social events through the process of in-depth understanding of the meaning of these events. Mental investigation stems from a theoretical and philosophical concept that seeks insight, understanding, exploration, and study of human behavior through interaction between the researcher and the researcher. Through an in-depth understanding of the feelings, thoughts, and beliefs of the respondents (Jamal & Ismail, 2018).

3.6 Axiology

According to the ethnographic methodology, what is worth knowing in human communication can be determined as follows:

- A. **Social Relations:** The nature of the ethnographic methodology requires the researcher to build social relationships for periods that may be long or short according to the nature of the ethnographic research and the circumstances of collecting its field data. However, they are relatively long compared to other research methodologies, and they are necessary to understand people's interactions and their social and cultural environments and help the researcher succeed in attracting participants related to the research topic. Building relationships is not an easy process but rather requires time and effort to communicate with the participants, convince them, and verify their continuity and credibility. What the ethnographer requires is "to live with the community he studies for some time to learn the language of the participants and to understand their customs, behaviors, motivations, and lifestyle" (Lichtman, 2023).
- B. **Speech communities:** According to Murghad (2014), they are groups that share values and attitudes about language use, types, and practices. These communities develop through ongoing interaction between those with shared and recognized beliefs and value systems associated with forms and methods of communication. Although we are born with the ability to learn language, we practice it within cultures and societies that shape the process of learning how to speak to others. The concept of a speech community does not simply focus on groups that speak the same language. Rather, the concept stems from the fact that language represents, embodies, structures, and constitutes meaningful participation in society and culture. It also assumes that a mutually intelligible symbolic and ideological communicative system must play a role among those who share knowledge and practices about how meaning exists across social contexts (Littlejohn et al., 2011). The communication ethnographer must study and investigate communication practices according to the following basic social units:
1. **Communicative situation:** This is the general context of communication. The communicative situation maintains a fairly consistent framework for observing and interpreting the details of communication. Examples include a school class, a birthday party, a committee meeting, a court trial, a religious service, a dentist appointment, or dinner with friends.
 2. **Communicative events:** They are locally specific contexts of communication that generally occur in communicative situations. Communicative events constitute starting points for ethnographic analysis because they suggest uniform sets of components (e.g., the same place, the same participants, the same general theme, the same rules of interaction). Examples include a conversation between friends during a

- birthday party, a call to worship during a religious service, or the opening and closing of a conference. During communicative events, social and cultural rules emerge and can be examined.
3. Communicative acts: Communicative acts refer to the use of language acts to do something to bring some realism to life. Examples of speech acts include commands, promises, requests, warnings, threats, compliments, apologies, suggestions, gossip, insults, jokes, and marriage announcements. Speech acts help define meaningful contexts for action in particular cultures. For example, swearing and insults could be appropriate in a bar or construction site, while this behavior would not be acceptable during a eulogy. Each context will impose different personal meanings.
 4. Thematized terms: These are words that become basic symbols for certain societies. Key terms and words play a crucial role in communication within a community, as they help to convey specific meanings and ideas effectively. Understanding these key terms is essential for fostering clear and meaningful interactions among community members. The concept is also used as a cultural element to confirm the identity of a particular group.
 5. Personal address: It includes the expressions that speakers use to refer to themselves and others in interaction. Because personal address inherently invokes relationships between communicators, it serves as a rich and unique means of accessing cultural meanings. A personal address can include a variety of options, depending on the context. For example, family names, nicknames used to indicate familiarity and friendship, titles used to show respect, and honorary titles common in many societies highlight the importance of status, power, and professional titles that differentiate people by having a formal education.
 6. Social dramas: Social dramas are a communicative series in daily life in which a departure from local social and cultural rules of behavior is publicly challenged.
 7. Narratives, or stories: They are sequential reports narrated from a certain point of view, and they are useful for auditory culture, especially when they are narrated and then usually narrated. The fact that stories are retold indicates their cultural importance and their embodiment of local cultural values. For instance, a narrative that is part of popular folklore and embodies certain cultural values.
 8. Silence: It is the absence of oral speech. Because silence, like speech, is also subject to society's rules of appropriate behavior, it offers rich possibilities for gaining insight into what is happening in a given context. For instance, many groups in different cultures use silence differently from others, as it is one of the sources of communication that forms the identity of groups and reinforces their traditional way of life.
- C. Speech codes: The speech code is defined in Philipsen et al. (2005) It is a system of socially constructed symbols and meanings, as well as premises and rules related to societal behavior. According to him, the theory of speech symbols is based on six basic assumptions, as follows:
1. These are distinctive symbols; they vary from one culture to another.
 2. The speech community has multiple speech codes. Although one symbol may prevail at certain times and in certain places, many symbols can be deployed within a society.
 3. Symbols Speech is a society's sense of how to be a person, how to communicate with others, and how to act or communicate within a social group. A symbol defines the actual forms of communication that competent members of a culture should know more than a list of semantic meanings.
 4. The code guides what communicators experience when they interact with each other. It tells them what certain actions should be counted for and determines the meaning of speech acts.
 5. Speech symbols are not separate entities but are embedded in everyday speech. You can "see" the code in commonly used communication styles, the terms communicators use to describe what they do when they speak, and how they explain, justify, or evaluate the communication being used. You can also discover speech codes in how members of a culture change their behavior and vocabulary in different forms of communication.
 6. Powerful speech codes. They form the basis on which one is evaluated and communicates. It observes and evaluates the skill or quality of performance in communication-based on the requirements of the speech code and makes moral judgments about whether individuals and groups communicate correctly and use cultural forms of communication appropriately.
 7. Interpretation: Although ethnographic researchers adopt multiple intellectual orientations about understanding social reality, according to each of their specializations, biases, and theoretical inclinations. What distinguishes and highlights all of these trends is their emphasis on the importance of

interpretation—that is, arriving at meaning derived from the point of view of those we study (Bibeer & Levy, 2011). In the social sciences (except for subfields such as visual anthropology), all observations begin as written texts (e.g., newspapers and various media texts) or transform from visual and audio to written texts (e.g., recorded field notes or indoor performances). Therefore, the simplest way to represent these observations is to describe them only by having the researcher write them down according to the methods used among qualitative researchers, especially ethnographers. A description is a means of presenting an image through specific sensory details. For the important and basic scenes, sites, things, individuals, and actions that the field researcher observed, and in this sense, the descriptive images are just part of what the field researcher does in narrating the events of the workday, the researcher within the research community can describe the field in which he exists because it is important for understanding the environment surrounding social interactions, and here the researcher specifies the details from which he creates the visual image of the research field. The researcher should also depict the appearances of the characters that are part of the described scenes to present the framework in which the actions and conversations take place (Emerson et al., 2010). Description is the cornerstone of ethnographic analysis. The analysis asks: What parts fit together? What parts do not fit together? When certain parts of the puzzle picture fit together, we have grasped a central or basic idea, which provides us with an idea of the truth of the puzzle and allows us to move forward toward our goal of completing the picture (Bibeer & Levy, 2011).

4. Thirdly: The Methodology of Ethnomethodology

4.1 Objective

The word ethnomethodology consists of two syllables: ethno, meaning a group or race (national, linguistic, or ethnic), and methodology, which means an approach. Credit goes to the sociologist Garfinkel (1967) for formulating the concept of ethnomethodology and publishing it in the 1960s of the twentieth century. Ethnomethodology is an approach in sociology that studies the "common sense" resources, procedures, and practices through which members of society interpret their daily lives and how these social interactions when mutually recognized in particular contexts, create order (Williams, 2001). It means "people's ways," and the goal is to reveal the methods used by members (participants) in any given social situation to communicate to each other what they think is happening—what the situation means to them—and the efforts that each of them makes to obtain a closer interpretation with others—never mind. Folk methodology refers not to the social world in general but rather to specific parts of the interaction between its members, as the focus is on how the system in a social situation is the achievement of its participants (Jones, 1993).

4.2 The Position of the Researcher and the Methodological Basis

The ethnomethodological methodology is a qualitative methodology that appeared in the mid-sixties of the last century, and although Harold Garfinkel, one of the most important researchers in this approach, benefited from the symbolic interactionists. He differed from them in defining the role of the researcher. In the time that symbolic interactionists specify in revealing meanings, Garfinkel (1967) believes that no meanings are waiting for researchers to discover and document them. Instead, he develops the interactionist vision and emphasizes that the role of the field researcher is to understand the processes through which the reality that can be observed and reported is organized, produced, and managed. Reported by individuals (Allard & Anderson, 2005), the primary interest of the ethnomethodological researcher is to discover the rules and rituals that govern interaction situations in daily life. Garfinkel (1967) believes that the basic approach that social interactionists use to create meaning is "commonsense reasoning." He also believes that communication and common reasoning can lead to shared interpretations of experiences. People come to a common understanding of things, and then groups of people, from juries to teachers, develop their ways of thinking and behaving, and this is what social scientists should study (Abdel-Gawad, 2002). Ethnomethodology does not refer to research methods but to the object of study: how people maintain a sense of external reality that is always ambiguous and problematic. Their task is to examine how people apply abstract cultural rules and logical understandings to concrete situations to make procedures appear routine, interpretable, and unambiguous (Taylor et al., 2015).

4.3 Method of Communication

The proponents of this trend view talking as practical action, and they emphasize the practical, comprehensive nature of language use. Language is thus understood in terms of its use, and language use is recognized as a basic type and means of social interaction and social action (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009). The language of everyday life is the primary means of communication. This approach sees that human societies build their organized social structures and construct meaning only through "folk methods" (implicitly known, routine practices, and ordinary

language) (Lynch, 2015). Social life, in Garfinkel's (1967) view is nothing but a practical project in which every individual living in this life participates. The activities that individuals carry out in their ordinary lives form a practical organizational complex, and through them, the members of the group create and control daily life situations. They are linked to the attempts of these members to make these situations justifiable, and life situations appear spontaneously through expectations that arise entirely and partially in the language of daily life in which all individuals participate as members of a specific social system (Zayed, 1981).

4.4 Ontology

The ethnomethodological approach is based on the fact that social life is fundamentally fraught with risks, as anything can happen in social interaction. However, the perpetrators never realized this. Because they have the practical abilities needed to make the world seem like an ordered or tidy place (Jones, 1993). The nature of communication according to this approach can be understood through the basic principles on which it is based, which were identified by Nickerson (2021) according to the ideas of Harold Garfinkel (1967) as follows:

- A. The approach is concerned with how ordinary people understand their social world.
- B. The ethno-methodological approach emphasizes the interrelated relationship between language and action. It emphasizes the search for common meaning in every situation.
- C. Focuses on analyzing everyday activities as ways for members to make those same activities visible, rational, and, for all practical purposes, communicable.
- D. Ethnomethodology is not concerned with individuals but is concerned with what is called the common competencies of being a member of a group.
- E. The social world is built on tight rules, consisting of a dense and often contradictory set of implicit understandings about what is going on.

Proponents of the ethnomethodological approach begin their search for how ordinary people understand their social world using several basic concepts, including:

1. Reflexivity: It refers to "the mutual relationship that reaches the point of equivalence between the meaning and the event" (Abdel-Gawad, 2002) Many of the patterns of interaction that occur between members of society aim to preserve a certain vision of the social reality that they have formed in specific situations. We find that many of the patterns of interaction between members of society are considered reflexive actions. The words, signals, and gestures that we use during the interaction process aim to preserve a certain vision of social reality and are used to form, interpret, and give meaning to the social world (Al-Zayat & Kamal, 1999).
2. Indexicality: This means that "understanding any topic or event can only be achieved by linking it to the context and circumstances in which it occurred" (Abdel-Gawad, 2002). It refers to the contextual or content nature of meaning, and Jar Finkel uses the concept of "indexicality" to explain that an individual's actions and behaviors are a product of the social situations they create or serve as indicators of those conditions in which daily life events arise.
3. Accountability: The broader understanding of justification in this direction refers to the fact that speech and actions are produced and perceived systematically and traditionally from the common categories of communication and social interaction, and they are mutually understood between them. The ethnomethodological methodology was concerned with the justification of all social phenomena, not just problems. With which excuses and justifications are closely related (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009). Proponents of ethnomethodology believe that "as long as a certain position is defined, this definition continues to exist as long as individuals live in the same group (Zayed, 1981)."

4.5 Epistemology

In addition to using participant observation, ethn-omethodologists developed other techniques for dealing with micro-interactions in which they were specifically interested, including:

- A. Documentary method: "It is a method that individuals use to explain their behavior, just as the researcher uses it to understand this behavior. The documentary method is based on a group of separate observations that can be considered indicators of a specific behavioral pattern" (Zayed, 1981). The documentary method of interpretation and reflection dates back to Harold Garfinkel and refers to a common type of practical inferential reasoning in which an underlying pattern is understood based on certain parts, or vice versa. Certain elements are treated as documents of an envisioned basic pattern and organized by an understanding of its particular elements. This reciprocal relationship between questions, answers, and context allows for a deeper understanding of the information being communicated. It emphasizes the importance of considering all

elements together to fully grasp the meaning. The ethnomethodological concept of reflexivity draws attention to the fact that descriptions constitute their sources and contexts (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009).

- B. The quasi-experimental method: It is considered one of the important experimental attempts carried out by “Garfinkel” and is called (the ethnomethodological experiment) or (the quasi-experimental method), as Garfinkel (1967) studied logic or the accepted rules of interaction in daily life through a variety of methods. Harmful experiments are called “breaching procedures,” in which the researcher intentionally breaks social rules to study people's reactions and how they try to repair the social fabric (Taylor et al., 2015). The researcher can apply the ethnomethodological method or experiment by trying to break the rules that govern the group's behavior in a way that differs from the agreed-upon rules while recording the group's reaction toward the researcher. Then the researcher can discover the rules that he does not know as well as the members participating in the interaction process know them, for example. The researcher deliberately attempts to act as if he were a stranger to his family members while recording the members' reactions. The individual's social reality is temporarily disrupted and observed to reveal the assumptions, beliefs, and understanding behind it. Ethno-methodologists seek to uncover the underlying rules and norms that govern everyday conversations and interactions among people. Other forms of communication, such as gestures and expressions that include social interaction by adapting existing methodology, systematically investigate the processes that individuals use to construct their social reality (Allard & Anderson, 2005).
- C. Conversation analysis: It is the detailed study of how people organize their daily lives while they talk together, and it includes a set of methods by which people work together to create social organization. This tendency views conversation as a social achievement because it requires that we accomplish some things collaboratively through talk. Therefore, conversation analysis is characterized by the following:
- Careful examination of the conversation sequence, where the analyst examines a portion of the conversation for the types of actions being accomplished in the conversation.
 - Studying what speakers do while communicating, such as the multiple things they do at the same time, the questions they ask and answer, and the rotation and protection of the face.
 - Use of language, devices, and forms used in interaction between the two parties.

Conversation analysis is one of the most influential contributions of the ethnomethodological trend in the field of communication” (Pawluch, 2005). Conversation analysis, founded by Sacks (1974), is considered one of the most widespread practices that rely on the principles of ethnomethodological methodology. Its approach was the striking originality of the arrangement of naturally occurring talk and texts, which is one of the forms taken by the early ethnomethodological approach, and both sequential analysis of conversation and analysis of talk and texts that emphasize the practical use of identity categories remain fundamentally rooted in ethnomethodological ideas and initiatives. Conversation analysis involves studying and clarifying the practical reasoning that people use when they engage in spoken interactions. Harvey Sacks's article on turn-taking is considered a seminal text in the field of conversation analysis (Sacks, 1974). Regardless of the controversy surrounding whether conversation analysis is a way to conduct ethnomethodology or not, Sacks's conversation analysis relies on grouping similar conversations, but it provides results. Generally, beyond any individual case (Sacks, 1974), in contrast to Garfinkel's focus on the uniqueness of individual events in a situational and societal context, Sacks's conversation analysis allows itself to draw generalizations (Ten Have, 2016), which produces several cumulative findings related to a wide range of topics. Along with Sacks's study of turn-taking, conversation analysis has led to insights into action sequences, lexical choice, the relationship between speech and non-vocal activities, and how participants cooperate in various interactions, such as giving advice, delivering bad news, and telling problems (Smelser & Baltes, 2001).

4.6 Axiology

The aspects worth knowing in the communication process can be identified according to the ethnomethodological approach as follows:

- A. The communicator between the self and the situation: The famous ethno-methodologist Erving Goffman uses the idea of theatrical performance to explain how communicators present themselves. People are considered actors who use performance to create a certain impression on the audience. When faced with a certain situation, people give a presentation or performance in which they person decide how to position themselves, what to say, and how to act. Goffman begins by assuming that a person must somehow understand the events he encounters in daily life and interpret the situation—that is, define it. When a person enters a situation, he tends to ask the natural mental question, “What is going on here?” His answer constitutes a definition of the situation.

The first definition is often insufficient, and re-reading may be necessary, as in the case of error, misunderstanding, or outright deception. The situation definition can be divided into segments and frames. Slide: It is a series of activities. Frame: It is a basic organizational pattern used to define the segment. In the context of this understanding, communication activities can be viewed as all activities in the context of frame analysis. Engagement, or confrontation, occurs when people interact with each other. In face-to-face interaction, Non-verbal signals such as body language, facial expressions, and tone of voice play a crucial role in shaping the dynamics of the interaction. These cues help establish rapport, convey emotions, and facilitate understanding between individuals. Goffman believes that the self is determined by the dramatic representations required by the situation. It is a product of the common scene and not a cause of it. Therefore, the difference in situations leads to a difference in the image in which the self is presented according to the goal. Once the situation is defined, moral control arises to preserve it. Everyone plays roles according to the roles that have been assigned to them, and the method of performance determines who is communicating. Communication, then, means presenting oneself, and any person may have many selves, depending on the many ways in which he presents himself in the countless situations he encounters in life (Littlejohn et al., 2011).

- B. Conversation: Pawluch (2005) refers to Goffman's classification of conversation into three types:
1. A sarcastic conversation is one in which the two speakers address a topic that they make fun of, such as mocking the boss or the nature of the work or comically exaggerating mistakes.
 2. Formal conversation: This involves the dialogue between the official and the lecturer when he delivers his lecture in front of the attendees, and some of the attendees come forward to ask their questions. Here the conversation is subject to the site sequence; that is, the dialogue does not take place qualitatively or arbitrarily but rather gradually.
 3. Talking to oneself: It refers to thinking with complete frankness about a topic that represents the individual's deviation from social requirements, such as if he is embarrassed to talk about it in front of others or is ashamed to bring it up publicly. Thus, he thinks about it and dialogues with it from several aspects and dives into it with complete freedom, then imagines the presence of others in front of a topic that embarrassed him, and imagines their reactions to it. Because, he feels that he needs a witness to correct his deviation or mistakes, through which he can strengthen himself and hold him accountable for that and imagine their reactions to it. Further, he feels that he needs a witness to correct his deviation or mistakes, through which he can strengthen himself and hold him accountable for that.

4.7 Interpretation

Ethno-methodologists adopt the principle of fully interpreting the situation by linking the research to the nature of the social situation being investigated. They believe that as long as a certain situation is defined, this definition will continue to exist as long as individuals live in the same group. In the same way, the meaning that individuals add to a specific topic will also continue on different occasions and situations. Meanings and definitions are similar through sharing expressions and symbols, and differences between individuals appear through their differences in experiences and life histories. This means that interaction in society is based on a set of rules and rituals that ordinary individuals acknowledge almost unconsciously (Zayed, 1981). Conversation analysis in this direction does not address individual differences or hidden mental processes but focuses on what happens in conversations when individuals interact, such as the actual speech, the paused movements that communicators make, how they organize the sequence of speech, and how communicators create organization and coherence in speech. The analyst works inductively by examining the details of actual conversations and then generalizing about the possible principles by which the participants organize their talk (Littlejohn et al., 2011).

5. Conclusion

Although all interpretive views persist in a shared concern with human action, the construction of meaning, the agency of social actors, and an interest in knowing about the social world from within. However, looking at the interpretive trend and how it deals with human communication, we find a difference in the interpretive viewpoints with its three methodologies—symbolic interactionist, ethnographic, and ethnomethodological—in their vision of a set of ontological, epistemological, and methodological issues and what their interpretations of reality represent. Firstly, looking at the main goal, we find that the symbolic interactionist methodology focuses on finding meaning. While the ethnographic methodology focused on its attempt to reveal the structural forces that determine behavior and beliefs, the ethnomethodological methodology focused on how to arrive at the true interpretation of meaning. Secondly, the position of the researcher and the methodological basis. In the symbolic

interactionist methodology, the researcher is part of the situation, and the focus of his interest is on what the interactants say in the interactive situation. The methodological basis is based on understanding society through the perceptions of the actors. While the position of the researcher in the ethnographic methodology revolves around recording all data with his participation in the daily life that the group is accustomed to doing and how they practice it, the methodological basis is based on understanding society through the perceptions of the actors. As for the ethnomethodological researcher, he focuses on discovering the rules and rituals that govern interaction situations in daily life. Thirdly, the most important of them were language, conversation, and gestures in the symbolic interactionist methodology. The word and phrase were the most important means of communication in the ethnographic methodology. Conversation and the language of daily life were the most important means of communication for ethno-methodologists. Fourthly, in the symbolic interactionist methodology, the focus is on understanding meanings, the concept of the self, and the relationship between the individual and society as a basis for understanding human behavior. While the vision of ethnographers is that communicative choices are determined according to the social context, that communicative symbols reside in the structures of social and cultural life, and that communication is a socially structured process, differentiated according to the resources available to conduct communication, it is a social product subject to normative and cultural structures, and yet it does not take place. Through culture or group, people are free to challenge and revise patterns of communication. As for ethno-methodologists, they believe that the nature of communication is based on the fact that anything can happen in social interaction and that the actors do not realize this. Because they do not have the practical capabilities for that understanding, the supporters of the ethnomethodological approach start their search for how ordinary people understand their social world using several basic concepts, such as reflexivity, indicativeness, and justifiability. Fifthly, the unstructured interview, along with participant observation, are the basic tools for obtaining knowledge according to the symbolic interactionist methodology. Participant observation was the basic tool in ethnographic methodology. There were many tools, including the documentary method, the ethnomethodological experience, and conversation analysis in the ethnographic methodology. Sixthly, the axiology of communication was explored to what is worth knowing in communication according to the symbolic interactionist methodology is meaning, the self, the mind, and society. Social relations, speech communities, and speech codes are what deserve to be known according to the ethnographic methodology. According to the ethnomethodological approach, understanding the way the communicator understands and interprets the situation in daily life in the context of the relationship between the self and the situation and understanding the type of conversation and the elements of its activity are aspects that deserve knowledge in the communication process. Seventhly, the process of interpretation and analysis. It depends on using understanding to make things meaningful in the symbolic interactionist methodology and on the interpretation of understanding, as the researcher may intervene in situations to determine the group's interpretations of them for understanding in the ethnographic methodology. Further, to explain the understanding through a complete interpretation of the situation by linking the research to the nature of the social situation investigated in the ethnomethodological methodology.

References

- Abdel-Gawad, M. K. (2002). *Contemporary Readings in Sociological Theory* (pp. 432-433). Cairo, Center for Social Research and Studies.
- Adu, P. (n.d). *Introduction to Qualitative Data*. In Taylor; & Francis Group (Eds.), Chapter
- Al-Hassan, E. M. (2015). *Advanced social theories: an analytical study in contemporary social theories*. Amman: Wael Publishing House,.
- Allard, F., & Anderson, E. (2005). Ethnography. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement, 1*, 833-843. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-12-369398-5/00028-1>
- Al-Quraini, S. (2020). *Qualitative research strategies and data analysis*. Jarir Bookstore, Riyadh, KSA.
- Al-Zayat, L., & Kamal, T. (1999). *Contemporary theory in sociology*. Cairo: Dar Gharib for printing.
- Angrosino, M. V. (2005). *Recontextualizing Observation: Ethnography, Pedagogy, and the Prospects for a Progressive Political Agenda*.
- Bibeer, c. H., & Levy, P. (2011). *Qualitative research in the social sciences* (translated by Hanaa Al-Gohary, reviewed and presented by Muhammad Al-Gohary) (Issue: 1783, p. 332). Cairo, Egypt: Social Sciences Series for Researchers, National Center for Translation.
- Blumer, H. (1979). Symbolic interactionism. *Interdisciplinary approaches to human communication*, 135-55. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351310000-8>

- Bousahla, E. (2016). Sociological studies in Algeria between quantitative and qualitative analysis (goal, topic, unit of analysis). *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(24), 183-194.
- Churton, M., & Brown, A. (2016). *Sociology theory and method*. Hanaa El-Gohary, translators) Cairo: The National Center for Translation.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative and mixed methods approaches*. London and Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Emerson, R., Fritz, R., & Shaw, L. (2010). *Ethnographic field research in the social sciences* (p. 53). Cairo, Egypt: National Center for Translation.
- Galabi, A. A. R. (2013). *Quantitative and qualitative approaches in sociology*. Alexandria, Egypt: University Knowledge House.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Griffin, E. A., Crossman, J., Bordia, S., Mills, C., Maras, S., Pearse, G., & Shanahan, D. (2009). A First Look at Communication Theory, Em Griffin (pp. 230-265). Details: Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Griffiths, H., Keirns, N., Strayer, E., Cody-Rydzewski, S., Scaramuzzo, G., Sadler, T., & Jones, F. (2015). *Introduction to sociology*. OpenStax.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2019). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315146027>
- Henslin, J. M. (2007). *A down-to-earth approach*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Erlangga. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1319145>
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. *Anthropology and human behavior*, 13(53), 11-74. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e596342011-002>
- Hymes, D. (2013). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315888835>
- Jamal, M., & Ismail, S. M. (2018). Methodology of ethnographic research in the field of social sciences. *Journal of Anthropology*, 4(7), 68.
- Jansson-Boyd, C. (2019). *Consumer Psychology 2e*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Jenkins, R. (2002). Foundations of sociology. In *Foundations of sociology* (pp. 1-14). Palgrave, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-87835-2_1
- Jones, P. (1993). *Studying society: Sociological theories and research practices* (trans. Muhammad Yasser Al-Khawaja, p. 27). Cairo, Egypt: Al Arabiya for Publishing and Distribution.
- Jones, P. (1993). *Studying society: Sociological theories and research practices*.
- Lichtman, M. (2023). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003281917>
- Light Jr, D., & Keller, S. (1975). *Sociology* (2nd ed). New York, United States: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (Vol. 1). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412959384>
- Littlejohn, S. W., Foss, K. A., & Oetzel, J. G. (2011). *Theories of human communication* (p. 30, 32). Long Grove, IL. Waveland Press, Inc.
- Lune, H., & Berg, B. L. (2017). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Pearson. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1319429>
- Lynch, M. (2015). Science and technology studies, ethnomethodology. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Oxford England, United Kingdom: Pergamon. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.85049-7>
- Mead, G. H. (2015). *Mind, self & society*. University of Chicago press.
- Mead, G. H. (2023). Self. In *Social Theory Re-Wired* (pp. 425-437). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003320609-55>
- Murghad, Z. (2014). Family communication in light of technology. *Journal of Human and Society Sciences*, 9, 229-256.

- Newman, W. L. (2003). *Social research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed), England, United Kingdom: Pearson New International Edition.
- Nickerson, C. (2021). *Using Ethnomethodology to Understand Social Order, Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org
- Pawluch, D. (2005). Qualitative Analysis, Sociology. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*, 3, 231-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-12-369398-5/00142-0>
- Philipsen, G., Coutu, L. M., & Covarrubias, P. (2005). Speech codes theory: Restatement, revisions, and response to criticisms. *Theorizing about intercultural communication*, 55-68.
- Richard, T. H. L. W. (2020). *Introducing communication theory: Analysis and application*. Mayfield Publishing Com. C 2000.
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*, 8, 337-353. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511611810.022>
- Sarantakos, S. (2017). *Social research* (p. 370). Bloomsbury Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-13387-1>
- Smelser, N. J., & Baltes, P. B. (Eds.). (2001). *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (Vol. 11). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Taylor, S. J., Bogdan, R., & DeVault, M. L. (2015). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394260485>
- Ten Have, P. (2016). Ethnomethodology. *The international encyclopedia of communication theory and philosophy*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118766804.wbiect010>
- Williams, J. (2001). *Phenomenology in sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/01939-2>
- Zayed, A. (1981). *Sociology: Classical and critical theories*. Retrieved from <https://ebook.univeyes.com/29733>

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Authors contributions

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Competing interests

Not applicable.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Canadian Center of Science and Education.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution

license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.