

CULTURE IN LANGUAGES – MULTIPLICITY OF INTERPRETATIONS

Lucija OK

Science and Research Center, University of Primorska, Slovenia

Abstract: *The values of civilisation, the spirit of humanism and general human norms in Europe and beyond are part of the efforts aimed at a harmonious coexistence of languages, cultures and nations. Various social institutions require a means of common communication, seen as a shared understanding of a common goal that is the manifestation of common interests. On the other hand, any language is culturally rich in the sense that it contains linguaculture (Agar, 1994; Risager, 2008) or 'culture in language'. Language communication is not only about mastering the language code and the respective culture, but it is also about applying the contents and its meaning, as well as the relationships between speakers which manifest the confrontation of their cultures and languages (Ok, 2008). By acquiring relevant linguistic and intercultural skills and competencies, individuals as well as social groups will be able to establish communication links needed for efficient cooperation. Cooperation and the exchange of knowledge and experiences, the mobility of people and ideas are the key factors in promoting knowledge, achievements and creative innovations. The new approaches in teaching and learning languages are designed to produce a plurilingual communicator, the intelligent listener and the intercultural mediator. A European strategy for cross-cultural and plurilingual education must be rethought and presented for debate. As relations between the state, society and culture change, the interface between social and political contexts requires new management procedures. Broader cultural capabilities are required for politicians, civil servants and army leaders. They have to be able to adapt successfully to any cultural setting. Meeting this capability, the development of culture-general knowledge and skills as a necessary complement to language skills and regional knowledge are required.*

Keywords: *language, culture, communication, cross-cultural awareness, cooperation*

1. CHALLENGES AND GAPS OF THE NEW EUROPE

After World War II the consequences of military issues provoked political changes in boundaries settings. New minorities arise and the old ones have been spread with some different settling or being consumed by a majority nation. The idea of an intimate relationship between language, people, nation, culture and land has been emphasised. National languages as objects were constructed around the centrality of the nation state, and this has had significant implications for the parallel use and promotion of other languages in the same political territory. It follows that language and culture have been at the heart of the constitution of the state and its relationship with its citizenship. Both language and culture have served as integrating symbols that have been so important in forging the population within the state's territory into a single community. It becomes difficult to separate both language and culture from the political dimension.

Current migration, tourism and other kinds of

mobility, especially following the postulate of the European Union (mobility of people, capital and goods) reinforce language use as a continuous flow in social and economic networks. These networks may be small and local, but may also stretch very far across continents. The Slovenian language, for example, in the recent past has been spoken by about three million people (within and beyond the Slovenian borders). Becoming an official European language encouraged it to spread in the social and political networks of the EU; speakers of Slovenian carry their Slovenian as communitarian language with them into new cultural contexts and put them to use in perhaps new ways under new circumstances. Learning Slovenian has become popular not just in neighbouring countries but here and there to new individuals worldwide in new social networks made possible by the new global communication technologies such as the World Wide Web.

The areas where cultures, languages, values and the historical memory meet are the laboratories of Europeism and hence a touchstone of the coexistence policy of the continent.

Civilisation contact areas (especially border areas) can transmit knowledge and new understandings of the importance and role of cultural and ethnic intertwining to other environments. Moreover, in cooperation with other similar environments, they can solve problems and processes of coexistence, compare their influence at national level, and also transmit experiences to the wider global territory. It is here that questions of the historical development of areas emerge, as well as problems regarding the formation of national and local authorities, provincial and state units; the effects of political transformations on the development of the socio-cultural structure of regional, ethnic and linguistic communities; intertwining and interaction between social and cultural units, art and science, civil society and economy; preservation and transmission of values in the process of passive and active integration of individuals and groups into the social corpus of the community. (ok, 2008.)

Transnational migration thus causes a large proportion of the languages of the world to be disembedded from their mother tongue (or local) contexts and to be re-embedded in a great variety of other cultural contexts. In the light of the challenges in the context of the wider world, apart from the existing contacts between related fields of expertise, work fields and economic and political interests, closer interdependent connections between distant fields also emerged. As Welsch asserts

Lifestyles are no longer limited or delineated by nationally based cultures. Categories, boundaries, and concrete distinctions such as "foreign" and "familiar" are becoming increasingly inaccurate, largely as the result of the globalization of economic and communication systems." (Welsch, 1999:205)

Social and political contexts require new management procedures. A European strategy for cross-cultural and plurilingual education must be rethought and presented for debate. (Williams, 2012:8).

On one hand the hegemony of one language (mostly English nowadays) separately of its cultural context, operates as features of the social practices of those involved, including the general public. The popularity and use of *linguae francae* since antiquity to recent times (before English other *linguae francae* were of historical importance: Greek and Latin in the Roman empire, Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America, French in overseas regions, Russian, Arabic, Chinese in

particular regions, etc.) are independent of the linguistic history or structure of the language. The 'global' status of English is a result of its role in the economic context and of its implications for social mobility, that is, for language prestige. The various institutions of society require a means of common communication, understood as a shared understanding of a common goal that does not require reflection and consideration in its application and is seen as a manifestation of common interests.

One of the great challenges of the present European reality is in the very attempt to carry out the economic and political integration under the provision of cultural diversity and thus to offer to the global public, after a century, a new civilisation model that would not equate the social-economic globalisation with the social-cultural variant of the American melting pot. This new European civilisation model will be confronted with the first test in the numerous European "contact" settings, where - apart from the issues of international contact and settling of the functional social, economic and administrative issues - conditions for coexistence and mechanisms to protect cultural specificities of different peoples, as well as ethnic and language groups and stimulate social cohesion are created. Abolition of different kinds of "frontiers" will demand a major revision of traditional and ethnocentric conceptions and social behaviours. (Bufon, 1997).

2. CULTURE IN LANGUAGE

European language policy stimulates pluri- and multilingualism, thus attempting to mitigate linguistic dilemmas about the significance of an individual language: mother/primary/foreign/secondary language and the *lingua franca*. In an individual, multilingualism is a cognitive and strategic ability to build awareness about languages and their usage as a multi-layered ability, which is used by the speaker to integrate in a multi-lingual and cross cultural environment, where they actively realise their intentions for communication. The individual's level of mastering this interaction can be through different levels of individual skills in various languages (understanding, communication, reading, writing, interaction). With a special, i.e. "strategic" competence, various speakers with the same level of knowledge and usage of language can very differently succeed in communication interaction. It depends on how an individual knows how to utilise their language knowledge and test it by

using own resourcefulness. Based on this success in the social environment the individual experiences how to communicate using their own knowledge. In this way, the tendency to imitate the authentic speaker of a foreign and new language is not being realised, but the tendency for developing linguistic repertoires that support each other and stimulate the promotion of linguistic skills in mutual correlation, is evolving. Language learning is a life-long process that evolves, deteriorates or progresses with regard to the active and motivated participation of the speaker communicating in a certain language on different levels (e.g. on the Common European Framework of Reference for languages, CEFR levels, 2001). By defining the level and with descriptors of these levels, each individual can set and plan the objectives they want to achieve in an individual language with regard to their needs, goals and ambitions.

Multilingualism is an ability inseparably connected with the recognition, acceptance and comprehension of the cultural context in which a language is realised. The cultural competence of a speaker (within a nation or the wider social community) that grows and evolves through contact with different existing actions of cultural versions, is enriching, deepening and sharpening in mutual comparisons, and multilingualism is its fundamental tool. Within the CEFR we can read the definition linked to language learning:

Plurilingualism and pluriculturalism is a personal feature which is put into action in a communicative situation. It is not a new competence, as we all use different “registers” of the same language in different situations just as we use different cultural repertoires in different situations. The new idea is the development of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism as the result of a process of language learning. (CEFR, 2001:13).

However, the level and quality of multilingual ability is measurable, which can hardly be said for the levels of multiculturalism and crossculturality. There are already problems with appropriate terminology. There are different terms, like multicultural, crosscultural and even transcultural. The latter term was developed by Welsch (1999:205), who believes that the categories foreign/domestic seem less and less relevant in this increasingly globalising world. Social community is multicultural, a process or the situation of intertwining at the contact of two cultures in a society or the individual’s awareness on this is interculturality. Transculturality is the state where cultures form an entity that is inseparable in

certain elements.

Transculturality accommodates globalizing trends as well as movements towards specificity and unity; both local and cosmopolitan affiliations are provided for. (Welsch, 1999:205)

Interculturality and transculturality are realised in communication relations, relations and communication with the help of communication strategies. Language awareness (*éveil au langage, educazione linguistica, éducation et ouverture aux langues*) cannot emerge separately from the awareness of culture. A multilingual speaker as a social stakeholder is aware of the diversity of social groups, their cultural management (cultural conventions), creativity and indirect realisation of cultures as such, which all merge in the matrix of the cultural contact. A multilingual speaker is aware how identity as the accompanying effect of the experience of living in different cultures is emerging. The content and form of the individual’s response is the result of a composed, dynamic and changeable process of awareness formation in a given moment.

Any language can be culturally rich in the sense that it contains linguaculture (Agar, 1994) or ‘culture in language’.

Language, in all its varieties, in all the ways it appears in everyday life, builds a world of meanings. When you run into different meanings, when you become aware of your own and work to build a bridge to the others, ‘culture’ is what you are up to. Language fills the spaces between us with sound; culture forges the human connection through them. Culture is in language, and language is loaded with culture. (Agar, 1994: 28)

But language use and types that a speaker chooses in a given communication position in their primary/original language, are mostly connected with the context of pragmatic norm, cultural and speaking habits and also on the level and speciality of their idiolect. The language that the individual is using is filled with verbal and non-verbal experiences in communication, their social and historic origin. Agar strongly emphasises the connection between language and culture that diverts the speaker to search for more general, usable patterns in the interaction with speakers of other languages and cultures. (Risager, 2008). When discussing cultural experience, one should pay attention to the multiplicity of accepted values and functions that an individual or social group has acquired through time. Yet an individual, who would like to retain his/her accepted values, is far

from being static when performing activities aimed at preserving his/her values. The dynamics of his/her memory use is complemented by his/her will with which s/he strives to transform the world. In the process, s/he makes use of mediational means of higher mental functions related to cultural behaviour and practices (perception and active use of intercultural language communication, formation of active and empathic relations and positions between participants in the communicative situation, use of safeguards and incentives during participation in communication, etc.) and develops the mediational means as a means of communication and behaviour related to the formation of cultural memory. (Cole, 1996:113). Cultural memory is developed through the elaboration of more complex »tools of remembering« that help create a new, deeper cultural experience, which serves as a basis for the further development of relations between individuals and groups. One of the mediational means of mental functions is language, which is linked to culture in several ways:

- Language is a manifestation of culture at a given moment and an expression of the manner through which an individual exhibits his/her cultural awareness;
- Certain cultural content is materialised through the use of language tools and verbalisation;
- Language forms abstract systems of values and identities, the implicit elements of which are cultural values and cultural identity.

3. INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION BETWEEN LIVE AND VIRTUAL

In this domain several frameworks have been developed that identify a set of dimensions on which cultures differ and determine what knowledge enables effective adaptation in a foreign culture, such as Hofstede (1980), Trompenaars- Hampden-Turner (1993), Byram (1997) and others. But there are few frameworks for culture-centred education to be considered as basic: Egan (1979) for general education development, Bennett (1993) for the development of intercultural sensitivity, Byram and Morgan (1994) and Kramsch (1993) for the inclusion of culture in the language classroom. The first two are based on the precepts of continuity, progression, and expansion of competence; they are dynamic and interact with the maturation levels of learners. Since narrative is important to

language development and because narrative automatically includes culture, the work of Egan (1997) cannot be ignored. Egan's four stages of development give meaning to expression in language through a link to educational growth that learners demonstrate at a particular stage (*Mythic* - approximate age 4/5 to 9/10 years, *Romantic* - approximate age 8/9 to 14/15 years, *Philosophic* - approximate age 14/15 to 19/20 years, *Iconic* (approximate age 19/20 and then throughout adulthood).

Bennett's research and application (2003) provide us with a conceptualisation of cultural sensitivity. That sensitivity for Bennett is outlined in a set of six stages that lead the learner from the ethnocentric to the ethnorelative perspective. The six stages of the model are classified under these two levels: under the ethnocentric denial, defence, minimisation of differences; and acceptance, adaptation, and integration under the ethnocentric level. The contribution of Bennett's model is twofold. It provides a challenge for the learners; the content to be learned arouses curiosity, identifies intercultural skills, promotes cooperative activities, and prepares learners to function autonomously using research strategies. Self-reflection upon and self-assessment of cultural experience can prove to be much more constructive from the educational point of view, owing to the fact that self-reflection and the acquisition of primary cultural experiences allows for the authenticity of the cognitions acquired and the possibility to exert an active influence on the process of the formation of one's personality.

The definition of national awareness, which can be considered as a mental representation, covers the emotional, cognitive and dynamic areas. The *cognitive area* refers to an individual's thoughts, concepts, judgement and assessment activities, the *emotional* to the emotions and values that the individual assigns to his/her nation and national attributes, and the *dynamic area* to his/her aspirations to actively participate in the dynamics of happenings related to nationality. (Musek in Gomezel Mikoli, 2000) It is difficult to determine easily understood and transparent criteria for considering the phenomenon. On the basis of results of a pilot introduction of the language portfolio in Slovenia (ok, 1999) and findings of eminent researchers (Byram, 1997), the paper proposes three areas of self-reflection and self-assessment. (ok, 2006) By using the following descriptors, the portfolio user will evaluate his/her linguistic experience at the following levels: (1)

attitude to intercultural diversity; (2) discovery of intercultural diversity and modulation of inputs; (3) transfer of intercultural awareness to life.

Level 1: *Attitude to cultural diversity.*

Cognitive attitude/abilities (Intra-cultural awareness, intercultural readiness/comprehension of intercultural context)

- *Intra-cultural/cognitive level:* Acquiring new knowledge of one's own culture. Acquiring new knowledge and awareness of the target culture and, consequently, encouraging reflection about one's own culture.

- *Intercultural understanding of the reality:* Knowledge of otherness, heuristic approaches to languages and cultures, awareness of the socio-cultural context.

Level 2: *Discovery of intercultural diversity and modulation of inputs.*

Emotional attitudes/awareness and behaviour

- *Cross-cultural/emotional (affective) level :* intercultural knowledge, reflection on one's identity, communication between two cultures (source and target) and, consequently, earning respect and learning tolerance for the new cultural context, ability to challenge and question one's own conceptual models, tolerance for ambiguity.

Level 3: *Transfer of intercultural awareness to life.*

Dynamic intercultural communication and acting

- *Intercultural/dynamic level:* Response to on one's own anthropological/cultural experiences, dynamics (action) in cross-cultural referencing, ability to modify one's own beliefs (intercultural flexibility), positive attitudes and standpoints related to target cultures.

Communication between young people spans different forms of creative communication, which is reflected more and more in virtual communication. Even though theories of language planning do highlight the social, economic and political effects of external factors on the individual's choice and use of a particular language code, they don't include language use in virtual environments/computer-mediated communication. The choice of language and the variety of a particular language used by the individual at a given moment is not only influenced by that individual's will and need but also by the social network of their peers and supporters, as well as their current interests and their general social sensitivity towards the community.

In language learning and language use the

computer has become more than just a technical aid. The user's actions, directed towards various connections and information, browsing and opening different windows while surfing the Internet, create a continuum between the real and the virtual world generated by the computer. In fact, the computer is both the product and the producer of a certain type of communication code, and similarly also of language and communication genres. This communication takes place in various languages and genres. Observation and monitoring of language use, especially in younger internet generations, in the fields of multilingualism and intercultural communication can thus reveal the strengths and weaknesses or even risks this new technology has presented to the participants of computer-mediated communication. Since in this network the individual is moving outside their national environment/space, the mutual influences of virtual communication put their national and cultural identity to a test. (ok, Beguš, 2011).

The mythical reality surrounding the user of the virtual world of communication is liberating, but at the same time it is an a- historical world. (Kramsch, 2009:184).. Just as Barthes (1973:125) argues that myth is "speech stolen and restored", similarly virtual mediation "steals" the real world and restores it in the form of hyper reality, perceived by the users of this form of mediation as reality. The computer has enabled creation of a communication space where creativity and play are boundless.

Nevertheless, boundaries between different languages do exist, regardless of the fact that they are connected, between cultures, although they are in contact, between memory and historical experience, between actual events and virtual scenarios. The capability of individuals to engage in the real world is not developed in a boundless space, but in the ability to decide which the limits that can be exceeded are. (Kramsch, 2009:185).

4. INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATORS

The importance of creating a trans- cultural and multicultural individual for the future (postmodern) society is more than obvious. The concurrent trends of globalisation, mass migration, intensified intercultural contacts at individual and informal levels as well as international formal contacts for economic, ecological, political and other interests represent prevailing phenomena in postmodern society. In such social circumstances,

the emergence of an individual who has experience and knowledge of multiculturalism, intercultural awareness and sensibility is necessary if we are to avoid the negative aspects of intercultural relations, such as misunderstandings, prejudice, stereotyping, xenophobia, and finally, in the most intense form, physical/actual (military) levels.

On the basis of mutual knowledge of one another, various ethnic communities can comprehend and accept cultural norms of other groups and establish unbiased interaction. The competence to identify oneself mentally with other cultures (empathic competence) is often considered as one of the most important intercultural competences. To provide an example: when various national experts represent their countries in the EU, their success and efficiency also depends on their cultural knowledge, competences and skills. In other words, the level of their cultural awareness determines the manner in which they establish relations in verbal and non-verbal communication, their competence to present various subjects and their manner of participation in partnerships. Various manners of dealing with intercultural communication imply various types of interaction: various approaches at the labour market, varying distribution of linguistic inequality, different use of language at work, various roles of a certain language in the socio-economic development of society. (ok, 2008).

Points where intercultural dialogue fails are most often also sites of cultural conflict. We are convinced that our own culture is imperfect, but nevertheless think it is less imperfect than others, so we accept it as the best and reject others. Although no culture offers perfection and the best way of life, dialogue and coexistence of cultures where every community can find what's best for it seems the wisest, if not only solution. Multiculturalism is therefore a concept that is universal and timeless, and needs to be understood, promoted and developed. And it is precisely scientific research that can set out suitable paths for cultural coexistence. Cross-cultural competence is recognised as a critical capability that helps personnel become mission ready and meet the challenges of this decade in several of the following domains: diplomacy, economy and industry, science, civil service operators, peacekeeping process personnel, NGO volunteers, military leaders and corps. The intention of this paper isn't to disclose all the dimensions of those domains. A new, much longer presentation would be needed.

The global economy, for instance, creates a new generation of studies that connect language and the economy. People and institutions emerge in the processes of global economy, who have to communicate very quickly and well to achieve success and the objectives set by the capital. Not only new information technologies are important in this communication, the language is also important, and it differs from goods, services, assets, because goods, service management does not exist without language. Language management means users' management (Cameron, 2005).

Research, higher education, developmental projects and strategies exceed the local borders, regions and continents. The emergence of new knowledge and the development of new information technologies and tools, where cross-cultural awareness and acting are necessary, are raising besides multilingualism. Joint policies of regulating world dimensions would be more successful if policy makers would know that the awareness about the fact that there is no single truth and uniform view of the problem is the only way to joint solutions. It is difficult to speak about the positive relation to another, possibly hostile culture in war circumstances; therefore, it is especially interesting to know whether the cross-cultural awareness in war is the element of victory.

In the presentation of the book that analyses the military culture *Cross-Cultural Competence for a 21st Century Military Culture, the Flipside of the COIN* (Sands and Sand, ed.2013) I have found the contemplation about how warfare in this century differs of the warfare throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Contemporary warfare is continuing to be an exercise in military strength, but beside the kinetic force is composed of missions that depend on skills to forge interpersonal relationships and build sustainable partnerships with a host of actors that once had no voice or role in the conflict's duration or conclusion. Today, final victory does not conclude directly from conflict, in fact victory may be subsumed into the larger and more consuming equation of international stability.

This is quite important for soldiers, because their relation to other culture is thoughtful and comprehended. During participation in war and even more during their work in peace, they will be set in numerous situations where they will have to decide based on the relation to own and other cultures that are set in advance. It seems necessary to introduce the elements of the cross-cultural ability or cross-cultural awareness in various

contents of military training, understanding and respecting diversity is the fundamental value of warfare.

5. 3C IN THE ARMY

Among many studies, implemented by American researchers for the need of missions of American soldiers abroad, I have chosen the topic on the 3C (Cross- Cultural Competence) by Gulick and Herman (2007) and Culhane, Reid, Crepeau, LJ. in McDonald (2012). The extensive processing of topics and the presentation of scientific publications of the 3C, including those who discussed the issue of cross-cultural ability in the army, is found in the collected bibliography of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences: *Cross- Cultural Competence in the Department of Defense* (2014).

The introduction, followed by the distribution of works by target topics in the mentioned bibliography, shows the purpose of the collection and an attempt to determine topics in individual sections that consider the 3C. Prior to distributing individual works by content, the collection authors initially critically discuss the areas and in this way simplify the search for the appropriate source. As usual, they find themselves tackling the problem how to define the cross-cultural competence in the mass of accessible definitions. The distribution of contents is initially merged within the scope of general knowledge about culture (core concepts from social science for learning about and understanding culture, cross-cultural schemas, etc.). Among the descriptions of an individuals' level of proficiency or competency in performing a specific task, they focus on psycho-motor and behavioural competences. Among the abilities, authors present mostly the appertaining features of an individual which can significantly impact or limit cross-cultural awareness rising. Other characteristics include preliminary experience, work practices, individual's lifestyle including the belonging to a multicultural family, travel experience, deployment or time abroad, as well as exposure to individuals from different backgrounds or who have different opinions and beliefs. Works are included which in a synthetic manner present the models of cross-cultural awareness raising or structure processes that lead to this.

The authors of the bibliographical collection admit that despite the numerous forms of training on all levels more research is needed to empirically determine what knowledge, skills, abilities, and other attributes should be prioritized as part of

training. It is difficult to unify, whether knowledge and skills are more important to the army than cognition, emotions and characteristic features of an individual. They question who should be the educator of cross-cultural awareness, which features of foreign environments are fundamental, what does language knowledge and what the use of a translator mean, how do differences in military ranks and tasks impact the qualification of the 3C and what are the differences in training special forces (Air Force, Army and Marine Corps). "One size fits all" approach to 3C is unsatisfactory, coordination of research efforts and alignment (vs. standardisation) of core curricula is still likely to be highly beneficial.

Despite advances in the development of 3C assessments, however, one of the greatest concerns with existing ones is that most of them rely on self-report methodologies. As such, self-report assessments of 3C may actually reflect an individual's level of self-efficacy or beliefs about his/her success in cross-cultural contexts, rather than his/her true level of 3C or actual performance in cross-cultural settings. The assessment of 3C by models that apply to other areas in the cases of cross-cultural awareness evaluation in the army is only partially suitable if not even completely useless. The real world in which military personnel operate is not an experimental laboratory where scientists can control conditions and "test" the utility of cross-cultural competence. The solution could be found in two directions: verifying skills and abilities that support the raising of awareness of the 3C and crossing the interviews of the service personnel with data of lessons learned reports and after action reviews to uncover what skills or abilities identify as important and effective. The presented works also focus on questions when and how the assessed achievements of verification should be used and for what purposes.

The works in the bibliographical collection also bring novelties, especially open areas among various sciences that examine the 3C. The aspect of the entire spectrum of external factors that impact the awareness of the 3C is also important. This involves national and global policies, the traditions of an individual environment in accepting otherness, the adaptation to team work and adaptation, army management style and similar. We know little about the consequences of negative circumstances or experiences with cross-cultural interaction. In students, world travellers and job seekers the return to the local environment

can be healing and relaxing after a bad experience. Unfortunately, this is not the case for many military members, whose deployment experience and negative or traumatic events will impact their 3C on current and future deployments. Studying new possibilities to resolve these stressful situations should be further explored. The research in this direction should not remain within individual sciences and geographical borders.

On the basis of different cultural understanding and language proficiency studies (CULP) in the CULP report of the U.S. Army Research Institute (2007): *Cross-Cultural Competence in Army Leaders: A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation* the researchers have attempted to identify the cross-cultural knowledge, skills, and affect that Army leaders need to better understand the adversary, interact effectively with a local population, and work collaboratively with coalition partners. The mentioned CULP study had three objectives: 1) to identify the knowledge related to culture and identity needed by Army leaders, 2) to identify measures and predictors of effective performance in cross-cultural settings, and 3) to identify the extent to which proficiency in a foreign language provides transferable skills. This first report addresses the second objective. The first and third objectives are addressed in two companion reports.

The researchers consider that the role of culture-general competence of Army leaders that may experience multiple deployments to different countries over their career is very important. In their opinion, the general dimensions of 3C are at least as important as culture-specific variables like language and regional knowledge.

In the study are prominent special traits called the Big Five. They include openness/intellect, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability (neuroticism). These traits were empirically derived using a variety of methods and represent a comprehensive approach to personality structure (Wiggins & Trapnell, 1997).

The second study *Beyond frontiers: The critical role of cross-cultural competence in the military* (Culhane, E., Reid, P., Crepeau, L.J., & McDonald, D., 2012) discusses the critical need for military personnel to be cognitively, socially, and culturally adapted to effectively meet the changing needs and growing spectrum of varied missions within the next decade that increasingly involve efforts focused on stabilisation, reconstruction, security operations, and

humanitarian endeavours. The authors describe the 3C as a “set of cultural behaviours and attitudes integrated into the practice methods of a system, agency, or its professionals that enables them to work effectively in cross-cultural situations” (National Centre for Cultural Competence, 2001:9). The multifactorial model that they propose is leadership centred. Leaders can use 3C to integrate, tolerate, and bridge differences that allow for congruent communication pathways and perspectives and helps them to fasten leadership capabilities, such as systems thinking, strategic agility, forecasting team strengths, building strategic networks, and ultimately planning, preparing, executing, and assessing operations.

The number and scope of works that have recently dealt with the incentives of military services for cross-cultural awareness raising, shows the current meaning of the 3C also among professions and missions where power and weapons were significant a century ago, i.e. by studying and the applicability of different models and strategies for successful cross-cultural mediation in exceeding conflicts and finally by simulating the most appropriate relations in direct combats that would minimise human and material losses. Is 3C the new weapon that will more successfully chase off terrorism and unjust wars? Let's end with a quote that tries to answer that question:

Cultural knowledge and linguistic ability are some of the best weapons in the struggle against terrorism. Mastering these weapons can mean the difference between victory and defeat on the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. (Gabrielle Giffords, Address at the Defense Language Institute, August 2009)

6. CONCLUSIONS & ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The content of this paper is the result of author's research work carried out in the last two decades that has been partially implemented in the author's academic work with students and her research in the wider multilingual society. She takes full responsibility for the contents and scientific correctness of it.

It is her pleasure to have the opportunity to present it at the International conference *Redefining community in intercultural context* (Brasov, 21 – 23 May, 2015), organised by Henri Coanda Air Force Academy in Brasov.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Agar, M. (1994). *Language Shock. Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: William Morrow.
2. Barthes, R. (1973). *Le Plaisir du texte*. Paris: Seuil.
3. Bennett, J.M. & Bennett, M.J. (2003). Developing intercultural sensitivity. In D. Landis, J. Bennett, M. Bennett (eds.), *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 147-165.
4. Bennett, J.M. (1993). Cultural marginality. Identity issues in intercultural training. In R.M. Paige (Ed.) *Education for intercultural experience*. Varmouth, ME: Intercultural Press. 109-135.
5. Bufon, M. (1997). Geopolitical and ethnic transformations in the upper Adriatic between conflicts and integration perspectives. *Annales*, 10. 295 - 306.
6. Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
7. Byram, M., Morgan, C. (1994). *Teaching and learning language and culture*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
8. Cameron, D. (2005). Communication and commodification. Global economic change in sociolinguistic perspective. In G. Erreygers, G. Jacobs (eds.). *Language, Communication and the Economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 9-23.
9. Čok, L. (1999). Portfolio of languages in Slovenia: content, procedures and phases of trial implementation in Slovenia 1998-2001. In J. Hytönen, C. Razdevšek-Puč, G. Smyth (eds.). *Tempus S_JEP-11187-96 Respect: contributions to the project*. Ljubljana: Faculty of Education. 97-101.
10. Čok, L. (2006). Can the intercultural language competence be (self)assessed? : parameters / descriptors for assessing the levels of knowledge, competences and acts. In L. Čok, Lucija (ed.), *Bližina drugosti* (Knjižnica Annales Majora). Koper: Založba Annales. 57-72.
11. Čok, L. (2008). The human coexistence - underpinned by languages and cultures. *Šolsko polje*, 19, 5/6. 91-106.
12. Čok, L., Beguš, A. (2011). Intercultural Communication in Boundless Space. Computer- Mediated Communication (CMC) and Languages. Paper presented at the 4th International Adriatic-Ionian scientific conference: *Across Languages and Cultures*. September 2011. Ca' Foscari University, Venice. 1-3.
13. Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural Psychology, a once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA, London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press
15. Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Language policy unit. [online] Strasbourg: Cambridge University Press. Available www.coe.int/lang-cefr. [Accessed on 5/5/15].
16. Culhane, E., Reid, P., Crepeau, L.J., & McDonald, D. (2012). Beyond frontiers: The critical role of cross-cultural competence in the military. [online]. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 50, 30-37. Available <http://www.siop.org/tip/july12/05culhane.aspx> [Accessed on 5/5/15].
17. Culhane, E., Reid, P., Crepeau, L.J., & McDonald, D. (2012). Beyond frontiers: The critical role of cross-cultural competence in the military. [online] *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 50. 30-37. Available <http://www.siop.org/tip/july12/05culhane.aspx> [Accessed on 5/5/15].
18. Egan, K. (1997). *Educational development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
19. Gallus, J.A. et al. (2014). Special Report 71. *Cross-Cultural Competence in the Department of Defense: An Annotated Bibliography*. Fort Belvoir: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
20. Gomezel Mikoli, V. (2000). Povezanost narodne in jezikovne zavesti. *Jezik in slovstvo*, XLV / 5.
21. Gulick, Lisa M. V. and Herman, Jeffrey L. (2007). Cross-Cultural Competence in Army Leaders. [online]. *A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation. Consortium Research Fellows Program. U.S. Army Research Institute*. Available <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/army/sr2008-01.pdf>. [Accessed on 5/5/15].
22. Hofstede, G. (2003). *Culture's consequences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
23. Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
24. Kramsch, C. (2009). *The Multilingual Subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
25. Risager, K. (2008). Towards a Transnational

- Paradigm in Language and Culture Pedagogy. Paper read at *the AAAL 2008 Annual Conference*, Washington D.C., USA.
26. Sands, Robert R. Greene & Allison Greene-Sand (eds). (2014). *Cross-Cultural Competence for a 21st Century Military Culture, the Flipside of COIN*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
27. Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture* (2nd ed.). London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
28. Welsch, W. (1999). Transculturality – the Puzzling Form of Cultures Today. In M. Featherstone & S. Lash (eds.), *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*. Ed. Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash. London: Sage. 194-213.
29. Wiggins, J.S. & Trapnell, P.D. (1997). Personality structure: The return of the Big Five. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (eds.), *Handbook of Personality Psychology*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. 737-765.
30. Williams, G. *et al.* (2012). Globalisation, Modernity and Language: New Perspectives on Language in education. [online]. *The EUNoM report*. Available http://in3.uoc.edu/opencms_in3/export/sites/in3/webs/projectes/EUNO_M/_resources/documents/THE_EU_NOM_REPORT_v2.pdf [Accessed on 4/27/15].